## CP

#### CP: The member nations of the world trade organization ought to –

#### ---create a new form of Sui Generis patent applications as per Vezina 20

#### ---Grant this form of patent to Indigenous peoples

#### ---Exclude non Indigenous groups from applying for Sui Generis patents and reduce intellectual property protections for medicines for non Indigenous groups

#### Sui generis moral rights framework emphasizing guardianship over ownership and are the only way to stop the appropriate that comes with public knowledge – answers the reforms fail ev bc it bars settlers from using knowledge which isn’t sharing – also solves K of IPR used by Indigenous groups bc it uses a new fw

Vézina 20 “Ensuring Respect for Indigenous Cultures A Moral Rights Approach” Brigitte Vézina [fellow at the Canadian think tank Centre for International Governance Innovation. She holds a bachelor’s degree in law from the Université de Montréal and a master’s in law from Georgetown University], Centre for International Governance Innovation Papers No. 243 — May 2020, <https://www.cigionline.org/static/documents/documents/vezina-paper_1.pdf> SM

Features of a Sui Generis Moral Rights-type Framework

Subject Matter and Beneficiaries

TCEs that maintain a current and significant relationship with the Indigenous peoples who hold them would be protected. As long as a community, as a whole and by virtue of its own internal cultural rules, identifies with a specific form of expression and can establish a particular relationship with it, it can claim protection over it. As Susy Frankel points out, the key rationale in favour of protecting TCEs is the guardianship relationship, from which proportionate moral rights flow.155 Guardianship is to be contrasted with ownership, which is the concept buttressing most IP law systems, with the notable exception of moral rights. To wit, the Waitangi Tribunal did not recommend that TCEs be treated as owned, lest that would amount to building a legal wall around TCEs and end up choking culture.156 At any rate, cultural boundaries are porous and fluid, and it follows that blending, intermixing, hybridization or even “contamination” of cultures can be promoted.157

Obviously, cultures are seldom unique to a people. TCEs might be shared among different Indigenous groups that all identify and hold a guardianship relationship with them. In such cases, procedures should be in place to facilitate cooperation and settlement of disputes. What is more, no people are monolithic, a reality that is rendered in one illustrative phrase: “The Sámi people are one, but multiple.”158 Some communities might have distinct TCEs that have been part of their culture for a long time, with little or no outside influence. Others might have experienced contact with other cultures and incorporated various elements over the generations that have substantially modified previous iterations. For example, in the case of Mixe huipil at stake in the Isabel Marant case, some were quick to point out that the embroideries had, in the upshot of the Spanish conquest, incorporated European elements.159 Hence, when considering a relationship between a TCE and its holder, one should not exact uniqueness or exclusiveness, but embrace the fact that a group can identify with TCEs that are dynamic and kaleidoscopic, all the while remaining authentic.

Beneficiaries of protection should be TCE holding Indigenous communities as a whole, such that moral rights would be afforded to the entire community as group rights. Recognition of beneficiaries as well as determination of the authority to exercise the rights would have to be done from within the community, by way of application of customary law160 or be captured under the legal constructs of trusts, associations, or other legal entities holding the rights.161 Indigenous communities need to have the autonomy to exercise control over and make their own decisions regarding the management of their moral rights in their TCEs.162

Scope of Protection

At first glance, it is difficult to reconcile the notion of personhood, the cornerstone of moral rights, with the pluralistic conception of a community, by definition made up of several persons with their own individual personalities. In response, some scholars have wrought the concept of “peoplehood” to encapsulate the personality of a people in its entirety and provide a justification for granting a personality right to a group.163 As mentioned, TCEs often encompass cultural elements that are integral to Indigenous peoples’ sense of identity, that bear the distinct mark of their holders and, indeed, that reflect their peoplehood. Moral rights can therefore fulfill the duty, arising out of human rights law, to protect the identity of Indigenous peoples.164

Forasmuch as TCEs are collectively and communally held, so too must the moral rights of Indigenous peoples be communal.165 In fact, even conventional moral rights are not purely individualistic, and there has been a recognition of a “socially-informed view of the author” and “the social gestation of authorship... the social womb from which authors brought forth their works.”166 This strand of moral rights theory might be more congruent to accepting a group right for a community than the classic individual theory underpinning moral rights.167

Moral rights would only regulate the relationship between the community and the outside world; use in a traditional and customary context would not be affected. Just as moral rights vest automatically in the author (without any need for registration or any other form of assertion), so too would sui generis moral rights vest in the community.

Communal moral rights would include, at a minimum, the right of attribution, including false attribution (to ensure proper recognition of the community as the source and to prevent others from falsely claiming a guardianship over a TCE) and integrity (to protect TCEs against inappropriate, derogatory, or culturally insensitive use). It could be considered to also include the rights of disclosure (to make, where desired, TCEs known to the world and to retain the power to keep TCEs out of “public” reach, for example, in the case of sacred or secret TCEs) and withdrawal (to allow TCE holders to remove from circulation the TCEs that they no longer wish to make publicly available).

In most national laws, moral rights are inalienable or non-transferable. In other words, they cannot be divested from the author — they cannot be assigned, licensed or given away. As mentioned, if an author transfers all their economic rights to a third party, the author retains their moral rights in the work.168 As such, sui generis moral rights in TCEs would be independent from any economic rights that might arise and be held and exercised separately, regardless of who might hold these economic rights (in cases, for example, where communities would commercialize their TCEs and grant licences) or who might have physical ownership of a TCE (such as a cultural institution). However, in some jurisdictions, such as Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom (but not Australia and France), moral rights can be waived, irreversibly, in whole or in part, explicitly, by contract, at the discretion of the author. In order to ensure flexible protection to TCEs, it could be envisaged that sui generis moral rights be made waivable.

When applying the right of integrity, the determination of what is offensive should not be narrowly prescribed but based on the facts at hand. Assessment should be done both subjectively, from the point of view of the community that claims violation, and objectively, by the court, within the framework of guidelines to be developed legislatively or through case law, as informed by Indigenous customary laws, practices and protocols. Reliance on particular facts may be difficult to reconcile with the need for certainty and predictability, but flexibility trumps these concerns, as no use should be considered offensive per se.

#### Their ev even agrees – 1AC McGingle

the ethnopharmacology community has not yet addressed these questions with sustained debate, nor has there been much done to envision an ethical platform upon which to establish exchange agreements that incorporate ‘non-modern’ visions of the world. **Indigenous communities therefore need sui generis laws to protect their shared cultural heritage and shared natural resources**.

#### Reforming IPR is key to affirming native sovereignty. Solves the aff because it shifts away from western conceptions of property, but the perm fails since we think IPR is good.

Younging 10 “Intergovernmental Committee On Intellectual Property And Genetic Resources Traditional Knowledge And Folklore” Seventeenth Session Geneva, December 6-10, 2010 Wipo Indigenous Panel On The Role Of The Public Domain Concept: Experiences In The Fields Of Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge And Traditional Cultural Expressions: Experiences From Canada Document prepared by Mr. Gregory Younging [Creative Rights Alliance, Kelowna, Canada, Opaskwayak Cree Nation-Canada] <https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/tk/en/wipo_grtkf_ic_17/wipo_grtkf_ic_17_inf_5_a.pdf> SM

Under the IPR system, knowledge and creative ideas that are not “protected” are in the Public

Domain (i.e. accessible by the public). Generally, Indigenous peoples have not used IPRs to protect their knowledge; and so TK is often treated as if it is in the Public Domain – without regard for Customary Laws. Another key problem for TK is that the IPR system’s concept of the Public Domain is based on the premise that the author/creator deserves recognition and compensation for his/her work because it is the product of his/her genius; but that all of society must eventually be able to benefit from that genius. Therefore, according to this aspect of IPR theory, all knowledge and creative ideas must eventually enter the Public Domain. Under IPR theory, this is the reasoning behind the time period limitations associated with copyright, patents and trademarks.

The precept that all Intellectual Property, including TK, is intended to eventually enter the Public Domain is a problem for Indigenous peoples because Customary Law dictates that certain aspects of TK are not intended for external access and use in any form. As a response to this, there have been circumstances where indigenous people have argued that some knowledge should be withdrawn from circulation and that for specific kinds of knowledge, protection should be granted in perpetuity. 29 Examples of this include, sacred ceremonial masks, songs and dances, various forms of shamanic art, sacred stories, prayers, songs, ceremonies, art objects with strong spiritual significance such as scrolls, petroglyphs, and decorated staffs, rattles, blankets, medicine bundles and clothing adornments, and various sacred symbols, designs, crests, medicines and motifs. However, the present reality is that TK is, or will be, in the Public Domain (i.e., the IPR system overrides Customary Law.)

Certain aspects of TK should not enter the public domain (as deemed under Customary Law) and should remain protected as such into perpetuity, which could be expressed as a form of “Indigenous private domain.” (Younging 2007). Indigenous peoples’ historical exclusion from the broad category of ‘public’ feeds part of the differences in objectives. Indigenous peoples also present different perceptions of knowledge, the cultural and political contexts from which knowledge emerges, and the availability, or perceived benefits of the availability, of all kinds of cultural knowledge. 30

Copyright Case Study: The Cameron Case

In 1985 the Euro-Canadian author Anne Cameron began publishing a series of children’s books though Harbour Publications based on Westcoast Indigenous traditional stories. These books include: The Raven, Raven and Snipe, Keeper of the River, How the Loon Lost Her Voice, Orca’s Song, Raven Returns the Water, Spider Woman, Lazy Boy and Raven Goes Berrypicking. Cameron had been told the traditional stories by Indigenous storytellers and/or had been present at occasions where the stories were recited. The original printing of the books granted Anne Cameron sole authorship, copyright and royalty beneficiary, and gave no credit to the Indigenous origins of the stories. As the discourse around Indigenous cultural appropriation emerged in the 1990s, Cameron’s books came under severe Indigenous criticism; not only on the grounds of cultural appropriation, but the Indigenous TK holders asserted that some of the stories and aspects of the stories were incorrect.

This led to a major confrontation with Indigenous women authors at a women writer’s conference in Montreal in 1990. At the end of the confrontation Cameron agreed not to publish any more Indigenous stories in the series: however, she did not keep her word and the books continued to be reprinted and new books in the series continued to be published (Armstrong and Maracle1992). Some minor concessions have been made in subsequent reprints of books in the series and new additions. Reprints of the books that were produced after around 1993/94 contained the disclaimer: “When I was growing up on Vancouver Island I met a woman who was a storyteller. She shared many stories with me and later gave me permission to share them with others… the woman’s name was Klopimum.” However, Cameron continued to maintain sole author credit, copyright and royalties payments. In a further concession, the 1998 new addition to the series T’aal: the One Who Takes Bad Children is co-authored by Anne Cameron and the Indigenous Elder/storyteller Sue Pielle who also shares copyright and royalties.

Patent Case Study: The Igloolik Case

An example of the failure of the Patent Act In Canada to respond to Inuit designs is the Igloolik Floe Edge Boat Case.31 A floe edge boat is a traditional Inuit boat used to retrieve seals shot at the floe edge (the edge of the ice floe), to set fishing nets in summer, to protect possessions on sled when travelling by snowmobile or wet spring ice, and to store hunting or fishing equipment. In the late 1980’s the Canadian government sponsored the Eastern Arctic Scientific Research Center to initiate a project to develop a floe edge boat that combined the traditional design with modern materials and technologies. In 1988 the Igloolik Business Association (IBA) sought to obtain a patent for the boats. The IBA thought that manufactured boats using the floe edge design would have great potential in the outdoor recreation market. To assist the IBA with its patent application the agency, the Canadian Patents and Developments Limited (CPDL) initiated a pre-project patent search that found patents were already held by a non-Inuit company for boats with similar structures. The CPDL letter to the IBA concluded that it was difficult for the CPDL to inventively distinguish the design from previous patents and, therefore, the IBA patent would not be granted. The option of challenging the pre-existing patent was considered by the IBA, however, it was decided that it would not likely be successful due to the high financial cost and risk involved in litigation.

Trademark Case: The Snumeymux Case

As most Indigenous communities are far behind in terms of establishing businesses most trademarking of TK involves a non-Indigenous corporation trademarking an Indigenous symbol, design or name. Again, many cases could have been examined in this section but only two have been chosen: one case involving the Snumeymux Band trade marking petroglyphs through the Canadian Patent Office, and one involving an international corporation’s patent licence being the subject of an intense international Indigenous lobbying effort.

The Snumeymux people have several ancient petroglyphs located off their reserve lands near False Narrows on Gabriola Island, BC. In the early 1990s non-Indigenous residents of Gabriola Island began using some of the petroglyph images in coffee shops and various other business logos. In the mid-1990s the Island’s music festival named itself after what had become the local name of the most well known petroglyph image, the dancing man. The Dancing Man Music Festival then adopted the image of the dancing man as the festival logo and used it on brochures, posters, advertisements and T-shirts.

The Snuneymux Band first made unsuccessful appeals to the festival, buisnesses and the Gabriola community to stop using the petroglyph symbols. In 1998 the Snuneymux Band hired Murry Brown as legal counsel to seek protection of the petroglyphs (Manson-2003). At a 1998 meeting with Brown, Snuneymux Elders and community members on the matter, The Dancing Man Festival and Gabriola business’ and community representatives were still defiant that they had a right to use the images from the petroglyphs (Brown-2003).

On the advice of Murry Brown, The Snuneymux Band filed for a Section 91(n) Public Authority Trademark for eight petroglyphs and was awarded the trademark in October of 1998 (Brown2003). The trademark protects the petrogylphs from “all uses” by non-Snuneymux people and, therefore the Dancing Man Festival and Gabriola Island business and community representatives were forced to stop using images derived from the petroglyphs. In the Snuneymux case the petroglyphs were trademarked for “defensive” purposes. The Snuneymux case represents an innovative use of the IPR system that negotiated within the systems limitations and found a way to make it work to protect TK.

Case Studies Summary

The case studies have shown that serious conflicts exist between the IPR and TK systems and lead to the conclusion that it constitutes a major problem which Indigenous peoples must work out with the modern states they are within and the international community. In contrast to Eurocentric thought, almost all Indigenous thought asserts that property is a sacred ecological order and manifestations of that order should not be treated as commodities.32 It is clear that there are pressing problems in the regulation of TK. It is also clear that IPR system and other Eurocentric concepts do not offer a solution to some of the problems. There have been cases of Indigenous people using the IPR system to protect their TK. However, the reality is that there are many more cases of non-Indigenous people using the IPR system to take ownership over TK using copyright, trademark, patents and the Public Domain. In many such cases this had created a ridiculous situation whereby Indigenous peoples cannot legally access their own knowledge. A study undertaken on behalf of the Intellectual Property Policy Directorate (IPPD) of Industry Canada and the Canadian Working Group on Article 8(j) concluded: “There is little in the cases found to suggest that the IP system has adapted very much to the unique aspects of Indigenous knowledge or heritage. Rather, Indigenous peoples have been required to conform to the legislation that was designed for other contexts and purposes, namely western practices and circumstances. At the same time, there is little evidence that these changes have been promoted within the system, i.e., from failed efforts to use it that have been challenged” (IPPD-2002). Such conclusions, along with other conclusions being drawn in other countries and international forums, and the case study examples discussed, appear to support the argument that new systems of protection need to be developed. Sui Generis models based on and/or incorporating Customary Laws have been proposed and developed in many countries and are being discussed in the WIPO IGC.

Gnaritas Nullius (Nobody’s Knowledge)

Just as Indigenous territories were declared as Terra Nullius in the colonization process, so too has TK been treated as Gnaritas Nullius (Nobody’s Knowledge) by the IPR system and consequently flowed into the public domain along with Western knowledge. This has occurred despite widespread Indigenous claims of ownership and breech of Customary Law. The problem is that advocates for the public domain seem to see knowledge as the same concept across cultures, and impose the liberal ideals of freedom and equality to Indigenous peoples knowledge systems. Not all knowledge has the same role and significance within diverse epistemologies, nor do diverse worldviews all necessarily incorporate a principle that knowledge can be universally accessed. Neither can all knowledge fit into a Western paradigms and legal regimes. A central dimension of Indigenous knowledge systems is that knowledge is shared according to developed rules and expectations for behavior within frameworks that have been developed and practiced over centuries and millennium. Arguments for a public domain of Indigenous knowledge again reduces the capacity for Indigenous control and decision making (Anderson 2010) and can not be reasonably made outside the problematic frameworks of the colonization of TK and Gnaritas Nullius.

## CP

#### The member nations of the World Trade Organization should eliminate patents on medicines based on Indigenous knowledge from patentability unless the patents are already owned or will be owned by indigenous people.

## DA

#### Indigenous people need strong intellectual property rights to traditional medicines – their unique medicinal knowledge is open to appropriation and theft from larger Western pharmaceutical companies without it – Sinela and Ramcharan ‘05

SINJELA, MPAZI, and ROBIN RAMCHARAN. “Protecting Traditional Knowledge and Traditional Medicines of Indigenous Peoples through Intellectual Property Rights: Issues, Challenges and Strategies.” International Journal on Minority and Group Rights, vol. 12, no. 1, 2005, pp. 1–24. LK

At one stage a desire began to emerge in indigenous circles for a forum in the United Nations that dealt not only with human rights issues but with the broad range of environmental, developmental and cultural issues affecting indigenous populations. This led to calls for the establishment, as a subsidiary body of the ECOSOC, of a permanent forum on indigenous issues. This forum was finally established in 2000 and met for the first time at UN headquarters in New York in the summer of 2002.9 The Permanent Forum has thus far held three sessions. As of the time of writing there is a debate going on whether the buo Commission's Working Group on Indigenous Populations should be continued in the light of the establishment of the Permanent Forum. Some governments have apparently favored the discontinuance of the Working Group while indigenous peoples favor its continuation. At the Summer Session of the ECOSOC in 2004 the Secretary General of the United Nations submitted a report summarizing the views of States and indigenous organizations on this issue, and, as of the time of writing, the issue still remains open. The study by Mr. Martinez Cobo, the Working Group on Indigenous issues, the working group on a draft declaration and the Permanent Forum have thus been the main building blocks within the United Nations in the past four decades to advance the human rights of indigenous peoples. In the course of their work, they have, inter alia, highlighted the need for the protection of the intellectual property rights of indigenous peoples. Following on from the work of Mr. Martinez Cobo, cultural heritage and intellectual property have been issues of interest to the Working Group. In 1992, the Working Group and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) held a Technical Conference on Indigenous peoples at which participants recommended that the United Nations develop more effective measures to protect the intellectual and cultural property rights of indigenous peoples.10 A 1993 report by Erica Daes, Chairperson of the Working Group, on the protection of cultural and intellectual property, noted that the term "'indigenous' embraces the notion of a distinct and separate culture and way of life, based on long-held traditions and knowledge which are connected, fundamentally, to a specific territory. Indigenous peoples cannot survive, or exercise their fundamental human rights as distinct nations, societies and peoples, without the ability to conserve, revive, develop and teach the wisdom they have inherited from their ancestors."" The Chairperson was "compelled to the conclusion" that the distinction between cultural and intellectual property, from the indigenous viewpoint, was an artificial one. Indeed, "Industrialized societies tend to distinguish between art and science, or between creative inspiration and logical analysis. Indigenous peoples regard all products of the human mind and heart as interrelated, and as flowing from the same source: the relationship between the people and their land, their kinship with other living creatures that share the land, and with the spirit world. Since the ultimate source of knowledge and creativity is the land itself, all of the art and science of a specific people are manifestations of the same underlying relationship, and can be considered as manifestations of the people as a whole."12 It is not a coincidence that Article 8(j) of the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted at the Rio Earth Summit, creates legal obligations for States party to respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous people related to the conservation and sustainable use of bio diversity. The protection of cultural and intellectual property "is connected fundamentally with the realization of the territorial rights and self determination of indigenous peoples".13 The Chairpersons' report noted that the Working Group had received news from "indigenous representatives from every continent about the priority and urgency they attach to the protection of their spiritual and cultural life, arts and scientific and medical knowledge".14Consequently, the Draft Declaration prepared by the Sub-Commission, while recognizing in its preamble the "inherent rights and characteristics of indigenous peoples, especially their rights to their lands, territories and resources," provided for the right to fully participate, inter alia, in the cultural life of the State (Article 4), the right to revitalize and practice their cultural traditions (Article 11), the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit to future generations their language, oral traditions, writing systems and literatures (Article 13) and, more importantly for present purposes, "the right to their traditional medicines and health practices, including the right to the protection of vital medicinal plants, animals and minerals" (Article 22). In this vein, the draft Article 27 provides that "[indigenous peoples have the right to special measures to protect, as intellectual property, their sciences, technologies and cultural manifestations, including genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs and visual performing arts". Moreover, Article 28 provides that States should seek the free and informed consent of indigenous peoples "prior to commencement of any projects on their lands and territories, particularly in connection with natural resource development or exploitation of mineral or other sub-surface resources".15 In December 1995, to give impetus to the Decade for Indigenous People, the UN General Assembly adopted a Program of activities aimed at strengthening international cooperation for the solution of problems faced by indigenous people in such areas as human rights, the environment, development, health, culture and education. Among the specific actions to be taken were: (i) "the promotion and protection of the rights of indigenous people and their empowerment to make choices which enable them to retain their cultural identity while participating in political, economic and social life, with full respect for their cultural values, languages, traditions and forms of social organization" and (ii) a request for specialized agencies of the UN system and other international and national agencies, as well as communities and private enterprises, "to devote special attention to development activities of benefit to indigenous peoples".16 WIPO has responded accordingly and the report by the Coordinator of the UN Decade for Indigenous Peoples has noted that WIPO's response "has been dramatic" as there is an entire division as part of the regular budget which is now responsible for traditional knowledge and related issues.17 The Permanent Forum has maintained a keen interest in traditional knowledge, soliciting information from all relevant parts of the UN system, notably WIPO.18 The last three sessions of WIPO have focused on its activities in the areas of intellectual property and genetic resources, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, and are described in greater detail below. Before proceeding to a consideration of the protection of the intellectual property rights of indigenous peoples, we shall in the next section, examine a major heritage of indigenous peoples - traditional medicine. TM, an important part of TK, refers to medicines used by local, tribal and indigenous communities. Such medicine is often herbal and sometimes combined with spiritual elements, such as those practiced by the shaman in tribal communities.19 TM has been refined over centuries of practice by communities who have inherited knowledge from their ancestors. For example, Felix, a member of the Arawak indigenous community of Guyana who works in the Shanklands resort on the banks of Essequibo River, conveyed his impressive knowledge of his community's medicinal uses of various plants and trees in the tropical rainforest. Using the native names of trees, he related the use of the 'yarula' tree for preventing and curing malaria, the use of the 'kakaballi' tree for treating diarrhea and the use of the 'capadulla' tree as a local viagra.20 While relying on textbooks for the Latin names, Felix's knowledge came from his father, the shaman in his community and from inherited knowledge among his people. Thus, often such knowledge is held communally and does not 'belong' to any single person or entity. Equally often, such knowledge cross-cuts communities as well as territorial boundaries. These aspects have implications for intellectual property protection, which we will consider below. The type of TM differs from community to community depending on the type of healing system that is historically prevalent. Until recently non-western healing systems and medicines were disregarded by western health systems, which insist on the development of medicines and healing techniques based on scientific proof and testing. Centuries-old healing systems of the world, such as Chinese traditional medicine and Indian Ayurveda, were given scant attention as the 'scientific' approach was allegedly missing. In Chinese medicine, for example, "disease is viewed as a disharmony of the various elements of the body and the personality of the patient. Chinese therapeutic thought concerns the entire organism's balance, rather than being devoted to clearly localizing and defining the nature of the illness" as in western medicine.21 The argument that non-western medicine is not based on scientific evidence may well ignore the centuries of trial and error, which has actually gone into making a particular medicine or remedy appropriate to a given community. Western science has grudgingly accepted alternative healing systems. However, they have readily sought after TK/IK, which could lead to the production of new drugs, "especially since the cost of putting new drugs on the market is becoming very high".22 Erica Daes noted in her 1993 report, cited above, that studies found that "using traditional knowledge increased the efficiency of screening plants for medical properties by more than 400 percent".23 Already by 1993, estimates of the total world sales of products derived from traditional medicines ran as high as USD 43 billion.24 However, only a tiny fraction of the profits are returned to the indigenous peoples and local communities. For example, it was estimated in the early 1990s, "that less than 0.001 per cent of profits from drugs developed from natural products and traditional knowledge accrue to the traditional people who provided technical leads for research".25 Attempts by Western governments and drug producing companies to harness such TK and TM for their own benefit have led to phenomena such as 'bio piracy' (theft of genetic resources by 'bioprospectors'). Concern has arisen for the preservation of biological diversity and genetic resources. The United States National Cancer Institute had already, by 1960, began a global program to collect and study naturally occurring substances and had tested some 35,000 plant species and a larger number of micro-organisms by 1981. This process intensified with the advent of research to combat AIDS. Pharmaceutical companies, necessarily driven by profit, have become increasingly aware of the potential economic rewards of TK/TM. Among the major US pharmaceutical companies engaged in screening plant species were Merck and Co., Smithkline Beecham, Monsanto, Sterling and Bristol Meyers. But this creates a conflict with the holders of TK/TM. The problem was stated thus by former Filipino President, Fidel Ramos at a ceremony for the signing of a Traditional and Alternative Health Care Law (R.A. 8423) in Manila on 9 December 1998: "We have looked forward to other nations for new technologies and cures, even for ordinary ailments. Indeed, many other nations have been exploiting the potentials of our own resources, claiming them as their own discoveries without giving due credit to us, and in addition to making tremendous profits at our own expense".26 The problem was recognized by Mrs. Daes in her report in 1993, namely that 'collectors' or bio-prospectors, "do not ordinarily have any formal contractual arrangements ... with the indigenous peoples upon whose knowledge of ecology they may rely. Indigenous people have also objected to alleged appropriation of their bodily substances which is taking place in the context of the Human Genome Diversity Project.28

## Case

(some of these are from other case negs, so check through case answers)

#### 1] Framework – the role of the ballot is to determine whether the plan is a good idea through evaluation of consequences. Anything else is self-serving, arbitrary and begs the question of the rest of the debate.

Christopher A. Bracey 6, Associate Professor of Law, Associate Professor of African & African American Studies, Washington University in St. Louis, September, Southern California Law Review, 79 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1231, p. 1318

Second, reducing conversation on race matters to an ideological contest allows opponents to elide inquiry into whether the results of a particular preference policy are desirable. Policy positions masquerading as principled ideological stances create the impression that a racial policy is not simply a choice among available alternatives, but the embodiment of some higher moral principle. Thus, the "principle" becomes an end in itself, without reference to outcomes. Consider the prevailing view of colorblindness in constitutional discourse. Colorblindness has come to be understood as the embodiment of what is morally just, independent of its actual effect upon the lives of racial minorities. This explains Justice Thomas's belief in the "moral and constitutional equivalence" between Jim Crow laws and race preferences, and his tragic assertion that "Government cannot make us equal [but] can only recognize, respect, and protect us as equal before the law." [281](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=cd9713b340d60abd42c2b34c36d8ef95&_docnum=9&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkVA&_md5=9645fa92f5740655bdc1c9ae7c82b328) For Thomas, there is no meaningful difference between laws designed to entrench racial subordination and those designed to alleviate conditions of oppression. Critics may point out that colorblindness in practice has the effect of entrenching existing racial disparities in health, wealth, and society. But in framing the debate in purely ideological terms, opponents are able to avoid the contentious issue of outcomes and make viability determinations based exclusively on whether racially progressive measures exude fidelity to the ideological principle of colorblindness. Meaningful policy debate is replaced by ideological exchange, which further exacerbates hostilities and deepens the cycle of resentment.

#### Double bind – either only member states cant patent in which case they definitely cant solve – actors within states cant – OR we get competition because indigenmosu peoples groups geographically within nations – US doesn’t categorize grousp as saovering subject to law – even if they should be

* Say actors cant patent

#### Their rotb just indicates there’s an imperative to take legal action to resolve appropriation but that 1. Doesn’t preclude the importance of other impacts 2. Relies on a consequential calculus to prove why the obligation exists 3. Is arbitrary and impact justified

#### Reps don’t shape reality – justifying a policy in 2 ways is still the same policy – leads to endless abstraction

#### 2] Don’t let them weigh the sum total of their impact—they only get to weigh the unique amount solved by the affirmative. Filter the debate through scope of solvency—there’s no impact to root cause if they don’t solve it

#### 3] No performative or methodological offense, only offense from the plan—reject it cuz it explodes predictable limits, spiking out of neg ground making any discussion qualitatively worse

#### 4] Our impacts matter

#### A] Focus on large scale catastrophes is good and they outweigh – appeals to social costs, moral rules, and securitization play into cognitive biases and flawed risk calculus – 2020 is living proof

Weber 20 (ELKE U. WEBER is Gerhard R. Andlinger Professor in Energy and the Environment and Professor of Psychology and Public Affairs at Princeton University.), November-December 2020 Issue, "Heads in the Sand," Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2020-10-13/heads-sand> mvp

We are living in a time of crisis. From the immediate challenge of the COVID-19 pandemic to the looming existential threat of climate change, the world is grappling with massive global dangers—to say nothing of countless problems within countries, such as inequality, cyberattacks, unemployment, systemic racism, and obesity. In any given crisis, the right response is often clear. Wear a mask and keep away from other people. Burn less fossil fuel. Redistribute income. Protect digital infrastructure. The answers are out there. What’s lacking are governments that can translate them into actual policy. As a result, the crises continue. The death toll from the pandemic skyrockets, and the world makes dangerously slow progress on climate change, and so on.

It’s no secret how governments should react in times of crisis. First, they need to be nimble. Nimble means moving quickly, because problems often grow at exponential rates: a contagious virus, for example, or greenhouse gas emissions. That makes early action crucial and procrastination disastrous. Nimble also means adaptive. Policymakers need to continuously adjust their responses to crises as they learn from their own experience and from the work of scientists. Second, governments need to act wisely. That means incorporating the full range of scientific knowledge available about the problem at hand. It means embracing uncertainty, rather than willfully ignoring it. And it means thinking in terms of a long time horizon, rather than merely until the next election. But so often, policymakers are anything but nimble and wise. They are slow, inflexible, uninformed, overconfident, and myopic.

Why is everyone doing so badly? Part of the explanation lies in the inherent qualities of crises. Crises typically require navigating between risks. In the COVID-19 pandemic, policymakers want to save lives and jobs. With climate change, they seek a balance between avoiding extreme weather and allowing economic growth. Such tradeoffs are hard as it is, and they are further complicated by the fact that costs and benefits are not evenly distributed among stakeholders, making conflict a seemingly unavoidable part of any policy choice. Vested interests attempt to forestall needed action,
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using their money to influence decision-makers and the media. To make matters worse, policymakers must pay sustained attention to multiple issues and multiple constituencies over time. They must accept large amounts of uncertainty. Often, then, the easiest response is to stick with the status quo. But that can be a singularly dangerous response to many new hazards. After all, with the pandemic, business as usual would mean no social distancing. With climate change, it would mean continuing to burn fossil fuels.

But the explanation for humanity’s woeful response to crises goes beyond politics and incentives. To truly understand the failure to act, one must turn to human psychology. It is there that one can grasp the full impediments to proper decision-making—the cognitive biases, emotional reactions, and suboptimal shortcuts that hold policymakers back—and the tools to overcome them.

AVOIDING THE UNCOMFORTABLE

People are singularly bad at predicting and preparing for catastrophes. Many of these events are “black swans,” rare and unpredictable occurrences that most people find difficult to imagine, seemingly falling into the realm of science fiction. Others are “gray rhinos,” large and not uncommon threats that are still neglected until they stare you in the face (such as a coronavirus outbreak). Then there are “invisible gorillas,” threats in full view that should be noticed but aren’t—so named for a psychological experiment in which subjects watching a clip of a basketball game were so fixated on the players that they missed a person in a gorilla costume walking through the frame. Even professional forecasters, including security analysts, have a poor track record when it comes to accurately anticipating events. The COVID-19 crisis, in which a dystopic science-fiction narrative came to life and took everyone by surprise, serves as a cautionary tale about humans’ inability to foresee important events.

Not only do humans fail to anticipate crises; they also fail to respond rationally to them. At best, people display “bounded rationality,” the idea that instead of carefully considering their options and making perfectly rational decisions that optimize their preferences, humans in the real world act quickly and imperfectly, limited as they are by time and cognitive capacity. Add in the stress generated by crises, and their performance gets even worse.

Because humans don’t have enough time, information, or processing power to deliberate rationally, they have evolved easier ways of making decisions. They rely on their emotions, which serve as an early warning system of sorts: alerting people that they are in a positive context that can be explored and exploited or in a negative context where fight or flight is the appropriate response. They also rely on rules. To simplify decision-making, they might follow standard operating procedures or abide by some sort of moral code. They might decide to imitate the action taken by other people whom they trust or admire. They might follow what they perceive to be widespread norms. Out of habit, they might continue to do what they have been doing unless there is overwhelming evidence against it.

Not only do humans fail to anticipate crises; they also fail to respond rationally to them.

Humans evolved these shortcuts because they require little effort and work well in a broad range of situations. Without access to a real-time map of prey in different hunting grounds, for example, a prehistoric hunter might have resorted to a simple rule of thumb: look for animals where his fellow tribesmen found them yesterday. But in times of crisis, emotions and rules are not always helpful drivers of decision-making. High stakes, uncertainty, tradeoffs, and conflict—all elicit negative emotions, which can impede wise responses. Uncertainty is scary, as it signals an inability to predict what will happen, and what cannot be predicted might be deadly. The vast majority of people are already risk averse under normal circumstances. Under stress, they become even more so, and they retreat to the familiar comfort of the status quo. From gun laws to fossil fuel subsidies, once a piece of legislation is in place, it is hard to dislodge it, even when cost-benefit analysis argues for change.

#### Can’t solve – removing patents just makes all applications of IK functionally generics – that GREENLIGHTS corporations to appropriate them and doesn’t do anything to protect knowledge beyond slightly decreasing profit incentives – the plan does nothing to detach IK from capital

#### Blood quantum DA – settler states are the actors of the plan so they have jurisdiction over what is and isn’t Indigenous Knowledge – its really to trace back medicines to any possible Indigenous roots which incentivizes nations to say substances and knowledge “aren’t native enough” which decks aff solvency AND perpetuates a form of cultural genocide

#### No developing country competition – even if they aren’t barred from plant based generics through patents, there are massive disparities in R&D capabilities and pharmaceutical industry size that allow the global north to dominate
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#### Joint statement is 1. Answered by our CP which cites Indigenous groups utilizing patents to protect their knowledge 2. Relies on Indigenous legal systems to protect knowledge which can only deter settler appropriation if its codified in settler law

#### Spillover from the held ev is nonsense – explain how the plan or its reps – also don’t largely change legal forums and if they do both cps do as well

#### Indigenous people need strong intellectual property rights to traditional medicines – their unique medicinal knowledge is open to appropriation and theft from larger Western pharmaceutical companies without it. Turns case because they prevent Indigenous people from patenting their own medicines by limiting patents to countries. – Sinela and Ramcharan ‘05

SINJELA, MPAZI, and ROBIN RAMCHARAN. “Protecting Traditional Knowledge and Traditional Medicines of Indigenous Peoples through Intellectual Property Rights: Issues, Challenges and Strategies.” International Journal on Minority and Group Rights, vol. 12, no. 1, 2005, pp. 1–24. LK

At one stage a desire began to emerge in indigenous circles for a forum in the United Nations that dealt not only with human rights issues but with the broad range of environmental, developmental and cultural issues affecting indigenous populations. This led to calls for the establishment, as a subsidiary body of the ECOSOC, of a permanent forum on indigenous issues. This forum was finally established in 2000 and met for the first time at UN headquarters in New York in the summer of 2002.9 The Permanent Forum has thus far held three sessions. As of the time of writing there is a debate going on whether the buo Commission's Working Group on Indigenous Populations should be continued in the light of the establishment of the Permanent Forum. Some governments have apparently favored the discontinuance of the Working Group while indigenous peoples favor its continuation. At the Summer Session of the ECOSOC in 2004 the Secretary General of the United Nations submitted a report summarizing the views of States and indigenous organizations on this issue, and, as of the time of writing, the issue still remains open. The study by Mr. Martinez Cobo, the Working Group on Indigenous issues, the working group on a draft declaration and the Permanent Forum have thus been the main building blocks within the United Nations in the past four decades to advance the human rights of indigenous peoples. In the course of their work, they have, inter alia, highlighted the need for the protection of the intellectual property rights of indigenous peoples. Following on from the work of Mr. Martinez Cobo, cultural heritage and intellectual property have been issues of interest to the Working Group. In 1992, the Working Group and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) held a Technical Conference on Indigenous peoples at which participants recommended that the United Nations develop more effective measures to protect the intellectual and cultural property rights of indigenous peoples.10 A 1993 report by Erica Daes, Chairperson of the Working Group, on the protection of cultural and intellectual property, noted that the term "'indigenous' embraces the notion of a distinct and separate culture and way of life, based on long-held traditions and knowledge which are connected, fundamentally, to a specific territory. Indigenous peoples cannot survive, or exercise their fundamental human rights as distinct nations, societies and peoples, without the ability to conserve, revive, develop and teach the wisdom they have inherited from their ancestors."" The Chairperson was "compelled to the conclusion" that the distinction between cultural and intellectual property, from the indigenous viewpoint, was an artificial one. Indeed, "Industrialized societies tend to distinguish between art and science, or between creative inspiration and logical analysis. Indigenous peoples regard all products of the human mind and heart as interrelated, and as flowing from the same source: the relationship between the people and their land, their kinship with other living creatures that share the land, and with the spirit world. Since the ultimate source of knowledge and creativity is the land itself, all of the art and science of a specific people are manifestations of the same underlying relationship, and can be considered as manifestations of the people as a whole."12 It is not a coincidence that Article 8(j) of the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted at the Rio Earth Summit, creates legal obligations for States party to respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous people related to the conservation and sustainable use of bio diversity. The protection of cultural and intellectual property "is connected fundamentally with the realization of the territorial rights and self determination of indigenous peoples".13 The Chairpersons' report noted that the Working Group had received news from "indigenous representatives from every continent about the priority and urgency they attach to the protection of their spiritual and cultural life, arts and scientific and medical knowledge".14Consequently, the Draft Declaration prepared by the Sub-Commission, while recognizing in its preamble the "inherent rights and characteristics of indigenous peoples, especially their rights to their lands, territories and resources," provided for the right to fully participate, inter alia, in the cultural life of the State (Article 4), the right to revitalize and practice their cultural traditions (Article 11), the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit to future generations their language, oral traditions, writing systems and literatures (Article 13) and, more importantly for present purposes, "the right to their traditional medicines and health practices, including the right to the protection of vital medicinal plants, animals and minerals" (Article 22). In this vein, the draft Article 27 provides that "[indigenous peoples have the right to special measures to protect, as intellectual property, their sciences, technologies and cultural manifestations, including genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs and visual performing arts". Moreover, Article 28 provides that States should seek the free and informed consent of indigenous peoples "prior to commencement of any projects on their lands and territories, particularly in connection with natural resource development or exploitation of mineral or other sub-surface resources".15 In December 1995, to give impetus to the Decade for Indigenous People, the UN General Assembly adopted a Program of activities aimed at strengthening international cooperation for the solution of problems faced by indigenous people in such areas as human rights, the environment, development, health, culture and education. Among the specific actions to be taken were: (i) "the promotion and protection of the rights of indigenous people and their empowerment to make choices which enable them to retain their cultural identity while participating in political, economic and social life, with full respect for their cultural values, languages, traditions and forms of social organization" and (ii) a request for specialized agencies of the UN system and other international and national agencies, as well as communities and private enterprises, "to devote special attention to development activities of benefit to indigenous peoples".16 WIPO has responded accordingly and the report by the Coordinator of the UN Decade for Indigenous Peoples has noted that WIPO's response "has been dramatic" as there is an entire division as part of the regular budget which is now responsible for traditional knowledge and related issues.17 The Permanent Forum has maintained a keen interest in traditional knowledge, soliciting information from all relevant parts of the UN system, notably WIPO.18 The last three sessions of WIPO have focused on its activities in the areas of intellectual property and genetic resources, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, and are described in greater detail below. Before proceeding to a consideration of the protection of the intellectual property rights of indigenous peoples, we shall in the next section, examine a major heritage of indigenous peoples - traditional medicine. TM, an important part of TK, refers to medicines used by local, tribal and indigenous communities. Such medicine is often herbal and sometimes combined with spiritual elements, such as those practiced by the shaman in tribal communities.19 TM has been refined over centuries of practice by communities who have inherited knowledge from their ancestors. For example, Felix, a member of the Arawak indigenous community of Guyana who works in the Shanklands resort on the banks of Essequibo River, conveyed his impressive knowledge of his community's medicinal uses of various plants and trees in the tropical rainforest. Using the native names of trees, he related the use of the 'yarula' tree for preventing and curing malaria, the use of the 'kakaballi' tree for treating diarrhea and the use of the 'capadulla' tree as a local viagra.20 While relying on textbooks for the Latin names, Felix's knowledge came from his father, the shaman in his community and from inherited knowledge among his people. Thus, often such knowledge is held communally and does not 'belong' to any single person or entity. Equally often, such knowledge cross-cuts communities as well as territorial boundaries. These aspects have implications for intellectual property protection, which we will consider below. The type of TM differs from community to community depending on the type of healing system that is historically prevalent. Until recently non-western healing systems and medicines were disregarded by western health systems, which insist on the development of medicines and healing techniques based on scientific proof and testing. Centuries-old healing systems of the world, such as Chinese traditional medicine and Indian Ayurveda, were given scant attention as the 'scientific' approach was allegedly missing. In Chinese medicine, for example, "disease is viewed as a disharmony of the various elements of the body and the personality of the patient. Chinese therapeutic thought concerns the entire organism's balance, rather than being devoted to clearly localizing and defining the nature of the illness" as in western medicine.21 The argument that non-western medicine is not based on scientific evidence may well ignore the centuries of trial and error, which has actually gone into making a particular medicine or remedy appropriate to a given community. Western science has grudgingly accepted alternative healing systems. However, they have readily sought after TK/IK, which could lead to the production of new drugs, "especially since the cost of putting new drugs on the market is becoming very high".22 Erica Daes noted in her 1993 report, cited above, that studies found that "using traditional knowledge increased the efficiency of screening plants for medical properties by more than 400 percent".23 Already by 1993, estimates of the total world sales of products derived from traditional medicines ran as high as USD 43 billion.24 However, only a tiny fraction of the profits are returned to the indigenous peoples and local communities. For example, it was estimated in the early 1990s, "that less than 0.001 per cent of profits from drugs developed from natural products and traditional knowledge accrue to the traditional people who provided technical leads for research".25 Attempts by Western governments and drug producing companies to harness such TK and TM for their own benefit have led to phenomena such as 'bio piracy' (theft of genetic resources by 'bioprospectors'). Concern has arisen for the preservation of biological diversity and genetic resources. The United States National Cancer Institute had already, by 1960, began a global program to collect and study naturally occurring substances and had tested some 35,000 plant species and a larger number of micro-organisms by 1981. This process intensified with the advent of research to combat AIDS. Pharmaceutical companies, necessarily driven by profit, have become increasingly aware of the potential economic rewards of TK/TM. Among the major US pharmaceutical companies engaged in screening plant species were Merck and Co., Smithkline Beecham, Monsanto, Sterling and Bristol Meyers. But this creates a conflict with the holders of TK/TM. The problem was stated thus by former Filipino President, Fidel Ramos at a ceremony for the signing of a Traditional and Alternative Health Care Law (R.A. 8423) in Manila on 9 December 1998: "We have looked forward to other nations for new technologies and cures, even for ordinary ailments. Indeed, many other nations have been exploiting the potentials of our own resources, claiming them as their own discoveries without giving due credit to us, and in addition to making tremendous profits at our own expense".26 The problem was recognized by Mrs. Daes in her report in 1993, namely that 'collectors' or bio-prospectors, "do not ordinarily have any formal contractual arrangements ... with the indigenous peoples upon whose knowledge of ecology they may rely. Indigenous people have also objected to alleged appropriation of their bodily substances which is taking place in the context of the Human Genome Diversity Project.28

#### IP rights should never prevent Indigenous people from taking advantage of their own knowledge.

SINJELA, MPAZI, and ROBIN RAMCHARAN 05 “Protecting Traditional Knowledge and Traditional Medicines of Indigenous Peoples through Intellectual Property Rights: Issues, Challenges and Strategies.” International Journal on Minority and Group Rights, vol. 12, no. 1, 2005, pp. 1–24. // mb-va

The question is whether the existing laws, national and international, govern ing intellectual property allow for the effective protection of traditional knowl edge and folklore in particular. If the laws are not appropriate then is there a need for a sui generis system. On the latter point, a sui generis system must be in function of the needs and demands of the TK holders. As Kongolo and Shyllon note, "the fact is that knowledge that is claimed to have been 'invented' and hence 'patented' and converted into intellectual property is often an existing innovation in traditional or indigenous knowledge systems". With respect to the use of traditional medicinal plants, they posit four main issues for consideration: (1) whether the contribution of traditional knowledge to a final product is the sort of contribution that would allow one or more traditional persons to be considered joint inventor; (2) whether publication of information concerning indigenous plant use would bar the availability of a patent, (3) how to address the problems of compensation in the exploitation of herbal knowledge, and (4) whether devel oping countries should recognize through national legislation the rights of tradi tional flows from industrialized countries.61 Any system of protection must recognize the customary laws under which the knowledge evolved. In this connection, WIPO has noted, in the context of the work of the IGC, that, "the use of private property rights for TK protection should thus be carefully balanced with other policy measures to reflect the char acteristics of the protected TK, the stakeholder interests involved, the customary uses, and custodianship patterns. Most countries which have implemented TK protection have therefore supplemented a limited use of private property rights with a combination of other measures."62 Examples of sui generis initiatives include the combination of the grant of exclusive rights with access regulation in Brazil; combination of defensive protection of native insignia with repression of unfair competition in native Indian products in the United States; and combina tion of exclusive property rights, access regulation and unfair competition law to create tailored TK protection measures in Costa Rica and Portugal. "By learning from such national experiences, the combined or comprehensive approach would thus join different legal doctrines and policy tools which have been identified by Member States and have been proven effective in their jurisdictions in order to achieve an appropriate form of protection."63 Thus a 'bundle of rights and methods' may be best suited for the protection of TK. This combined approach "would result in the availability of TK protec tion through a bundle of rights at the national level, which would include the use of existing IP rights, sui generis measures, and non-IP tools, such as access reg ulation and contractual agreements". 61 T. Kongolo and F. Shyllon, 'Panorama of the Most Controversial IP Issues in Developing Countries', 6 European Intellectual Property Review, p. 260. 62 WIPO, Traditional Knowledge: Policy and Legal Options, WIPO/GRTKF/IC/6/4, 12 December 2003, para. 11. The international dimension of protection is addressed in-depth in doc ument WIPO/GRTKF/IC/6/6. Defensive protection of TK is covered only briefly, since documents WIPO/GRTKF/IC/5/6 and WIPO/GRTK.F/IC/6/8 cover this more extensively. 63 6. Key Legal Issues for the Protection of TK/TM What, then, are the core principles and legal doctrines that must underwrite the protection of TK. For this purpose we rely on WIPO studies undertaken for the IGC.64 The principles and doctrines enumerated below have emerged from exten sive discussions within the IGC on national experiences of TK protection. 6.1. Core Principles First, a comprehensive and combined approach is a starting point. It is recog nized that a comprehensive and TK specific approach must be taken using exist ing IP mechanisms, the repression of unfair competition, the grant of exclusive sui generis rights and/or the application of prior informed consent requirements linked to access regimes. It has been noted that a "bundle of rights" and meth ods might be applied for protection. Such a combined approach is not foreign to conventional IP law. For example, ornamental or visually distinctive aspects of products can be protected by a combination of copyright, individual or unfair competition law. Second, the repression of unfair competition, including appropriation and mis take of distinctive traditional characteristics. This may entail the suppression of any false, misleading or culturally offensive references to TK in the commercial arena, and any false or misleading indications or linkage with or endorsement of TK holders. Third, the principle of recognition of rights of TK holders, pertains to con ventional IP rights arising from innovation and intellectual creativity contained in TK elements, as well as to sui generis exclusive rights that may be available for TK. Aggrieved TK holders should be able to seek remedies for misuse of TK and possibly to gain remuneration and benefit-sharing. Fourth, the principle of prior informed consent (PIC) entails confirming that TK, held by a traditional community should not be accessed, recorded, used or commercialized without the prior informed consent of TK holders. Fifth, the principle of equity and benefit-sharing, entails protecting TK in a manner conducive to social and economic welfare, balancing rights and obliga tions, and the equitable sharing of benefits. "A broad principle of equity is cen tral to IP law, and is also implied in non-IP international legal instruments".65 Sixth, the principle of regulatory diversity, including sectoral distinctions, entails that a comprehensive use of TK protection "may need to reflect distinct policy objectives in specific sectors, and may need to be integrated with several regulatory systems at the national level".66 Distinct measures have been taken in some countries to regulate traditional medicine, traditional agricultural practices, TK associated with genetic resources and tradition-based industries.67 64 Ibid., para. 22. 65 Ibid. 66 Ibid., para. 23. 67 Seventh, a principle of adapting the form of protection to the nature of TK. Whatever law is adopted, that law may be shaped or guided by the particular characteristics of the TK. TK may be disclosed or undisclosed, attributable or unattributable, collectively or individually held, codified or uncodified, and may be defined and bounded by diverse forms of customary laws and protocols."68 Eighth, a principle of effective and appropriate remedies entails "making avail able effective and expeditious remedies such as injunctions and penalties, or mechanisms for payment of use fees or other compensation where there is out right prohibition on third party use".69 Ninth, a principle of safeguarding customary uses entails the encouragement of the use of TK and associated genetic resources, which "should not be restrained by the formal legal protection of TK, nor by other IP rights".70 Tenth, the principle of consistency with access and benefit-sharing frameworks for associated genetic resources entails adopting measures which regulate access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing. Legal protection of TK associated with genetic resources should be coordinated with policy frameworks for associated genetic resources, including conservation, sustainable use and benefit-sharing.71 Related principles governing procedural and consultative process might be con sidered including the principle of full and effective participation of TK holders and the principle of coordination with other relevant fora and processes.72 These principles clearly are geared towards affording maximum flexibility to TK holders, legislators and policy makers. The development of a bundle or menu of legal and policy options, "flexibility can be achieved by drawing selectively on general legal doctrines in order to tailor the form of protection to specific needs, TK subject matter and the legal systems of a given jurisdiction".73 6.2. Legal Doctrines and Policy Tools Various doctrines have been used as policy tools for TK protection in national law. Their selective use "could build a sufficiently versatile doctrinal basis for TK protection". The major doctrines are as follows. The first is the grant of exclusive property rights for TK. Such rights may be communally or collectively held. This is for TK that is distinct and has a clear owner. Existing IP rights have been used to protect TK or TK related subject matter. For example, practitioners of traditional medicine have protected their innovations by using patent rights under patent systems. An example is China, which granted 4479 patents for Traditional Chinese Medicine (TCM) in 2002.74 Where existing exclusive IP rights are deemed to be insufficient to take into 68 Ibid., para. 24. 65 Ibid., para. 25. 70 Ibid., para. 26. 71 Ibid., para. 27. 72 76id., paras. 28-30. 73 76/d., para. 31. 74 The Economist, supra note 43. 21 account the specificities of TK, sui generis rights have been called for. Difficul ties have arisen in this regard: meeting requirements of novelty or originality, and inventive step or non-obviousness; requirements in many IP laws for protected subject-matter to be fixed in material form; and the frequently informal nature of TK and the customary laws and protocols that define ownership; concern that protection systems should correspond to a positive duty to preserve and maintain TK,
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and not merely provide means to prevent unauthorized use; perceived tension between individualistic notions of IP rights and the sense of collective owner ship of TK; and limitations on the term of protection in IP systems (20 years in the case of patents).75 The second, is the application of the principle of prior informed consent (PIC). This enables a regulatory framework so as to control the use of TK by third par ties and ensure a flow of benefits to the knowledge holders, in ways consistent with the collective nature of TK. The third, is the compensatory liability approach, which would entitle TK holders to compensatory contributions from TK users who borrowed traditional know-how for industrial applications of their own during a specified period of time. This would ensure that TK holders gain a share of the economic and moral rewards resulting from exploitation of such knowledge and at the same time con tribute to ensuring access to such knowledge. The fourth, is repression of unfair competition. The law of unfair competition includes a wide range of remedies, including repression of misleading and decep tive trade practices, unjust enrichment, passing off, and taking of unfair com mercial advantage. The fifth, is recognition of customary laws and protocols, "which functions as a cross-cutting interface with local legal systems in all the above-mentioned tools".76 An African Model Law77 and the sui generis laws of Peru78 and the Philippines79 incorporate customary laws by reference to such laws. 7. Strategies and interim measures These then are the main legal principles and doctrines, which must be consid ered. At the national level, several steps are vital in the search for a functioning and effective TK protection system. 75 Ibid., para. 21. 76 Ibid., para. 45. 77 African Model Law for Protection of the Rights of Local Communities, Farmers and Breeders and the regulation of access to Biological Resources, 2000. 78 See 'Efforts at Protecting Traditional Knowledge: The Experience of Peru', document prepared for WIPO Roundtable on Intellectual Property and Traditional Knowledge, Geneva, 1-2 November 1999. See also WIPO, Intellectual Property Needs and Expectations of Traditional Knowledge Holders. WIPO Report on Fact-finding Missions on Intellectual Property and Traditional Knowledge (1998-1999) Report of Fact Finding missions of the WIPO, Publication No. 768. ™ Philippines Executive Order, No. 247, 1995, Section 2(a). Policy objectives have to be clearly defined for any sui generis system. In the case of TK and TM, for example, the following objectives could be considered: - to create an appropriate system for access to TK - to ensure fair and equitable benefit-sharing for TK - to promote respect, preservation, wider application and development of TK - to provide mechanisms for the enforcement of rights of TK holders; and - to improve the quality of TK-based products and remove low quality tra ditional medicine. (ii) The scope of the subject matter has to be defined and eligible for TK pro tection. The use of appropriate terms and criteria for eligibility has to be clearly spelled out. (iii) Formal requirements for acquisition of rights need to be established. For example, TK protection may be automatic (as in copyright protection which is automatic upon creation of the work) or a formal step may be required, such as registering the TK before protection becomes effective (as in the case of a trademark). (iv) Substantive criteria for eligibility must be established. For example, in Panama's sui generis law, only elements of TK that remain 'traditional', that is intrin sically linked to the community that has originated them, would be pro tected under the sui generis system.80 (v) The nature of rights in TK conferred depends on the legal doctrine or com bination of doctrines used for protection (vi) The scope of rights will determine the degree of control, which the right holder will be able to exercise. Potential rights may include prevention of unauthorized access to protected TK, unauthorized commercial use of such TK, third party claims over protected TK and so on. (vii) Determination of the custodians or beneficiaries. Does an individual or the community own the TK? Is TK understood in the national context to refer to a collective product? This may then dictate the granting of collective rights and not to individuals. On the other hand, distinctive right holders may not be necessary, as collective marks and certification marks may be protected on behalf of a group of beneficiaries. (viii) Expiration and loss of rights. The duration of rights, normally a key issue, may be problematic, as sui generis systems sometimes do not contain expiration and loss of rights provisions. Article 23 of the African Model Law states that community intellectual rights "shall at all times remain inalienable".8' (ix) Sanctions and enforcement. Appropriate mechanisms will need to be devised. Ley de Propiedad Intellectual Indigena, Ley No. 20 (26 June 2000). African Model Law, supra note 77. Defensive protection. This involves, for example, the publication of TK on a digital database, so as to record that a particular community has been using that knowledge. This may avoid the misguided grant of patents men tioned above. (xi) Linkages with benefit sharing schemes. As some TK is closely related to biological and genetic resources, such as when these resources are linked with traditional ways of life, regulation of access to biological resources may serve as a basis for protection of TK. In this regard, related conven tions such as the CBD will have to be closely studied
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#### Double bind: either the squo solves or the aff can’t because of circumvention. IP stars ‘18

IP Stars, 6-1-2018, "The fight against biopiracy and the Nagoya Protocol," No Publication, https://www.ipstars.com/NewsAndAnalysis/The-fight-against-biopiracy-and-the-Nagoya-Protocol/Index/3957

In 1992, the Rio Convention on Biodiversity set the goal of fighting practices known as biopiracy and which are generally seen in developing countries. These involve identifying certain genetic resources of a country and indigenous traditional knowledge that may be linked to their use, developing them, protecting them through patents and extracting commercial gain without any benefit to the indigenous populations in question. The [Nagoya Protocol](https://www.cbd.int/abs/doc/protocol/nagoya-protocol-en.pdf), an extension of the Rio Convention, enshrines a move from mere declarations of intent to concrete measures.   ¶The Nagoya Protocol has been ratified by more than 100 countries, including France and its main goal is to ensure that each member country incorporates into its national law provisions seeking to:  ¶make access to genetic resources in its territory, and such traditional knowledge as may be linked thereto, the subject of a system of prior registration or authorisation;  ¶ensure that the advantages arising from the use of the said resources and knowledge are indeed shared with indigenous populations.  ¶As far as the European Union is concerned, the principles of the Nagoya Protocol have been incorporated into [Regulation 511/2014](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014R0511&from=FR) and Implementing Regulation 2015/1866. In France, the provisions of the Protocol and the above-mentioned EU Regulations have for the most part been incorporated into the Environmental Code. The latter notably ensures, for all research activity (involving genetic and/or biochemical compositions) concerning genetic resources available in French territory, mandatory compliance with the following formal requirements:  ¶filing a [declaration](https://www.formulaires.modernisation.gouv.fr/gf/cerfa_15786.do) prior to accessing any genetic resources with a view to their study, the keeping thereof in a collection or uses thereof not being linked to immediate commercial development;  ¶obtaining an [authorisation](https://www.formulaires.modernisation.gouv.fr/gf/cerfa_15785.do) and entering into a contract concerning the sharing of benefits prior to any access to genetic resources with a view to their study and commercial uses thereof, as well as prior to any use of traditional knowledge linked to genetic resources (a specific [authorisation](https://www.formulaires.modernisation.gouv.fr/gf/cerfa_15784.do) and procedure have been laid down to this end).  ¶Furthermore, in cases where there is simultaneous use both of genetic resources and traditional knowledge linked thereto, supplementary reporting obligations are foreseen in the two following cases:  ¶for obtaining funding in order to carry out research;  ¶for the final development of a product which, if it gives rise to the filing of a patent application, will also result in the requirement to forward to the French Intellectual Property Office (INPI) supplementary information using the form appearing in Annex III of the [Implementing Regulation 2015/1866.](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32015R1866&from=FR)  ¶It may be noted that the corresponding provisions of the Environmental Code are accompanied by criminal penalties.