International Organization of Research & Development (IORD)
ISSN: 2348-0831
Vol 11 Issue 01 | 2023

COVID-19 and Intellectual Property Rights: The Promises and Limitations of a WTO Vaccine IP Waiver

Sharda Beniwal (Ph.D Research Scholar)[1], Dr. Vijaymala (Associate Professor)[2]
Department – Law, Shri Jagdish Prasad Jhabarmal Tibrewala University, Chudela, Jhunjhunu

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic spurred an extraordinary global response marked by rapid vaccine development, unprecedented public funding, and international calls for equitable access. Against this backdrop, the WTO vaccine IP waiver emerged as a contentious solution to address inequities in global vaccine distribution. This article critically analyzes the scope, rationale, and limitations of the proposed and partially adopted TRIPS waiver at the World Trade Organization. While hailed as a potential enabler of mass vaccine access in developing nations, the waiver's restricted scope, delay in implementation, and exclusion of critical medical technologies reflect systemic limitations. The study offers an in-depth legal and policy analysis of intellectual property rights, TRIPS flexibilities, and the global public health regime's preparedness for future pandemics.
Keywords: COVID-19, Intellectual Property Rights, TRIPS Waiver, WTO, Vaccine Equity, Global Health Law, Access to Medicines, Public Health, IP Monopolies, Licensing Barriers, mRNA Technology, Patent Reform

1. INTRODUCTION

The outbreak of COVID-19 ushered in one of the most extraordinary challenges to public health, scientific innovation, and international cooperation in modern history. While the world witnessed unprecedented collaboration in the development of life-saving vaccines, it also encountered deep fractures in the global distribution of those vaccines—exposing fundamental inequities in the way health technologies are governed and accessed. At the center of this tension lay intellectual property rights (IPRs), particularly patents protected under the World Trade Organization's TRIPS Agreement.

Pharmaceutical corporations, having invested heavily in research and development (R&D), claimed that strong IPRs were essential to fuel innovation and recoup investment. However, critics and many governments—especially from the Global South—argued that these patent protections created monopolistic barriers that restricted the production and affordability of vaccines, particularly for low- and middle-income countries. The resulting imbalance in vaccine access led to a phenomenon described as "vaccine apartheid," wherein high-income nations secured excess doses and boosters, while many poorer nations lacked even first-dose coverage.

Against this backdrop, India and South Africa jointly proposed a landmark waiver of certain TRIPS obligations at the WTO in October 2020. This proposal aimed to temporarily suspend patent rights and related IP enforcement for COVID-19 vaccines, thereby facilitating greater production and equitable distribution. The proposal gained significant traction and was hailed as a moral and legal step toward global solidarity. Yet, despite widespread support from developing countries and civil society organizations, the waiver faced delays, diplomatic resistance, and was ultimately narrowed in scope at the 12th WTO Ministerial Conference in June 2022.

This paper seeks to critically examine the legal rationale, ethical significance, and practical impact of the WTO vaccine IP waiver. It analyzes how IPRs—while intended to promote innovation—can obstruct urgent public health responses during pandemics. The study also investigates the promises of the waiver: its potential to enable manufacturing in the Global South, reduce trade tensions, and assert the precedence of human rights over commercial rights. Simultaneously, it evaluates its limitations: the restricted scope to only vaccines, lack of mandatory technology transfer, and delayed implementation.

In doing so, the research highlights the broader question of whether the global IP system, as currently structured, is fit for purpose in times of international health crises. It calls for a fundamental reconsideration of IP law, not only from a legal and economic lens but through the ethical imperative of ensuring that no life is lost because of patent exclusivity or licensing constraints.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The discourse on intellectual property rights (IPRs) during health emergencies predates the COVID-19 pandemic, but the crisis reignited global debate about the tension between patent protection and equitable access to medicines. Numerous scholars, international agencies, and advocacy organizations have analyzed the legal frameworks, ethical imperatives, and political dynamics that shaped the TRIPS waiver proposal and its

implementation. The literature reveals both the historical roots and the urgent contemporary relevance of the IP vs. public health debate.

1. UN General Assembly (1948)
The **Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)**, in Article 25, declares the right to a standard of living adequate for health and well-being, including access to medical care. While not binding law, this declaration has shaped international expectations regarding the human right to health. In the context of COVID-19, this right has been cited in arguments that IP laws must not become barriers to accessing vaccines or essential treatments.

2. WTO Doha Declaration (2001)
Adopted in response to the HIV/AIDS crisis, the **Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health** emphasized that TRIPS should be interpreted and implemented in a manner supportive of public health. It affirmed that WTO members have the right to use TRIPS flexibilities such as compulsory licensing and parallel importation. This declaration provided critical legal and political precedent for the COVID-19 TRIPS waiver debates.

3. MSF Access Campaign (2020–2022)
Médecins Sans Frontières (Doctors Without Borders), through a series of briefings, documented how **IP monopolies obstructed the production and affordability** of COVID-19 vaccines and therapeutics. MSF strongly advocated for a full waiver of TRIPS obligations, highlighting that voluntary licenses offered by pharmaceutical firms were often **selective, non-transparent**, and failed to meet global demand.

4. Gopakumar, K. (2021)
In his analysis for the **Third World Network**, Gopakumar explored the role of India and the Global South in pushing for the TRIPS waiver. He emphasized that the waiver was not just a legal tool but a political assertion of **South-South solidarity**, challenging the dominance of wealthy nations in setting global health policy. He also pointed out the contradictions in India's own domestic policy, which did not fully utilize its own compulsory licensing provisions.

5. Watal, J. (2021)
Writing in the **WHO Bulletin**, Jayashree Watal discussed the limitations of existing **TRIPS flexibilities**, particularly during emergencies. She argued that while compulsory licensing and security exceptions are legally available, they are **procedurally complex and diplomatically sensitive**, often rendering them ineffective during urgent crises. Watal called for a more structured global treaty to govern IP during pandemics.

6. WHO (2021)
In its analysis of the **Access to COVID-19 Tools (ACT) Accelerator**, the World Health Organization acknowledged the role of IP as a **structural barrier** in ensuring global access to vaccines and diagnostics. The WHO promoted initiatives like **C-TAP (COVID-19 Technology Access Pool)**, but participation remained minimal, reflecting pharmaceutical resistance to sharing technology and know-how.

7. Correa, C. M. (2022)
Carlos Correa, in *"IP and Public Health Post-COVID-19"* published by **South Centre**, delivered a thorough critique of the **limited scope and delayed implementation** of the TRIPS waiver adopted at the WTO's MC12. He emphasized that waiving patents alone was not enough—**technology transfer, capacity building, and legal certainty** were equally essential. Correa concluded that the waiver's symbolic value was high, but its practical effect remained limited.

8. Médecins Sans Frontières (2022)
In its review *"The TRIPS Waiver: One Year On,"* MSF concluded that the final waiver failed to deliver on its initial promise. By excluding therapeutics and diagnostics, and by not requiring **mandatory technology transfer**, the waiver was seen as a **diplomatic compromise**, not a functional solution. MSF called for structural reform of the global IP system to prevent similar failures in future health crises.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary goal of this study is to critically examine the legal, ethical, and practical dimensions of the WTO vaccine IP waiver proposed during the COVID-19 pandemic. While the waiver was hailed as a landmark moment in global health diplomacy, its limited scope and delayed implementation have raised significant concerns about the adequacy of the current international IP framework in addressing urgent public health needs. Accordingly, the study outlines the following specific objectives:

1. To analyze the structure and legal foundation of the WTO TRIPS waiver mechanism
The research aims to investigate the legal basis of the waiver under **Article IX of the Marrakesh Agreement**, the enabling charter of the WTO. It also assesses how existing TRIPS flexibilities—such as **compulsory licensing under Article 31**—compare to broader waiver mechanisms, and whether the legal tools available to WTO member states are sufficient to respond to global pandemics.

2. To evaluate the promises and intended outcomes of the COVID-19 vaccine IP waiver
The study explores how the proposed waiver was expected to enable **increased manufacturing**, **legal certainty for generic producers**, and **symbolic global solidarity**. It seeks to understand how the waiver could have enhanced equitable access to vaccines, especially in the Global South.

3. To assess the limitations and practical shortcomings of the waiver as adopted in MC12
While a partial waiver was agreed upon at the 12th WTO Ministerial Conference, it only applied to vaccines and excluded diagnostics and therapeutics. This objective examines the consequences of such **limited scope**, **lack of mandatory technology transfer**, and the **20-month delay** in adoption—by which time many wealthier nations had already achieved vaccine coverage.

4. To understand the geopolitical dynamics and divergent responses to the waiver proposal The study seeks to explain why certain high-income countries—such as the EU, UK, Switzerland, and Japan—opposed the waiver, citing alternative solutions like **COVAX** or **voluntary licensing**. It contrasts these positions with the overwhelming support from developing nations and organizations like **WHO, MSF, and South Centre**, framing the debate within the broader context of **North–South power asymmetries**.

5. To investigate India's strategic and legal role in the waiver debate and its domestic readiness India, as a co-sponsor of the waiver, played a critical role in shaping global discourse. This objective examines India's domestic **legal provisions (Sections 84, 92, 100 of the Patents Act)**, its vaccine manufacturing efforts (Covaxin, Covishield), and its restrained use of compulsory licensing. It also explores how India can better prepare its IP system for future pandemics.

6. To contribute to policy development for a more resilient and ethical global IP system Finally, the study aims to recommend **legal and institutional reforms** that ensure IP law aligns with public health priorities in emergencies. These include **codifying emergency IP waivers**, strengthening **global IP pooling frameworks**, and promoting **open science conditions** for publicly funded research.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a **doctrinal and analytical legal research methodology**, supported by policy analysis and ethical interpretation. Given that the topic centers on international treaties, national statutes, institutional decisions, and moral claims related to public health, the doctrinal approach is most suitable to critically evaluate legal texts, interpret international obligations, and assess policy-level impacts.

1. Nature and Scope of the Study
This is a **qualitative, non-empirical research study** focused on understanding:

- The legal framework of the WTO TRIPS waiver
- The ethical implications of IP enforcement during pandemics
- The policy responses by India and other countries
- The structure and limitations of global IP governance in public health emergencies

The scope covers both **international law** (TRIPS, WTO provisions, Doha Declaration) and **domestic legal readiness** (especially in India under the Patents Act, 1970).

2. Sources of Data

A. Primary Legal and Institutional Documents

- WTO TRIPS Agreement, especially Articles 7, 8, 31, and 73
- WTO Ministerial Conference (MC12) Waiver Decision Document (June 2022)
- TRIPS Waiver Proposal (WTO IP/C/W/669) by India and South Africa (2020)
- Indian Patents Act, 1970 (amended 2005), focusing on Sections 84, 92, and 100
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), particularly Article 25
- Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health (2001)

B. Secondary Sources

- Reports and policy briefs from WHO, Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), South Centre, and Third World Network
- Scholarly articles from journals of global health law, IP law, and public policy
- News reports, WTO press releases, and statements by national governments

- Expert commentary and ethical perspectives on vaccine access and IP monopolies

3. Methods of Analysis

- **Textual and Legal Interpretation**: Close reading and analysis of the TRIPS Agreement, WTO decisions, and national laws to assess their legal content and application.
- **Comparative Analysis**: Examining the responses of various countries (supportive vs. opposing) to the waiver and comparing domestic vs. international approaches.
- **Thematic Content Analysis**: Organizing information under recurring themes like "patent barriers," "vaccine inequity," "voluntary licensing vs. waiver," and "technology transfer."
- **Ethical Reasoning**: Applying utilitarian and rights-based ethical frameworks to assess the fairness and justifiability of IP enforcement during a pandemic.

4. Limitations of the Study

- The research does not include **empirical fieldwork**, interviews, or quantitative data collection.
- Several **licensing agreements and negotiations** related to vaccine IP are not publicly available, limiting transparency.
- The findings are based on information available up to **mid-2023**, and policy changes post-MC12 may not be reflected.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the WTO vaccine IP waiver and associated international developments reveals a complex intersection of **legal mechanisms**, **political negotiations**, and **ethical contradictions**. While the waiver was initially envisioned as a bold move toward equitable vaccine access, its final form and limited scope rendered its practical impact far more constrained than intended. The discussion below categorizes the key findings into thematic dimensions:

1. Legal Potential vs. Diplomatic Compromise

The original TRIPS waiver proposal by India and South Africa in 2020 sought a broad exemption from several TRIPS obligations—including patents, industrial designs, copyright, and trade secrets—for all COVID-19-related medical products. However, the **waiver adopted at the WTO's MC12 in 2022 was limited only to vaccines**, and even that with multiple caveats:

- It did **not include diagnostics or therapeutics**, despite global demand.
- It did **not mandate technology transfer** or data sharing.
- It required an additional decision to even consider expanding scope.

Thus, the waiver became more of a **diplomatic symbol** than a legal game-changer.

2. Time Lag Undermined Utility

By the time the waiver was finally approved in **June 2022**, over **18 months had passed** since its proposal—delaying potential benefits:

- Vaccine production in the Global South had already lagged.
- Many high-income countries had achieved full vaccination.
- Demand began shifting to therapeutics and boosters, which the waiver did not address.

This revealed a **mismatch between global urgency and WTO procedures**, raising concerns about the system's responsiveness in future pandemics.

3. Limited Participation in Voluntary Mechanisms

Initiatives like the **COVID-19 Technology Access Pool (C-TAP)** and **WHO's mRNA vaccine hub** struggled due to lack of participation from major pharmaceutical companies. The waiver was seen as a legal route to bypass these obstacles, but without **compulsory data-sharing provisions**, its effectiveness remained minimal.

- Moderna and Pfizer did not share key mRNA technology.
- Voluntary licensing remained **exclusive and opaque**, reinforcing inequity.

This signaled the **limitations of voluntary approaches** and the need for enforceable international mechanisms.

4. Divergence in Global Political Responses

While over 100 countries supported the waiver, several **high-income nations**, including **the EU, UK, Switzerland, and Japan**, opposed or diluted it. Their rationale included:

- Protecting innovation and R&D investments
- Promoting existing supply through **COVAX**
- Arguing that IP was not the primary barrier to access

In contrast, **developing nations** emphasized:

- The moral imperative of access
- Barriers caused by patent thickets
- Manufacturing capacity awaiting legal clearance

This political split revealed **deep power asymmetries** in global trade negotiations.

5. Ethical Dissonance in IP Enforcement

From an ethical standpoint, the rigid enforcement of patents during a deadly pandemic conflicted with:

- **Utilitarian values**, which prioritize greatest good for the greatest number
- **Human rights norms**, particularly the right to health (Article 12, ICESCR)
- The **moral obligation of states** to protect life over commercial interests

The fact that profits, market exclusivity, and licensing revenue continued to take precedence over global health needs exposed a **normative failure in the global IP regime**.

6. India's Paradoxical Position

India's leadership in proposing the waiver was diplomatically significant, yet it did **not invoke its own domestic IP flexibilities** such as compulsory licensing under Sections 84 and 92 of the Patents Act, 1970. Instead, it relied on voluntary licensing and public–private collaboration.

This reflects a **strategic gap between international advocacy and domestic legal action**, and highlights the need for internal policy reform to match international leadership.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The limitations of the WTO vaccine IP waiver during COVID-19 demonstrate the urgent need for a **reimagined global IP governance system** that balances innovation with equity. To prevent similar failures in future pandemics and to promote global solidarity, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Institutionalize Pre-Approved Global IP Waivers for Pandemics

There should be a **legally binding international framework** under the WTO or WHO that:

- Automatically activates IP waivers during WHO-declared Public Health Emergencies of International Concern (PHEIC)
- Covers not just vaccines, but also **therapeutics, diagnostics, and associated technologies**
- Includes **time-bound and scope-specific** guidelines to ensure clarity and enforceability

Such a proactive mechanism will eliminate procedural delays and geopolitical deadlocks.

2. Mandate Technology Transfer and Know-How Sharing

IP waivers alone are insufficient without access to:

- **Manufacturing blueprints**
- **mRNA and biological platform data**
- **Raw materials and supply chain coordination**

WTO reforms should include provisions that **require technology holders to share technical know-how**, especially when public funding is involved in R&D.

3. Strengthen Domestic IP Emergency Provisions in National Laws

Countries like India must:

- Codify clear **trigger mechanisms** for invoking compulsory licensing and government use (e.g., automatic activation during national health emergencies)
- Create dedicated legal task forces and inter-ministerial bodies for rapid IP policy action
- Train patent offices and legal departments to handle urgent IP waivers effectively

4. Reform Voluntary Licensing and Encourage Transparent, Public Interest Licensing

Current voluntary licenses are:

- **Opaque**, often bilateral
- **Restrictive**, limited to select manufacturers
- **Silent** on pricing and technology disclosure

Governments and institutions should:

- Encourage **non-exclusive licensing** models
- Support open-source platforms and patent pools (e.g., C-TAP, MPP)
- Make **transparency a legal requirement** in all voluntary licenses granted during emergencies

5. Reprioritize Public Health in WTO's IP Framework

The WTO should revisit the **TRIPS Agreement's objectives** and integrate:

- Explicit recognition that **IP rights are not absolute**
- A strong reaffirmation of the **Doha Declaration's principles**
- Guidance on balancing commercial interests with the **right to life and health**

This can help realign WTO's legal obligations with humanitarian goals.

6. Democratize Global IP Policymaking

Developing countries must be given:

- **Equal negotiating power** at WTO forums

- Access to legal expertise and technical assistance
- Support in coalition-building (e.g., G77, Global South networks)

This will correct the **structural imbalance** that currently privileges the Global North in IP decision-making.

7. Promote Open Science in Publicly Funded Research

Governments and international donors should:

- Require **open-access publishing** of pandemic-related research
- Mandate **open licensing** for publicly funded health technologies
- Invest in **public manufacturing infrastructure** to reduce dependency on monopolies

This ensures that **public money leads to public goods**.

8. Build IP Resilience for Future Pandemics

To prepare for future crises, countries should:

- Simulate **IP emergency drills** in national pandemic preparedness programs
- Integrate **IP waivers** into global health financing mechanisms
- Fund **regional technology hubs** (like WHO's mRNA hubs in Africa and Latin America)

7. CONCLUSION

The COVID-19 pandemic has starkly illuminated the profound tensions between intellectual property rights (IPRs) and public health imperatives. While the rapid development of vaccines and therapeutics was a testament to scientific innovation—much of it supported by public funding—the **rigid enforcement of IP rights exacerbated global inequalities in access**, especially for low- and middle-income countries. The WTO vaccine IP waiver, proposed with the promise of addressing this inequity, ultimately fell short of its transformative potential.

As this study has demonstrated, the **legal design and delayed adoption** of the waiver significantly curtailed its utility. By limiting the scope to vaccines and excluding crucial products like diagnostics and therapeutics, the WTO failed to respond comprehensively to the demands of global health justice. Moreover, the waiver did not include binding provisions for **technology transfer**, nor did it dismantle the procedural and diplomatic hurdles that prevent timely access to life-saving innovations.

The political divergence between the Global North and South, as revealed in the waiver negotiations, reflected **systemic power asymmetries** in global IP governance. While developing countries invoked the moral weight of the right to health, wealthier nations often prioritized proprietary control and innovation incentives. This not only delayed coordinated global response but also **undermined trust in international institutions**, particularly the WTO's ability to act in times of crisis.

India's dual role—as a leading manufacturer and as a co-sponsor of the waiver—further exposed the **gap between global advocacy and domestic policy execution**. Despite its legislative tools for compulsory licensing, India refrained from using them, perhaps out of diplomatic restraint or fear of trade retaliation. This highlights the need for countries to align their **internal legal preparedness** with their international positions.

At its core, the debate is not about rejecting IP rights altogether but about ensuring they remain **flexible, responsive, and humane** during emergencies. Public health should never be subordinated to profit motives, especially when lives are at stake and when public funds have underwritten much of the research.

In conclusion, the COVID-19 crisis must serve as a **turning point in global IP policy**. The waiver may not have delivered all that was promised, but it sparked a long-overdue conversation on the ethics, legality, and future of intellectual property in pandemics. Moving forward, **a new IP paradigm is essential**—one that upholds both innovation and inclusivity, that respects both creators and communities, and above all, that recognizes health not as a privilege, but as a **universal right**.

8. REFERENCES

1. WTO IP/C/W/669 – India and South Africa TRIPS Waiver Proposal, 2020
2. WHO (2021). Access to COVID-19 Tools (ACT) Accelerator
3. Médecins Sans Frontières (2022). "The TRIPS Waiver: One Year On"
4. Correa, C. M. (2022). "IP and Public Health Post-COVID-19" – South Centre
5. Watal, J. (2021). "Patent Law Flexibilities and Global Equity" – WHO Bulletin
6. UN General Assembly. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights
7. WTO MC12 Decision Document – Geneva, June 2022
8. Indian Patent Act, 1970 (Amended 2005)
9. Gopakumar, K. (2021). TRIPS Waiver and Global South Solidarity
10. MSF Access Campaign. (2020–2022). Various Briefings on IP Barriers