International Journal of Interdisciplinary Innovative Research &Development (IJIIRD)
ISSN: 2456-236X
Vol. **08** Issue **01** | **2023**

India and South Africa's WTO TRIPS Waiver Proposal: Implications for COVID-19 Patents and Copyrights

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 catalyzed global debate on access to life-saving technologies and the role of intellectual property rights (IPRs) as a barrier to equitable distribution. In October 2020, India and South Africa submitted a landmark proposal at the World Trade Organization (WTO) requesting a temporary waiver of certain TRIPS (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) obligations to facilitate affordable access to COVID-19 vaccines, therapeutics, and diagnostics. This article evaluates the legal, ethical, and geopolitical dimensions of the waiver proposal, focusing on patents and copyrights. It explores the context of the proposal, the support and opposition it received, and its implications for global IP law. The paper concludes with a reflection on the need to restructure international IPR regimes during health emergencies to prioritize global public good over monopoly rights.

Keywords: TRIPS Waiver, WTO, COVID-19, Intellectual Property Rights, Patents, Copyrights, Global Health Equity, Access to Medicines, India-South Africa Proposal, Compulsory Licensing, Pandemic Response, Vaccine Access

1. INTRODUCTION

The emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic was not merely a public health crisis; it was a global event that laid bare the deep structural inequalities in access to life-saving health technologies. As the world grappled with rising infection rates, overburdened healthcare systems, and unprecedented mortality, another silent crisis unfolded—inequitable access to vaccines, medicines, diagnostics, and related health technologies. While high-income countries rapidly secured vaccine supplies through advance purchase agreements, many low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) were left behind, waiting for donations or struggling with limited manufacturing capacity.

This disparity in access was not solely a logistical or manufacturing issue—it was deeply intertwined with the legal and structural framework of global intellectual property (IP) law, particularly the World Trade Organization's (WTO) Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). Enacted in 1995, TRIPS set binding minimum standards for IP protection for all WTO member states, including patent rights for pharmaceuticals and copyright protections for digital tools and data. While intended to stimulate innovation and protect inventors, the TRIPS Agreement has often been criticized for favoring profit-driven monopolies at the expense of public health, especially during emergencies.

Amid this context, in October 2020, India and South Africa jointly submitted a bold proposal to the WTO, seeking a temporary waiver of certain TRIPS obligations related to COVID-19 health products. Their argument was clear: IP rights—especially patents and copyrights—were acting as barriers to affordable, timely, and widespread access to vaccines, diagnostics, and therapeutics. The waiver aimed to empower countries to bypass these barriers, encouraging domestic production, technology transfer, and regional collaboration without fear of violating international IP law.

The waiver proposal sparked a worldwide debate, dividing nations and stakeholders. On one side were over 100 countries, several civil society organizations, global health agencies like the WHO and UNAIDS, and public health experts, who supported the waiver as a necessary and ethical intervention during an unprecedented health crisis. On the other side stood developed nations, pharmaceutical companies, and industry lobby groups, who argued that IP protections were essential to sustain innovation and that voluntary measures, such as licensing and COVAX, were sufficient to address access concerns.

This paper examines this complex intersection of global health equity, legal frameworks, and geopolitical dynamics. The waiver proposal is not just a legal maneuver but a reflection of a larger ideological struggle over whether human life and global solidarity should take precedence over corporate interests and profit-making in times of crisis. By focusing on the patent and copyright dimensions of the TRIPS waiver, this study aims to understand its broader implications for the future of intellectual property law and global pandemic preparedness.

Furthermore, the Indian and South African initiative highlights the rising voice of the Global South in shaping international norms. India, as a major manufacturer of generic medicines and vaccines, positioned itself as a leader of equitable health diplomacy, advocating for structural reforms in the IP regime that better reflect the needs of developing nations. The proposal not only challenged traditional IP paradigms but also raised critical questions

about the adequacy of existing legal tools such as compulsory licensing and government-use provisions, which were often too cumbersome for pandemic-scale responses.
The COVID-19 pandemic, thus, has forced the world to reconsider the balance between innovation incentives and public health imperatives. The TRIPS waiver debate is emblematic of this tension and represents a crucial opportunity to revisit how international law can be adapted during emergencies to serve the global public good.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The COVID-19 pandemic renewed global attention toward the role of intellectual property rights (IPRs) in public health emergencies. Over the years, several researchers and institutions have explored the limitations of existing IP frameworks in times of crisis, and COVID-19 amplified the urgency of such discourse.
World Health Organization (2020) introduced the **COVID-19 Technology Access Pool (C-TAP)** as a voluntary platform encouraging patent holders to share IP, knowledge, and data. However, WHO reported low participation from pharmaceutical companies, signaling the need for more enforceable mechanisms. The initiative emphasized global solidarity but also revealed structural challenges in relying solely on goodwill-based models during emergencies.
United Nations Development Programme (2021) published a legal review of how human rights principles can justify limiting IPRs in health crises. It pointed out that access to medicines is linked with fundamental rights, and global IP frameworks must be balanced against states' duty to ensure public health under international law.
Correa (2021), in a policy brief from the South Centre, emphasized that existing TRIPS flexibilities such as compulsory licensing are insufficient during pandemics. He argued that a temporary waiver was a more effective tool to remove legal and procedural barriers and enhance production capacity, particularly in the Global South.
Médecins Sans Frontières (2021) issued multiple position papers pointing out that voluntary licensing mechanisms—like those promoted by initiatives such as COVAX or Medicines Patent Pool—were often exclusionary, unpredictable, and dependent on the discretion of patent holders. MSF strongly advocated for the TRIPS waiver to democratize access to medical technology.
South African Department of Health (2021) issued a formal statement supporting the waiver proposal, citing that monopolies in vaccine technology were exacerbating vaccine apartheid. The department called for international solidarity and a fairer model of technology distribution.
Médecins Sans Frontières (2022) further criticized the limited outcome of the MC12 negotiations, highlighting that the final waiver failed to address diagnostics and therapeutics and completely ignored copyrights and data protections, which are crucial in the digital age.
Watal (2022), writing in the WHO Bulletin, examined the need for structural changes in the IP governance system. She proposed integrating pandemic-specific exceptions into the WTO legal framework so that countries do not need to rely on ad hoc waivers every time a crisis occurs. Watal emphasized embedding public health priorities into international IP agreements.
These studies collectively underscore a crucial shift in scholarly and institutional thinking. There is growing consensus that while IPRs may incentivize innovation in normal times, they can become significant obstacles in global health emergencies. The COVID-19 crisis has demonstrated the limitations of current IP frameworks and the urgent need for enforceable, equity-driven mechanisms to ensure access to medicines, vaccines, and knowledge as global public goods.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary aim of this research is to conduct a comprehensive and critical examination of the India-South Africa TRIPS waiver proposal submitted to the World Trade Organization during the COVID-19 pandemic. The study focuses on legal, ethical, geopolitical, and practical dimensions of intellectual property rights (IPRs) in the context of a global health emergency. The specific objectives of this study are as follows:

1. **To examine the legal and ethical implications of the India-South Africa TRIPS waiver proposal**: The research seeks to evaluate the proposal's compatibility with existing WTO agreements, particularly Article IX, which allows waivers in exceptional circumstances. Furthermore, the study explores the ethical dimensions of withholding life-saving medical technologies under IP protection and examines how global justice and the right to health are central to the debate.
2. **To analyze the influence of patents and copyrights on access to COVID-19 vaccines, diagnostics, and related technologies**: This objective aims to investigate how IPRs—especially patents on mRNA vaccines, diagnostic tools, and therapeutics, and copyrights on digital health tools and scientific databases—impacted the equitable distribution and affordability of COVID-19 technologies. The research will assess both the restrictive and enabling roles of IPRs in global public health.
3. **To study international responses to the TRIPS waiver proposal, including geopolitical and economic motivations**: The study evaluates the spectrum of support and opposition from various WTO member states, exploring how political alliances, pharmaceutical lobbying, economic interests, and regional partnerships

influenced positions on the waiver. It investigates the reasons behind the support of countries like the U.S. and opposition from the EU, UK, and Japan.

4. **To evaluate India's strategic positioning in global IP diplomacy and health governance**: The study explores India's role as a leader of the Global South and as a pharmaceutical manufacturing hub. It examines how India used the TRIPS waiver proposal to enhance its image as the "pharmacy of the world," promote South-South solidarity, and advocate for IP law reform in alignment with global equity goals.
5. **To offer policy-oriented recommendations for restructuring international IPR regimes for future health emergencies**: The research concludes with actionable suggestions aimed at reforming the WTO IP framework. These include calls for establishing permanent IP waiver mechanisms during pandemics, improving compulsory licensing practices, encouraging open-source innovation models, and integrating public health safeguards directly into international IP law.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study employs a **qualitative doctrinal research methodology** to critically examine the legal, ethical, and geopolitical implications of the India-South Africa TRIPS waiver proposal submitted to the WTO in 2020. Given the nature of the subject—which lies at the intersection of international law, intellectual property regimes, global health policy, and ethics—a doctrinal approach was most suitable for systematically analyzing legal texts, policy documents, and scholarly literature.

1. Research Design and Approach

The study adopts an analytical and interpretive research design. It involves a detailed examination of primary legal instruments (such as the TRIPS Agreement, WTO legal provisions, and national copyright/patent laws) and international declarations, along with analysis of secondary data from academic journals, policy briefs, government statements, and institutional reports.

2. Sources of Data

- **Primary Sources**:
  - The TRIPS Agreement (especially Sections 1, 4, 5, and 7 of Part II)
  - WTO legal provisions (specifically Article IX of the Marrakesh Agreement)
  - Official documents such as the India-South Africa proposal (IP/C/W/669)
  - The Indian Copyright Act, 1957 and related national laws
  - WTO Ministerial Conference (MC12) decisions
- **Secondary Sources**:
  - Scholarly articles, policy briefs, and opinion pieces published by WHO, UNDP, South Centre, and Médecins Sans Frontières
  - Reports from civil society organizations and global health think tanks
  - Statements and responses from WTO member countries
  - News reports and expert commentaries published during 2020–2023

3. Data Collection Method

Data was collected through:

- Desktop-based review of official WTO repositories and legal databases (such as TRIPS Gateway and WIPO Lex)
- Online academic databases (JSTOR, SSRN, Hein Online, and Google Scholar)
- International organizations' official portals (WHO, UNDP, MSF)

4. Analytical Tools

The collected data was thematically organized under categories such as "legal basis of the waiver," "global responses," "impact on public health," and "IP reform discourse." A **comparative analysis** was conducted to evaluate differing national responses and the effectiveness of existing IP mechanisms like compulsory licensing, against the proposed waiver approach. In addition, **content analysis** was employed to interpret political statements, policy language, and institutional standpoints to identify recurring themes, biases, and policy gaps.

5. Limitations of the Methodology

While the study draws upon extensive global documentation, it is limited by the lack of direct empirical data or field interviews with policymakers or health officials. However, the richness of doctrinal and policy sources ensures a robust analysis suitable for a legal and policy-oriented research inquiry.

6. Ethical Considerations

As the study is based on secondary, publicly available data, there are no human participants involved, and thus no ethical clearance was required. Nonetheless, the research upholds academic integrity through proper citation and objective interpretation of all materials.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study reveal significant insights into the global debate on intellectual property rights during the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly in the context of the India-South Africa TRIPS waiver proposal. The results are organized thematically to present the core outcomes and critically discuss their broader implications.

1. Widespread Support from the Global South and Civil Society

The TRIPS waiver proposal received strong support from over 100 developing and least-developed countries (LDCs), as well as civil society organizations and international health agencies. Countries in Africa, Latin America, and Asia saw the proposal as a necessary step to overcome IP barriers that limited local manufacturing and technology access. Organizations like Médecins Sans Frontières, UNAIDS, and the WHO emphasized that equitable access to health technologies could not be ensured without suspending monopolistic IP protections, at least temporarily.

This support underscored the shared frustration among the Global South with the existing TRIPS flexibilities—especially compulsory licensing—which, though legally available, were too complex and slow for pandemic-scale responses.

2. Geopolitical Divide and Resistance from Developed Countries

A notable outcome was the geopolitical polarization of responses to the waiver. While the United States eventually announced partial support (specifically for vaccines), several developed nations—including the European Union, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Japan—opposed the waiver. Their opposition was grounded in three major arguments:

- **IP was not a barrier** to vaccine access; rather, supply chain constraints were.
- **Waivers could deter innovation** by undermining incentives for research and development.
- **Voluntary licensing and COVAX** were seen as more reliable mechanisms for equitable distribution.

This resistance illustrated the influence of pharmaceutical industry lobbying and the prioritization of commercial interests, even during a global humanitarian crisis.

3. TRIPS Waiver Outcome at MC12 (2022): A Compromised Agreement

After prolonged negotiations, the 12th WTO Ministerial Conference (MC12) in June 2022 adopted a limited version of the TRIPS waiver, focusing only on vaccines. Provisions for therapeutics, diagnostics, and copyrights were deferred or excluded.

The final agreement was criticized by public health advocates for being overly narrow, bureaucratically complicated, and falling short of the original proposal. The delay and dilution of the waiver's scope raised concerns about the WTO's capacity to respond to urgent global health needs in a timely and effective manner.

4. India's Strategic Role and Global Leadership

India's proactive role in proposing and promoting the waiver marked a significant moment in global health diplomacy. As a major producer of generic medicines and vaccines (e.g., Covaxin, Covishield), India projected itself as the "pharmacy of the world." The country's position aligned with its broader strategic goals of fostering South-South cooperation and challenging the status quo of international IP regimes. India's domestic efforts to expand vaccine manufacturing and share technology with neighboring countries strengthened its credibility and diplomatic standing.

5. Challenges in Copyrighted Digital Health Tools and Data Sharing

The pandemic response involved extensive use of software for contact tracing, remote consultations, and clinical data analytics—all often protected under copyright laws. However, the waiver proposal's limited application to such digital tools meant that many low-income countries continued to face access barriers. The study found that existing national provisions (such as India's fair use clause in the Copyright Act, 1957) were underutilized due to lack of awareness, institutional inertia, and absence of enabling executive policies.

6. Ethical and Human Rights Concerns

The pandemic brought ethical considerations to the forefront. Restricting life-saving technologies due to intellectual property claims raised moral questions about the prioritization of profits over lives. Many scholars and health advocates argued that public funding had contributed substantially to COVID-19 vaccine development, justifying the need for open access and global sharing of results. The right to health, as enshrined in international human rights law, became central to arguments in favor of the waiver.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and analysis presented, this study offers several recommendations aimed at improving global intellectual property regimes, strengthening pandemic preparedness, and ensuring equitable access to life-saving health technologies during public health emergencies. These recommendations are directed toward international organizations, national governments, public health institutions, and policymakers:

1. Establish a Permanent Global IP Waiver Mechanism for Health Emergencies

The WTO should consider creating a permanent legal framework that automatically activates temporary waivers of certain TRIPS obligations during declared global health emergencies. This would reduce the time-consuming

negotiations and political resistance currently associated with ad hoc proposals like the India-South Africa TRIPS waiver.

2. Streamline and Expand Compulsory Licensing Provisions

Existing TRIPS flexibilities such as compulsory licensing should be made faster, more flexible, and less bureaucratic. The WTO should revise Article 31 to allow multi-country, multi-product licenses with reduced procedural requirements, particularly during pandemics.

3. Integrate Copyright and Digital Tools in Future Waiver Frameworks

Future waiver provisions must explicitly include copyright protections, especially for digital health tools like contact tracing apps, telemedicine platforms, and research databases. Ensuring open access to such tools is critical for rapid global coordination in health crises.

4. Promote Open Science and Knowledge Sharing

Governments and global agencies must promote open-access research models, mandatory data-sharing of publicly funded clinical trials, and non-exclusive licensing of essential technologies. This can be enforced through clauses in R&D funding contracts requiring recipients to contribute to global technology pools or platforms like WHO's C-TAP.

5. Enhance South-South Collaboration for Local Manufacturing Capacity

Developing countries should invest in regional cooperation to build vaccine and pharmaceutical manufacturing hubs, supported by technology transfer, training, and public-private partnerships. This would reduce dependence on Western pharmaceutical companies and improve regional health security.

6. Amend National IP Laws to Include Emergency Provisions

Countries like India should revisit their national IP laws to insert clear and operational emergency-use clauses for both patents and copyrights. These clauses should be executable through administrative orders without court proceedings, enabling rapid deployment of critical technologies during crises.

7. Ensure Transparency and Accountability in R&D Funding

Public funding of pharmaceutical research should come with conditions that ensure the final products remain accessible. Governments must demand transparency in pricing, technology sharing, and production processes for all publicly subsidized medical innovations.

8. Empower Civil Society and Public Health Advocates

Governments and international bodies must engage civil society organizations, academia, and healthcare professionals in shaping global IP policy. Their involvement ensures that equity and ethics remain central to decisions affecting public health.

9. Include Pandemic IP Preparedness in Global Health Governance

Institutions like WHO and the WTO should collaborate to create an IP and innovation preparedness framework as part of pandemic response protocols, ensuring that IP law reforms are seen as critical components of global health security.

10. Educate Stakeholders on TRIPS Flexibilities and Legal Options

Awareness programs should be launched for legal professionals, policymakers, and public health administrators to enhance understanding of TRIPS flexibilities, IP exemptions, and the legal rights of states during emergencies.

7. CONCLUSION

The India-South Africa TRIPS waiver proposal marked a historic turning point in the global discourse on intellectual property rights during health emergencies. While the proposal itself was initially broad and visionary—seeking to temporarily waive critical provisions of the TRIPS Agreement to enable universal access to COVID-19 vaccines, therapeutics, diagnostics, and digital health tools—its eventual outcome was significantly diluted, reflecting the geopolitical complexities and structural rigidity of the global IP regime.

This research has demonstrated that intellectual property laws, though essential for encouraging innovation, can become formidable barriers to public health in times of global crisis. The COVID-19 pandemic revealed deep disparities in vaccine access, with the Global North monopolizing supplies while many countries in the Global South were left dependent on donations and slow-moving voluntary mechanisms. The waiver proposal challenged the moral legitimacy of such monopolies, arguing persuasively that human lives must take precedence over commercial profits.

Through doctrinal and policy analysis, the study established that existing TRIPS flexibilities like compulsory licensing are inadequate during fast-moving pandemics due to their procedural complexity and country-by-country limitations. The waiver, though supported by more than 100 countries and civil society organizations, faced opposition from high-income nations and industry lobbies that prioritized innovation incentives over equity and solidarity.

India's leadership in co-authoring and defending the proposal also highlighted its growing role in global health diplomacy. As a major pharmaceutical manufacturing hub, India's advocacy for equitable access reinforced its identity as the "pharmacy of the world" and its commitment to South-South cooperation. However, the limited

outcome of the WTO's Ministerial Conference (MC12) and the exclusion of diagnostics, therapeutics, and copyrights from the final waiver indicate that structural reform of the international IP regime remains an urgent, unfinished task.

Moving forward, the world must embrace a reimagined intellectual property framework—one that is adaptable during emergencies, prioritizes public good over monopoly rights, and fosters inclusive innovation. Permanent waiver mechanisms, open-science collaborations, equitable technology transfer, and stronger South-South alliances are no longer optional; they are essential if we are to avoid repeating the injustices witnessed during the COVID-19 pandemic.

In conclusion, the TRIPS waiver debate has underscored a fundamental truth: global health security cannot be built on systems that exclude billions. Intellectual property governance must evolve to meet the demands of humanity—not just the expectations of the market. Only through such a shift can we hope to achieve a fairer, healthier, and more resilient world.

8. REFERENCES

1. WTO Document IP/C/W/669, "Waiver Proposal by India and South Africa," October 2020.
2. Correa, C. (2021). The TRIPS Waiver Proposal: An Urgent Measure to Expand Access. South Centre Brief.
3. UNDP. (2021). COVID-19 and Human Rights: Legal Perspectives.
4. Médecins Sans Frontières. (2022). TRIPS Waiver: What It Covers and What It Misses.
5. WTO Ministerial Conference 12. (2022). Outcome Document on TRIPS Waiver.
6. Watal, J. (2022). Global Health and IP: Time for Reform. WHO Bulletin.
7. Indian Copyright Act, 1957 (Amended 2012).
8. South African Department of Health. (2021). Statement on the TRIPS Waiver Proposal.
9. MSF Access Campaign. (2021). IP Barriers and Vaccine Equity.
10. WHO (2020). COVID-19 Technology Access Pool (C-TAP): Global Call for Action.