# 1NC v. Anushka Greenhill R5

## 1

### T

#### 1] Interpretation - Reduce means permanent reduction – it’s distinct from “waive” or “suspend.”

**Reynolds 59** (Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13] The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

#### Waiver is temporary.

Green 5/6 [Andrew Green (Devex Contributing Reporter based in Berlin, his coverage focuses primarily on health and human rights and he has previously worked as Voice of America's South Sudan bureau chief and the Center for Public Integrity's web editor). “US backs waiver for intellectual property rights for COVID-19 vaccines”. Devex. 06 May 2021. Accessed 7/31/2021. <https://www.devex.com/news/us-backs-waiver-for-intellectual-property-rights-for-covid-19-vaccines-99847> //Xu]

In a stunning reversal, U.S. President Joe Biden’s administration came out in favor of waiving intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines Wednesday. The move follows months of U.S. opposition that began under former President Donald Trump to a proposal from South Africa and India to temporarily set aside intellectual property rights around products that would protect, contain, and treat COVID-19. Its supporters have argued that the proposal, first tabled at the World Trade Organization in October and now backed by more than 100 countries, is necessary to expand vaccine production and overcome global shortages.

#### 2] Violation – the plan waives the TRIPS agreement – CX proves

#### 3] Vote neg for limits and neg ground – re-instatement under any infinite number of conditions doubles aff ground – every plan becomes either temporary or permanent – you cherry-pick the best criteria and I must prep every aff while they avoid core topic discussions like reduction-based DAs which decks generics like Pharma Innovation and Bio-Tech.

#### 4] TVA solves – permanently reduce COVID patents.

#### 5] Paradigm Issues –

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

## 2

### DA

#### Climate Patents and Innovation high now and solving Warming but COVID waiver sets a dangerous precedent for appropriations - the mere threat is sufficient is enough to kill investment.

Brand 5-26, Melissa. “Trips Ip Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents & Patent Law, 26 May 2021, www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964/. //sid

The biotech industry is making remarkable advancestowards climate change solutions, and it is precisely for this reason that it can expect to be in the crosshairs of potential IP waiver discussions. President Biden is correct to refer to climate change as an existential crisis. Yet it does not take too much effort to connect the dots between President Biden’s focus on climate change and his Administration’s recent commitment to waive global IP rights for Covid vaccines (TRIPS IP Waiver). “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures.” If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis (and of course [we dispute this notion](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/04/19/waiving-ip-rights-during-times-of-covid-a-false-good-idea/id=132399/)), can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not apply the same logic to the climate crisis? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth? United States Trade Representative (USTR) [Katherine Tai](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/05/tai-says-united-states-will-back-india-southafrica-proposal-waive-ip-rights-trips/id=133224/) was subject to questioning along this very line during a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing. And while Ambassador Tai did not affirmatively state that an IP waiver would be in the future for climate change technology, she surely did not assuage the concerns of interested parties. The United States has historically supported robust IP protection. This support is one reason the United States is the center of biotechnology innovation and leading the fight against COVID-19. However, a brief review of the domestic legislation arguably most relevant to this discussion shows just how far the international campaign against IP rights has eroded our normative position. The Clean Air Act, for example, contains a provision allowing for the mandatory licensing of patents covering certain devices for reducing air pollution. Importantly, however, the patent owner is accorded due process and the statute lays out a detailed process regulating the manner in which any such license can be issued, including findings of necessity and that no reasonable alternative method to accomplish the legislated goal exists. Also of critical importance is that the statute requires compensation to the patent holder. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act contemplates mandatory licensing of patents covering inventions of primary importance in producing or utilizing atomic energy. This statute, too, requires due process, findings of importance to the statutory goals and compensation to the rights holder. A TRIPS IP waiver would operate outside of these types of frameworks. There would be no due process, no particularized findings, no compensationand no recourse. Indeed, the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) already has a process under the TRIPS agreement to address public health crises, including the compulsory licensing provisions, with necessary guardrails and compensation, makes quite clear that the waiver would operate as a free for all. Forced Tech Transfer Could Be on The Table When being questioned about the scope of a potential TRIPS IP waiver, Ambassador Tai invoked the proverb “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” While this answer suggests primarily that, in times of famine, the Administration would rather give away other people’s fishing rods than share its own plentiful supply of fish (here: actual COVID-19 vaccine stocks), it is apparent that in Ambassador Tai’s view waiving patent rights alone would not help lower- and middle-income countries produce their own vaccines. Rather, they would need to be taught how to make the vaccines and given the biotech industry’s manufacturing know-how, sensitive cell lines, and proprietary cell culture media in order to do so. In other words, Ambassador Tai acknowledged that the scope of the current TRIPS IP waiver discussions includes the concept of forced tech transfer. In the context of climate change, the idea would be that companies who develop successful methods for producing new seed technologies and sustainable biomass**,** reducing greenhouse gases in manufacturing and transportation, capturing and sequestering carbon in soil and products, and more, would be required to turn over their proprietaryknow-how to global competitors. While it is unclear how this concept would work in practice and under the constitutions of certain countries, the suggestion alone could be devastating to voluntary internationalcollaborations. Even if one could assume that the United States could not implement forced tech transfer on its own soil, what about the governments of our international development partners? It is not hard to understand that a U.S.-based company developing climate change technologies would be unenthusiastic about partnering with a company abroad knowing that the foreign country’s government is on track – with the assent of the U.S. government – to change its laws and seize proprietary materials and know-how that had been voluntarily transferred to the local company. Necessary Investment Could Diminish Developing climate change solutions is not an easy endeavor and bad policy positions threaten the likelihood that they will materialize. These products have long lead times from research and development to market introduction, owing not only to a high rate of failure but also rigorous regulatory oversight. Significant investment is required to sustain and drive these challenging and long-enduring endeavors. For example, synthetic biology companies critical to this area of innovation [raised over $1 billion in investment in the second quarter of 2019 alone](https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/Climate%20Report_FINAL.pdf). If investors cannot be confident that IP will be in place to protect important climate change technologies after their long road from bench to market, it is unlikely they will continue to investat the current and required levels**.**

#### Private sector innovation is key to solve climate change – short term politicking and priority shifts means government can’t solve alone.

Henry 17, Simon. “Climate Change Cannot Be Solved by Governments Alone. How Can the Private Sector Help?” World Economic Forum, 21 Nov. 2017, www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/11/governments-alone-cannot-halt-climate-change-what-can-private-sector-do/.  Programme Director, International Carbon Reduction & Offset Alliance (ICROA) //sid

Climate leadership is also an opportunity for many organizations, and this was the most popular reason for purchasing carbon credits in Ecosystem Marketplace’s [2016 survey of buyers](http://www.forest-trends.org/documents/files/doc_5677.pdf%5Bforest-trends.org%5D). Companies are looking to differentiate from their competitors, and build their brand, by taking a leadership role on climate. Offsetting plays an integral role in delivering this climate leadership status, alongside direct emissions reductions. The survey indicated that companies that included offsetting in their carbon management strategy typically spend about 10 times more on emissions reductions activities than the typical company that doesn’t offset.

Beyond these direct commercial reasons for companies to take voluntary action, there are many broader, societal motivations at play. Climate change is a global, multidecade challenge that needs solutions and input from all stakeholders. It transcends the short-term nature of politics, which will inevitably experience changes in priorities, personnel and knowledge. Because of this, climate change cannot be solved by governments alone. Instead, it needs significant and long-term investment from the private sector. Companies that take a longer-term outlook recognise this and want to contribute to the solution to help secure the viability of their businesses.

#### Warming causes Extinction

Kareiva 18, Peter, and Valerie Carranza. "Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back." Futures 102 (2018): 39-50. (Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA)//Re-cut by Elmer

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (**climate change**, global **freshwater** cycle, **and** ocean **acidification**) do **pose existential risks**. This is **because of** intrinsic **positive feedback loops**, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all **directly connected to** the provision of **food and water**, and **shortages** of food and water can **create conflict** and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. **Ample clean water** is not a luxury—it **is essential for human survival**. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes **Humans** are remarkably ingenious, and **have adapted** to crises **throughout** their **history**. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). **However**, the many **stories** **of** human ingenuity **successfully** **addressing** **existential risks** such as global famine or extreme air pollution **represent** environmental c**hallenges that are** largely **linear**, have immediate consequences, **and operate without positive feedbacks**. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, **the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops**. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that **very warming can cause more CO2 release** which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that **forest fires will become more frequent** and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This **catastrophic fire** embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that **could catch humanity off-guard and produce a** true **apocalyptic event.** Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that **runaway climate change,** and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks **portends** even greater **existential risks**. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

## 3

### CP

#### The United States should:

#### - substantially increase production and global distribution of the COVID-19 Vaccine

#### - cooperate with allies to achieve increased production and global distribution of the COVID-19 Vaccine.

Solves heg – us intervenes in vaccine diplomacy better than the aff bc it looks like follow on w the other wto countries

Solves developing econs – gives them vaccines

Solves credibility – resolves covid which the wto is struggling with

#### That solves better – IP rights don’t hinder vaccine cooperation, but manufacturing capacity is the current constraint.

Hans Sauer 6-17 [(Deputy General Counsel, Biotechnology Industry Organization.) “Web event — Confronting Joe Biden’s proposed TRIPS waiver for COVID-19 vaccines and treatments” https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/210617-Confronting-Joe-Bidens-proposed-TRIPS-waiver.pdf?x91208&x91208] TDI

But contrary to what Lori said, **there are genuine real problems in the supply chain** that are **not caused by patents**, that are simply caused by the unavailability and the constraints on existing capacity. There is in this world such a thing as maxed-out capacity that just can’t be increased on a dime. It’s not all due to intellectual property. This is true for existing vaccines as well as for vaccine raw materials. There are trade barriers. There are export restrictions that we should all be aware of and that we need to work on. And there are very real political, I think, interests in finding an explanation for how we got to this place that absolve governments around the world from their own policy decisions that they made in the past. In the United States, again, it was the declared policy of the previous administration, as well as this one, that we would vaccinate healthy college kids and go all down the line and offer a vaccine to everybody who wants it before we start sharing any with grandmothers in Burkina Faso. That was the policy. You can agree with it or disagree with it, but that was policy. We had export restrictions in place before a lot of other countries did. And that, too, contributed to unequal access of vaccines around the world. Another thing that was predictable was that politicians and governments around the world who want to be seen as proactive, on the ball, in control, for a long time were actually very indecisive, very unsure about how to address the COVID problem, which has so many dimensions. Vaccines are only one of those. But with respect to vaccines, not many governments took decisive action, put money on the table, put bets on multiple horses, before we knew whether these vaccines would work, would be approved. And it was governments in middle-income countries who now, I think, justifiably are concerned that they’re not getting fast enough access, who didn’t have the means and who didn’t have the decision-making structure to place the same bets on multiple horses, if you will, that were placed in the relatively more wealthy, global North and global West. But there is, I think, a really good and, with hindsight, predictable explanation of how we got to this place, and I think it teaches us something about how to fix the problem going forward. **So why will the waiver not work**? Well, first of all, with complex technology like vaccines, Lori touched on it, reverse engineering, like you would for a small molecule drug, is much more difficult if not impossible. But it depends very much more than small molecule drugs on cooperation, on voluntary transfer of technology, and on mutual assistance. We have seen as part of the pandemic response an unprecedented level of collaborations and cooperation and no indication that IP has stood in the way of the pandemic response. **The waiver proponents have found zero credible examples of where IP has actually been an obstacle,** where somebody has tried to block somebody else from developing a COVID vaccine or other COVID countermeasure, right? It’s not there. **Second, the myth of this vast global capacity to manufacture COVID vaccines that somehow exists** **out there is unsubstantiated** and frankly, in my opinion, untrue. But there is no such thing as vast untapped, idle capacity that could be turned around on a dime to start making COVID vaccines within weeks or even months. This capacity needs to be built; it needs to be established. And at a time when time is of the essence to beat this pandemic, starting capacity-building discussions is helpful, but it won’t be the answer to beat this pandemic. It will be the answer if we do everything right to beating the next pandemic. And if we learn any lesson of this, and then I will stop, is that the COVID waiver as well as the situation in which we find ourselves — if anything, it’s a reminder that we definitely have to take global capacity-building more seriously than we did in the past. That is true for the global North, as well as for middle-income countries — all of whom have to dedicate themselves much more determinedly to pandemic preparedness. And there’s a need to invest both in preparedness and in public health systems that hasn’t happened in the wake of past pandemic threats. This is what we will need to do. We will need to reduce export restrictions, and we will need to rededicate ourselves to preparing for the next pandemic. As far as this pandemic goes, **there are 11 vaccines around the world that are already being shot into arms, only four of which come from the global North. How many more vaccines do we want?** I don’t know, maybe 11 is enough if we start making more of them. But there are manufacturers around the world who know how to do this — including in China, including in India, and including in Russia. All developed their homegrown vaccines, apparently without interference by IP rights, right? **So let’s make more of those. I think that’s going to be the more practical and realistic answer to solving the problem**. And we need to lean on governments to stop export controls and to dedicate themselves to more global equity.

## Case

### 1NC – Underview

#### Give me thirty speaks to rectify underlying biases

### 1NC – AT: WTO

#### WTO collapse solves extinction

Hilary 15 John Hilary 2015 “Want to know how to really tackle climate change? Pull the plug on the World Trade Organisation” <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/want-to-know-how-to-really-tackle-climate-change-pull-the-plug-on-the-world-trade-organisation-a6774391.html> (Executive Director, War on Want)//Elmer

Yet this grandiose plan soon fell victim to its own ambition. The WTO’s first summit after the launch of the Doha Round collapsed in acrimonious failure. The next was marked by pitched battles in the streets of Hong Kong as riot police fought Asian farmers desperately trying to save their livelihoods from the WTO’s free trade agenda. The WTO slipped into a coma. Government ministers must decide this week whether to turn off its life support. The answer is surely yes. It was the WTO’s poisonous cocktail of trade expansion and market deregulation that led to the economic crisis of 2008. Years of export-led growth resulted in a crisis of overproduction that could only be sustained with mountains of debt. The parallel deregulation of financial services meant that this debt soon turned out to be toxic, and the world’s banking system went into freefall. Nor is the WTO fit for purpose on ecological grounds. If last week’s climate talks in Paris taught us anything, it is that we must rethink the model of ever-expanding production and consumption in order to avoid planetary meltdown. Global capitalism may need limitless expansion in order to survive, but the planet is already at the very limits of what it can take. The choice is ours. Worst of all, it is the WTO’s ideology of unrestricted trade and corporate domination that lies behind all the bilateral trade deals that are proliferating at the moment, including the infamous Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). We need a radically different model of regulated trade and controlled investment if we are to have any chance of breaking the cycle of economic and ecological crisis. For the planet to survive, the WTO must die.

#### Stronger Dispute Mechanism deters Multilateral Environmental Agreements – threats are enough.

Chaytor 3, Beatrice, Alice Palmer, and Jacob Werksman. "Interactions with the World Trade Organisation: The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas." Berlin: Ecologic, http://www. ecologic. de/projekte/interaction/results. htm (2003). (International Trade Lawyer)//Elmer

The international trading regime governed by the World Trade Organisation (WTO) interacts with many international environmental regimes. The WTO is often a source of the interaction, invoking reactions from international environmental regimes in the design and implementation of rules which is responsive to WTO prescriptions. The vast number of WTO Members, the institution’s economic significance and its unparalleled ability to enforce its rules through its rigorous dispute settlement mechanism, contribute to the WTO’s tendency to be more effective as a source of interaction rather than as a target. Nevertheless, the WTO is also a target of interaction by international environmental regimes which are typically more proactive in seeking to inform and co-operate with the WTO. The effect of the interaction with the WTO as a source is largely disruptive, in the sense that **the WTO’s** primary objective of facilitating free trade **generates conflicts with** the principal objectives of **environment regimes** **aimed at promoting environmental protection and sustainable development**. The **mere possibility of a WTO challenge** **can inhibit negotiations and** the **implementation** of measures under the international environmental regimes. Moreover, **ambiguities in** the meaning and application of the **WTO rules** with respect to environmental measures **make it difficult to design** and implement the international **environmental regimes** in a manner that complements the WTO system. Despite these challenges, compromises are generally reached that ensure the complementary co-existence of the international trade and environment regimes This chapter examines the nature and effects of interaction between the WTO and two international environmental regimes in particular: the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT). It commences with a description of the WTO in Part 1 and follows in Part 2 with a summary of the experience of interaction between the WTO and each of the environmental regimes considered in the GATT/WTO “inventory” which was prepared in the research for this chapter. In Part 3, the interaction between the WTO and the Biosafety Protocol and ICCAT is studied in-depth, and general observations about the interaction between the WTO and the two environment regimes are set out in Part 4. 1. Introduction to World Trade Organisation 1.1 General The WTO is an intergovernmental organisation established in 1995 and has a Membership of over 140 countries and customs territories.1 The WTO is responsible for administering the multilateral trade agreements regulating the international trade in goods and services and the protection of intellectual property rights, for providing a forum for the negotiation of new trade rules, and for operating procedures for the settlement of disputes among its Members (the WTO Agreements). The WTO aims to liberalise markets, recognising the need to make “use of the world’s resources in accordance with the objective of sustainable development” and to “protect and preserve the environment… in a manner consistent with [the Members’] respective needs and concerns at different levels of economic development”.2 The WTO’s institutional framework comprises its governing body, the General Council, and several other councils and committees that are supported by the Secretariat in Geneva. The principal organ responsible for trade and environment issues at the WTO is the Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE). Other WTO bodies that consider issues of environmental relevance include the Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT Committee) and the Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Committee). The General Council and specialist councils and committees administer the WTO Agreements on a day-to-day basis and Members convene a Ministerial Conference approximately every two years.3 1.2 The WTO Agreements The WTO Agreements will interact with any environmental regulation that has an impact on the international trade in goods and services among its Members, including those regulations enacted pursuant to multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). The WTO pursues its objective of market liberalisation by requiring its Members to maintain both relative and absolute standards of treatment of goods and services in the international and domestic market place. The WTO’s relative standards prohibit WTO Members from the discriminatory treatment of “like” goods, services and service suppliers on the basis of country of origin. The WTO’s absolute standards prohibit or discourage Members from putting in place certain types of measures that directly or indirectly interfere with the trade in products and services. The three main WTO Agreements that have been of particular relevance to international environmental regimes are the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT), the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT Agreement), and the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement).4 At the most basic level, all three agreements share the common purpose of ensuring that measures that affect the trade in products do not discriminate on the basis of a product’s country of origin (National and Most-Favoured Nation Treatment), and that these measures are no more trade restrictive than is necessary to achieve the purpose for which they were designed. Each agreement has detailed rules, and a growing body of practice that develops these disciplines further. The so-called environmental exceptions in Article XX of the GATT and similar provisions in the TBT and SPS Agreements deserve special mention. 5 Under Article XX, a measure which is “necessary to protect human, animal or plant life or health” or which relates to “the conservation of exhaustible natural resources” is permitted under the GATT provided it is not being applied in an arbitrary or unjustifiable manner, or as a disguised restriction on international trade.6 The WTO Agreements are backed by a compulsory dispute settlement system with the ability to authorise bilateral trade sanctions (known as suspensions of concessions). Any Member that feels benefits it expected to derive from the WTO Agreements have been undermined by a trade measure put in place by another Member can initiate dispute settlement procedures. If the Members are unable to settle their differences between themselves, an ad hoc arbitral Panel of trade experts will be established, and will seek to resolve the dispute. The report of the Panel can be appealed to a permanent Appellate Body of seven independent trade jurists, appointed by the WTO Membership. The outcome is formally reviewed by the WTO Dispute Settlement Body, a committee of all Members, which can only reverse the conclusion of a Panel or the Appellate Body by consensus. The main objective of the dispute settlement system is to ensure that any trade measure that is found to be inconsistent with WTO rules be removed or made consistent. If a Member fails to correct the offending measure, it can agree to compensate the affected Member, or find itself subject to trade sanctions imposed by the affected Member at a level equivalent to the continuing harm done by the offending measure.7 The WTO Agreements, both on paper and in practice, also anticipate the need to take into account other existing international agreements, such as MEAs, and other relevant state practice. Both the SPS and the TBT Agreements make reference to international standards developed by competent international organisations operating outside the WTO system. Under the SPS Agreement, a WTO Member is required (unless it can justify the need for a higher standard) to base its SPS measures on international standards, guidelines or recommendations adopted by those international agencies specifically identified in the SPS Agreement or that may be later agreed by the SPS Committee (Article 3.1). SPS measures that are in conformity with these international standards are rebuttably presumed to be consistent with the SPS Agreement (Article 3.2). No MEA has thus far been recognised as a standard setting instrument under the SPS Agreement. Under the TBT Agreement, a WTO Member is also required to use international standards as the basis of its technical regulation (Article 2.4). A technical regulation that is put in place for an identified “legitimate objective” (which includes the protection of human heath or safety, animal or plant life or health, or the environment) and is in accordance with “relevant international standards” is rebuttably presumed to be TBT compatible (Article 2.5). Unlike the SPS Agreement, the TBT does not identify which international standards would qualify for this presumption. Many MEAs would, however, appear to meet the TBT’s general requirement that standards derive from a recognised “body or system whose membership is open to the relevant bodies of at least all of the Members.”8 1.3 Institutional Development of Trade and Environment Agenda Since the WTO’s establishment, its Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE) has had the mandate to explore the relationship between the WTO and MEAs.9 In the CTE, and other WTO organs dealing with environmental matters, Members have discussed a range of trade and environment issues. These include: the application of the WTO rules to trade measures taken pursuant to a MEA; the application of the WTO rules to measures based on process and production methods (PPMs); environmental (or eco) labelling (especially with respect to genetically modified organisms); the relevance of the precautionary principle to risk assessments based on scientific evidence (particularly in the context of the SPS Agreement); and the environmental impacts of certain subsidies, especially fisheries subsidies.10 Most observers acknowledge the usefulness of the CTE’s work in promoting a better understanding of the WTO-MEA relationship and acknowledging the legitimate role of MEAs in promoting environmental objectives. However, the CTE’s work has thus far been general and inconclusive, other than recognising that international trade rules and international environmental rules should be designed and implemented in a manner that is “mutually supportive”.11 The CTE has been widely criticised for failing to produce any conclusions or recommendations of a substantive nature that would, for example, instruct the WTO’s dispute settlement system on how to deal with a conflict should one arise.12 At the fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha, November 2001, the WTO Membership agreed to include as part of a new round, substantive negotiations: without prejudging their outcome, on [. . .] the relationship between existing WTO rules and specific trade obligations set out in multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). The negotiations shall be limited in scope to the applicability of such existing WTO rules. as among parties to the MEA in question. The negotiations shall not prejudice the WTO rights of any Member that is not a party to the MEA in question.13 The mandate is both vague and restrictive. It does, however, suggest that for the first time the WTO may produce substantive rules aimed directly and intentionally at trade-related measures contained in MEAs to which its Members are also parties. In fulfillment of the WTO’s obligation to make arrangements for cooperation with intergovernmental organisations,14 the CTE has granted observer status to intergovernmental organisations, including the Secretariats of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and ICCAT, and hosts meetings with MEA Secretariats to discuss issues relevant to the WTO and MEAs.15 The fourth WTO Ministerial Conference encouraged “efforts to promote cooperation between the WTO and relevant international environmental organisations”16 and launched negotiations between the Members on “procedures for regular information exchange between MEA Secretariats and the relevant WTO committees, and the criteria for the granting of observer status.”1 There is a wary co-existence between the WTO and the institutions overseeing the design and implementation of MEAs (environment regimes). The WTO Agreements anticipate the need to take into account MEAs, and the Appellate Body has been inclined to consider existing MEAs when clarifying relevant provisions of the GATT/WTO. Some recent MEAs, such as the Biosafety Protocol, have included language that acknowledges WTO rights and obligations. At the outset, the interaction between the WTO and environment regimes is generated by differences in regime objectives and by differences in the institutional features designed to achieve those objectives. **The WTO is designed to promote free trade; the environment regimes** in varying degrees **require** or authorise **trade restrictions** in order **to discourage** the production and consumption of specific **products with negative environmental consequences** The WTO Agreements are backed by a compulsory dispute settlement system with the ability to authorise bilateral trade sanctions, while the arrangements for dispute settlement within most MEAs are looser and less binding. Membership of the WTO and environment regimes substantially overlaps since each regime aims for universal membership. The WTO and the five environment regimes examined in the inventory prepared in researching this chapter – Montreal Protocol, Biosafety Protocol, Basel Convention, ICCAT and CCAMLR18 – have each played roles as a source and a target of interaction for the other. The GATT/**WTO** consistency of trade restrictions has been a concern that **has constrained** the respective rules and regulations of the **environment regimes (Biosafety, Montreal**, ICCAT). Yet, some environment regimes have been cited in the WTO as examples of properly functioning, multilaterally negotiated, and narrowly drawn exceptions to free trade rules (CCAMLR, Montreal).19 A summary of the nature of the interactions between the WTO and the five environment regimes is contained in Table 1. The effect of the WTO on the design of primary rules within the environment regimes has been viewed as “**chilling**”, disrupting or slowing negotiation processes (Montreal, Biosafety), and limiting the composition and reach of trade measures (Biosafety, Basel), and their further development and application (Montreal). The WTO and the Conferences of the Parties of the various environment regimes each has the mandate to act in areas that lie in the other’s jurisdiction. Thus the nature of their “influence” over each other, though implicit, is as powerful as if it were expressly stated. Although a dispute challenging a MEA provision has never been brought before the WTO dispute settlement system, the threat of a WTO “challenge” under the WTO’s dispute settlement system further influences the design of rules under the environment regimes, and the membership of the environment regimes remains acutely conscious of this interaction. While some rules and behaviour of the environment regimes have developed to accommodate WTO rules, adjustments have tended to come at the expense of the environment regimes’ objectives. In particular, there has been no satisfactory resolution of the distinctions, if any, to be made between otherwise like products on the basis of their process and production methods.

### 1NC – AT: India

#### India Scenario -

#### 1] Non-Unique - India COVID improving.

The Economist 5-24 5-24-2021 "India's COVID-19 crisis is beginning to ease" <https://archive.is/rpQ63#selection-579.0-582.0> //Elmer

Yet even India’s faulty government numbers now give **reason for hope**. The parts of the country where counting is fairly reliable show a clear trend. The virus’s vicious **second wave** is **rolling back almost as fast as it rolled in**. In early May, India was recording some 400,000 new cases a day. This has now fallen below 250,000. The number of **daily** **new cases** **in Mumbai**, the country’s commercial capital and one of the first places to see a surge, is now **about one-seventh of its peak**. In **Delhi**, the hard-hit capital, the proportion of covid **tests** proving **positive** in April reached a frightening 36%. This has now tumbled **below 3%.** The corresponding national “positivity rate”, heavily weighted towards cities where more tests are performed, has fallen from 24% to under 12%. In the main cities at least, the **desperate fight to get** **oxygen** to gasping patients **has** been **won**. Daily demand for liquid medical oxygen (LMO), which reached some 9,000 metric tons—three times the demand during India’s first peak in September—has now begun to drop, says a government task-force. Jokers point to another indicator of improving fortunes. Leaders whose visibility faded notably as the tragedy mounted have suddenly grown less camera-shy. “You know cases are going down because...Modi has reappeared,” joked one tweet, referring to the prime minister, Narendra Modi, who very publicly appeared to choke with emotion during a televised Zoom call with doctors in his parliamentary constituency.

#### 2] Decreases likelihood of War.

Gul 20 Ayaz Gul 4-28-2020 "Kashmiri Leader: COVID-19 Lowers Chances of Pakistan-India War" <https://www.voanews.com/south-central-asia/kashmiri-leader-covid-19-lowers-chances-pakistan-india-war> (VOA reporter)//Elmer

ISLAMABAD - **Pakistan and India** are **locked in** almost **daily military clashes** across their Kashmir frontier, **but** the **president of** the **Pakistani-ruled part** of the disputed territory **says** the **coronavirus** pandemic **has** for now **diminished chances, if any**, **of** the **tensions escalating into a full-blown war**. Islamabad and New Delhi routinely accuse each other of firing the first shot that started the clashes in violation of a 2003 mutual truce across what is referred to as the Kashmir Line of Control (LoC). Critics say the increased violence in recent years, however, already has rendered the truce ineffective. The clashes have caused dozens of casualties on both sides, mostly civilians living in villages close to the LoC. “I **don’t foresee a war** in the near future,” said President Masood Khan of Azad (independent) Jammu and Kashmir (AJK), the official name Pakistan uses for the part of the divided region it administers. India controls the remaining two-thirds of the largely Muslim Himalayan region, claimed by both of the nuclear-armed rival nations. “Right now, the **world** is **preoccupied with** the **COVID**-19 **pandemic**, and nobody seriously expects India and Pakistan to go to war. And we do not know what the world would look like once this pandemic is over,” Khan told VOA in an interview at his camp office in the Pakistani capital.

#### 3] Pakistan instability were unrelated to COVID – we’ll insert the card

1AC Somos 20. [Christy Somos is a CTVNews.ca Writer) “COVID-19 has escalated armed conflict in India, Pakistan, Iraq, Libya and the Philippines, study finds,” CTV News, December 17, 2020. <https://www.ctvnews.ca/world/covid-19-has-escalated-armed-conflict-in-india-pakistan-iraq-libya-and-the-philippines-study-finds-1.5236738>] TDI

INDIA India saw a rise in armed conflict during the study period, with violent clashes in the Kashmir region between Kashmiri separatists facing off against the Indian military, as well as conflicts between Pakistan and India. “So what mostly drove the increase in conflict intensity…were basically due to two factors,” Ide said. “The first being that there is some evidence that Pakistan sponsors or supports these insurgents in Kashmir, to encourage them to increase their attacks [on Indian forces] because they perceived them to be weak and struggling with the pandemic.” The second factor, Ide explained, was that while Indian government enacted a “pretty comprehensive lockdown in Kashmir, and sealing it way from international media attention…launched more intense counter-insurgency efforts and…crack[ed] down on any pro-Pakistani sympathy expressions.” IRAQ Iraq had an increase in armed conflict, but Ide noted that the overall intensity did not change that much – a “very slight upward trend” in scale that was not linear. What did increase were attacks by ISIS in April, May, and June. “The Iraqi government was really in trouble,” he said. “They had enormous economic loss, they had to go head-to-head and use troops and funds to combat the pandemic – the international coalition supporting the government partially withdrew troops or stopped their activities.” “The Iraqi government was really in a position of weakness.” Ide said the Islamic State exploited the pandemic and the thin resources at hand to the government to expand territorial control, conquer new areas and to stage more attacks. LIBYA The civil war in Libya between the Government of National Accord’s (GNA) forces and the Libyan National Army escalated during the study period, after a ceasefire brokered in January was broken, Ide said. “As soon as international attention shifted to the pandemic…they really escalated the conflict, tried to make gains while hoping the other side is weakened because of the pandemic, hoping to score an easy military victory” Ide said. “It didn’t happen.” The UN Security Council noted in a May report that the pandemic was bolstering the 15-month conflict, citing the history of more than 850 broken ceasefire agreements and “a tide of civilian deaths” on top of a worsening outbreak. PAKISTAN **The ongoing conflict with India saw a rise in armed conflict in Pakistan** during the study period – **which were unrelated to the pandemic**, but also a rise in Taliban-affiliated groups and anti-government sentiments due to pandemic restrictions, Ide said. “There were a lot of anti-government grievances,” Ide said. “There were restrictions on religious gatherings, which religious groups did not like, and there were some negative **economic impacts which affected the local people**.” Ide said those two factors could have been exploited by the Taliban in a quest to recruit more followers. Later in the study period, a swath Pakistani government officials were struck with COVID-19, **leaving the country with a leadership crisis**, which saw an increase of attacks by Taliban groups in May.

### 1NC – AT: Case

#### Aff fails---trade secrets remain secrets and existing logistical hubs fail.

Banri Ito 21 [(Professor of Economics, Aoyama Gakuin University; Fellow, RIETI), 8/8/21, Impacts of the vaccine intellectual property rights waiver on global supply, <https://voxeu.org/article/impacts-vaccine-intellectual-property-rights-waiver-global-supply>] Justin

Regarding waivers of vaccine patents, there have been some voluntary initiatives. On 8 October, soon after South Africa and India proposed a waiver of the TRIPS agreement on 2 October 2020, Moderna, a US pharmaceutical company, expressed its intention not to exercise its patent rights on its COVID-19 vaccine.1 Although Moderna reached an agreement with South Korean pharmaceutical company Samsung Biologics on consignment production of the vaccine on 22 May 2021, so far there have been very few confirmed cases of efforts to reproduce Moderna's vaccine or of licenses being granted to other companies.

With respect to the COVID-19 vaccines developed by Pfizer (jointly with BioNTech of Germany) and Moderna, it appears that the whole body of relevant technical knowledge has not necessarily been patented but that some of the technical knowledge remains undisclosed as trade secrets. Patenting is only one means of ensuring ‘appropriability’, which refers to a company's capacity to secure profits from its own technological innovation. While patent information may make it possible for outsiders to achieve development results similar to those achieved by the patented technology through a similar method without infringing the patent right, keeping the technology undisclosed as a trade secret or incorporating complex processes into it may be an effective means of ensuring appropriability. Pharmaceuticals can easily be counterfeited through ‘reverse engineering’, which refers to a process in which the active ingredients of a drug are identified as a result of deformulation. Therefore, as a general rule, it is considered important to exclude the risk of counterfeiting through patenting.

While it is not clear how much of the relevant technological knowledge remains unpatented, there are apparently some technical reasons for not obtaining full patent protection. The Pfizer and Moderna vaccines use advanced technology based on messenger RNA (mRNA), representing the first case of practical application of such technology. Although I, a non-expert in this field, will refrain from going into further detail, it is highly likely that those vaccines cannot easily be counterfeited as their production requires complex production processes and unique technology.

Patenting involves public disclosure of technical knowledge, providing information on how to reproduce patented inventions. It has the function of lowering technology trade costs by clarifying property rights on technical knowledge. If the technical knowledge necessary for manufacturing a certain product remains undisclosed as a trade secret, it may not be recorded in a written or other tangible form, and it may become necessary to pass down the technical information as cumulative implicit knowledge. As a result, technology transfer may become difficult.

Perhaps in view of that risk, in April 2021, the World Health Organization (WHO) established a COVID-19 vaccine technology transfer hub as a scheme to promote the sharing of mRNA-based technology. However, there are no media reports to date indicating that technical knowledge has been provided through this scheme.2

#### The aff causes a scramble for limited resources by manufacturers with no experience – turns case.

Breuninger 21 [Kevin; Specialist at CNBC; “Pfizer CEO opposes U.S. call to waive Covid vaccine patents, cites manufacturing and safety issues,” CNBC; 5/7/21; <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/05/07/pfizer-ceo-biden-backed-covid-vaccine-patent-waiver-will-cause-problems.html>] Justin

“Currently, infrastructure is not the bottleneck for us manufacturing faster,” Bourla wrote in a dear colleague letter posted on LinkedIn. “The restriction is the scarcity of highly specialized raw materials needed to produce our vaccine.”

Pfizer’s vaccine requires 280 different materials and components that are sourced from 19 countries around the world, Bourla said. He contended that without patent protections, entities with much less experienced than Pfizer at manufacturing vaccines will start competing for the same ingredients.

“Right now, virtually every single gram of raw material produced is shipped immediately into our manufacturing facilities and is converted immediately and reliably to vaccines that are shipped immediately around the world,” Bourla wrote.

He predicted that the proposed waiver “threatens to disrupt the flow of raw materials.”

“It will unleash a scramble for the critical inputs we require in order to make a safe and effective vaccine,” Bourla wrote.

“Entities with little or no experience in manufacturing vaccines are likely to chase the very raw materials we require to scale our production, putting the safety and security of all at risk,” the CEO wrote.

#### Prevents distribution---causes vaccine hesitancy.

Newey et al 21 [Sarah Newey*;* Anne Gulland*;* Jennifer Rigby, (GLOBAL HEALTH SECURITY CORRESPONDENTS at the telegraph) *and* Samaan Lateef (Reporting IN INDIA) 6/1/21, Vaccinating the world: the obstacles hindering global rollout – and how to overcome them, Telegraph, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/global-health/science-and-disease/vaccinating-the-world/>] Justin

[Vaccine hesitancy has also reared its head](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/global-health/science-and-disease/hesitancy-hard-wired-us-indulge-now-peril/), with concerns around rare blood clots linked to the AstraZeneca and J&J vaccines hitting public confidence in Africa. The Democratic Republic of Congo sent 1.3m unwanted doses to countries including Togo and Senegal before they expired in late June, while Malawi destroyed 20,000 unused shots last month as hesitancy hit rollout. “There were some assumptions in the public health community that this is such a bad pandemic... that this will change people’s minds if they were ever hesitant about vaccines,” Prof Heidi Larson, director of the Vaccine Confidence Project, told a Devex event. “Well, it hasn’t really – in fact, the groups and the questioning around vaccines and some of the anti sentiments have actually escalated.” There are also growing concerns that the AstraZeneca and J&J vaccines may be viewed as the “cheap relation” compared to the new mRNA vaccines produced by Pfizer and Moderna. Given the former make up the bulk of Covax’s supply and are far easier to distribute in the developing world, this is a substantial hurdle. “The AstraZeneca row has significantly impacted confidence – not just across Africa, but around the world,” says Dr Ayoade Alakija, co-chair of the Africa Union Vaccine Delivery Alliance. “But there is no choice here [to pick a different vaccine].” However, back in Kumasi, Mr Nyarko says it is supply rather than confidence that is currently undermining his district’s roll out. And with no clear picture on when more shots will arrive, he’s left with few options. “All we can do for now is pray that Ghana can secure another batch,” he says. “We are praying that the UK and Europe will help us.

#### Patents can’t solve the vaccine problem- they don’t have enough info and manufacturers shield key replication information

Santos Rutschman 21 Santos Rutschman, Ana (Professor of Law, St. Louis University) and Julia Barnes-Weise (Executive Director of the Global Healthcare Innovation Alliances Accelerator a non-profit organization spun out of a program in Public Policy at Duke University, and a Senior Consultant to the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations. She is a lawyer, global health policy consultant, entrepreneur and Certified Licensing Professional). "The COVID-19 Vaccine Patent Waiver: The Wrong Tool for the Right Goal." Bill of Health (2021) (2021)./SJKS

In order to understand the practical limitations of a waiver of intellectual property rights when a vaccine is involved, it may be useful to think of patents as informational mechanisms akin to the information and tools needed to turn a recipe into an edible product. One or more patents will provide a recipe for a process or a component needed to produce a vaccine. But, just as with a culinary recipe, the informational power of a patent does not cover any tips or instructions that have not been memorialized in writing, nor does it provide any access to the raw materials needed to put a vaccine together. Waivers, therefore, temporarily remove exclusionary rights, but do not address two fundamental sources of the current vaccine scarcity problem. First, we are still left with a significant informational problem: as many [commentators](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/369/6506/912) have remarked, knowledge disclosed through patents alone is often insufficient for a third party to actually be able to replicate a vaccine. From a scientific perspective, vaccines are biological products, and, as such, their relative complexity makes them highly dependent on specific manufacturing processes and practices, many of which are not disclosed in a patent — think of it as the unwritten tips or instructions for a particular recipe. Some of this information may be kept secret by a company for competitive reasons; in these cases, lifting patent rights will not result in increased informational disclosure, unless the patent holders themselves are willing to collaborate. A waiver thus solves the exclusivity problem, but not the information problem that undergirds competition in vaccine manufacturing. To revisit the analogy introduced above, a waiver allows third parties to freely use the recipe. It does not, however, provide all the information that may be needed to manufacture the desired good, nor does it provide manufacturers with the tacit knowledge that only the original manufacturer possesses and is not disclosed elsewhere.

#### The aff can’t solve – but creates low-quality vaccines and discourages investment in critical areas.

CPIP 21 [Center for Intellectual Property x Innovation Policy; “A View from Both Sides: COVID-19, the TRIPS Waiver, IP Rights, and How to Increase the Supply of Vaccines,” Antonin Scalia Law School / George Mason University; 6/22/21; <https://cip2.gmu.edu/2021/06/22/a-view-from-both-sides-covid-19-the-trips-waiver-ip-rights-and-how-to-increase-the-supply-of-vaccines/>] Justin

A waiver on patent rights, even with the corresponding trade secrets, can only give permission to manufacture. But Eva Bishwal of Fidus Law Chambers writes that the real problems in India “are state inaction, dearth of raw materials and low production capacity.”

According to Patrick Kilbride of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Global Innovation Policy Center, and as cited in Pharmaceutical Technology, “[p]roposals to waive intellectual property rights are misguided and a distraction from the real work of reinforcing supply chains and assisting countries to procure, distribute and administer vaccines to billions of the world’s citizens.”

Low-quality vaccines could do more harm than good

Former USPTO Director Andrei Iancu voiced concern recently at a World IP Day event, asking, “if we waive IP rights, and exclude the original manufacturers, how are we going to control the quality of the vaccines that go into people’s arms? How are we going to control for the fake vaccines? Just last week we saw fake Pfizer vaccines.” And as Philip Thompson points out for IPWatchdog, when investigators are forced to “determine if adverse events or sub-par effectiveness originate from ‘real’ vaccines or fake doses, we should expect global production starts and stops to become much more frequent.”

It will discourage investment in the most critical areas

Pharmaceutical developers invest unfathomable amounts of money into bringing drugs to market. The path to success is long, expensive, and highly uncertain. But what is certain is that successful drugs can yield a profit that covers the loss from failures. Now critics are deeply worried that this waiver will skew future cost-benefit analyses against important classes of medicine. All other things being equal, a developer has a better chance at a positive return by investing in drugs that pose no risk of seizure during a global emergency. As Amanda Glassman of the Center for Global Development writes, the waiver sends the wrong message to innovators and investors: “don’t bother attacking the most important global problems; instead, throw your investment dollars at the next treatment for erectile disfunction, which will surely earn you a steady return with far less agita.” The scramble amongst pharmaceutical giants to develop a vaccine was an all-out race, with good reason, and that’s exactly how it should be. If those companies believe that forfeiture is waiting at the finish line next time around, we might see fewer contestants.

#### AT COVID causes Conflict –

#### 1] Be extremely skeptical of the brink or uniqueness for this – COVID has happened for nearly two years and we have yet to see a great power conflict.

#### 2] No Correlation and best studies show COVID decreases Conflict.

Salemi 20 Colette Salemi 10-15-2020 "Does COVID-19 raise the risk of violent conflict? Not everywhere" <https://archive.is/h591O#selection-309.0-312.0> (Colette Salemi is a PhD student in applied economics at the University of Minnesota. Her research focuses on conflict, forced displacement, environmental degradation and their intersections.)//Elmer

How we did our research We **used** the Armed Conflict Location and Event Data (**ACLED**), a **database** **that counts** the **number of conflict events daily around the world**. For 2019 and 2020, ACLED includes more than 100 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe — and tracks three categories of violent conflict: battles, violence against civilians and explosions/remote violence. We examine trends in the number of conflict events over time. To see whether the trend changes in response to covid-19, we look at what happened after the World Health Organization declared a global pandemic (March 11) or the country declared a lockdown. [Don’t miss any of TMC’s smart analysis! Sign up here for our newsletter.] The **relationship between pandemics and conflict is theoretically unclear.** In some countries, job losses from the covid-19 pandemic mean people have fewer income-generating options — that can make participation in violence seem a more viable alternative. But if **market disruptions** and reduced global demand are **driving down** the **value of natural resources** such as oil wells, then **we** may **see less conflict** over control of such resources. We then **conducted** case **studies** based **on** our knowledge of countries with high rates of violent conflict before **covid**-19. These include countries with active civil wars (such as Syria) as well as countries with violent militia groups (such as the Philippines). Conflict during the coronavirus pandemic varies greatly **Worldwide**, **we didn’t observe an increase in violent conflict**. **If anything, conflict has decreased**, as the figure below shows. **Violent conflict** between March and August 2020 **was 23 percent lower** than violent conflict during the same period in 2019. Comparing these time periods, battles are down 20 percent and remote violence and bombings are down 40 percent. But violence against civilians — the deliberate attack of unarmed noncombatants by armed groups — continued at similar rates globally.
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#### 3] Cooperation and Solidarity Check.

Ide 21, Tobias. "COVID-19 and armed conflict." World development 140 (2021): 105355. (School of Geography, The University of Melbourne, 221 Bouverie St, Carlton, VIC 3053, Australia Institute of International Relations, Brunswick University of Technology)//Elmer

**COVID**-19 might also **provide** a **chance to demonstrate solidarity and good intentions**, and hence lessen grievances. The literature on health diplomacy, for example, discusses how **cooperation on** shared h**ealth challenges can increase** the **prospects for peaceful relations**. The empirical success of such efforts is so far been limited (Kelman, 2019). However, research on environmental peacebuilding has revealed that low-level, mutually beneficial cooperation can yield peace dividends in certain contexts (Ide, 2019). Furthermore, **ceasefires** **to deliver health benefits** **have** at least temporally **reduced armed conflict intensity** on several occasions **in the past** (Chattu & Knight, 2019). **In response to the pandemic** (and António Guterres’ call), **armed groups in 14 countries have announced ceasefires** to support responses to COVID-19 (Rustad, 2020).

#### 4] Actors turn inward NOT outward.

Ide 21, Tobias. "COVID-19 and armed conflict." World development 140 (2021): 105355. (School of Geography, The University of Melbourne, 221 Bouverie St, Carlton, VIC 3053, Australia Institute of International Relations, Brunswick University of Technology)//Elmer

However, **COVID**-19 might also **shape** **opportunity costs in a way** **to reduce armed conflict risks**, at least temporarily. If a **state’s capability is strained** and there is an **urgent need to deal with a health emergency**, **military offensives are** certainly **unlikely** (Price-Smith, 2009). Furthermore, existing as well as potential **rebel groups** and militias **face similar challenges** in the face of the pandemic. They need to raise money and food to supply to their fighters during an economic recession, convince their members to take part in operations rather than staying at home (to reduce infection risks and support their family or community), and deal with the logistical constraints of lockdowns and border closures. **Starting** or intensifying **attacks** **during** the **COVID**-19 crisis is **likely to decrease** the local (and international) **legitimacy** of armed groups, especially if health infrastructure is affected. The ceasefire declarations by armed conflict parties in several countries can also be interpreted as a sign that COVID-related capability and legitimacy concerns are warranted.

### 1NC – AT: Solvency

#### The WTO can’t enforce the aff- causes circumvention.

Lamp 19 [Nicholas; Assistant Professor of Law at Queen’s University; “What Just Happened at the WTO? Everything You Need to Know, Brink News,” 12/16/19; <https://www.brinknews.com/what-just-happened-at-the-wto-everything-you-need-to-know/>] Justin

Nicolas Lamp: For the first time since the establishment of the WTO in 1995, the Appellate Body cannot accept any new appeals, and that has knock-on effects on the whole global trade dispute settlement system. When a member appeals a WTO panel report, it goes to the Appellate Body, but if there is no Appellate Body, it means that that panel report will not become binding and will not attain legal force.

The absence of the Appellate Body means that members can now effectively block the dispute settlement proceedings by what has been called appealing panel reports “into the void.”

The WTO panels will continue to function as normal. When a panel issues a report, it will normally be automatically adopted — unless it is appealed. And so, even though the panel is working, the respondent in a dispute now has the option of blocking the adoption of the panel’s report. It can, thereby, shield itself from the legal consequences of a report that finds that the member has acted inconsistently with its WTO obligations.

#### TRIPs waiver doesn’t solve- it doesn’t obligate countries to do anything, just makes it legal.

Mercurio 21 [Bryan; Professor of Law, The Chinese University of Hong Kong; "The IP Waiver for COVID-19: Bad Policy, Bad Precedent," 2021; 1-6. International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law.] Justin

It is not only the length of time which is an issue but also the ultimate impact of the waiver. A waiver simply means that a WTO Member would not be in violation of its WTO obligations if it does not protect and enforce the COVID-19-related IPRs for the duration of the waiver. The waiver would thus allow Members to deviate from their international obligations but not obligate Members to suspend protection and enforcement of the IPRs. Members like the US who support the waiver may not implement the necessary domestic legislation to waive IPRs within the jurisdiction. It is questionable whether the US could even legally implement the waiver given that IPRs are a matter of constitutional law.17

#### Patents can’t solve the vaccine problem- they don’t have enough info and manufacturers shield key replication information

Santos Rutschman 21 Santos Rutschman, Ana (Professor of Law, St. Louis University) and Julia Barnes-Weise (Executive Director of the Global Healthcare Innovation Alliances Accelerator a non-profit organization spun out of a program in Public Policy at Duke University, and a Senior Consultant to the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations. She is a lawyer, global health policy consultant, entrepreneur and Certified Licensing Professional). "The COVID-19 Vaccine Patent Waiver: The Wrong Tool for the Right Goal." Bill of Health (2021) (2021)./SJKS

In order to understand the practical limitations of a waiver of intellectual property rights when a vaccine is involved, it may be useful to think of patents as informational mechanisms akin to the information and tools needed to turn a recipe into an edible product. One or more patents will provide a recipe for a process or a component needed to produce a vaccine. But, just as with a culinary recipe, the informational power of a patent does not cover any tips or instructions that have not been memorialized in writing, nor does it provide any access to the raw materials needed to put a vaccine together. Waivers, therefore, temporarily remove exclusionary rights, but do not address two fundamental sources of the current vaccine scarcity problem. First, we are still left with a significant informational problem: as many [commentators](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/369/6506/912) have remarked, knowledge disclosed through patents alone is often insufficient for a third party to actually be able to replicate a vaccine. From a scientific perspective, vaccines are biological products, and, as such, their relative complexity makes them highly dependent on specific manufacturing processes and practices, many of which are not disclosed in a patent — think of it as the unwritten tips or instructions for a particular recipe. Some of this information may be kept secret by a company for competitive reasons; in these cases, lifting patent rights will not result in increased informational disclosure, unless the patent holders themselves are willing to collaborate. A waiver thus solves the exclusivity problem, but not the information problem that undergirds competition in vaccine manufacturing. To revisit the analogy introduced above, a waiver allows third parties to freely use the recipe. It does not, however, provide all the information that may be needed to manufacture the desired good, nor does it provide manufacturers with the tacit knowledge that only the original manufacturer possesses and is not disclosed elsewhere.

#### List of supply shortages – there is no way the aff solves, but they decrease available vaccines.

[Laurie Garrett 21, (Columnist at Foreign Policy and former senior fellow for global health at the Council on Foreign Relations). 5/7/21, Stopping Drug Patents Has Stopped Pandemics Before, Foreign Policy, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/05/07/stopping-drug-patents-pandemics-coronavirus-hiv-aids/>] Justin

The vaccines aren’t easy to make. Manufacturing errors in a Maryland Emergent BioSolutions factory caused an 86 percent plummet in Johnson & Johnson vaccine supplies in early April. Complex steps in the process of isolating, purifying, preserving, storing, and delivering COVID-19 immunizations are each error-prone and require long lists of specialized chemicals and machinery.

The world is in the grips now of pipette tips shortages—used to suck out chemicals and viral samples from test tubes in key steps of vaccine making. Syringes are in short supply, prompting vaccinators to toss vaccine supplies for lack of means to administer them. The sterile containers used to hold vaccines are running out. From the earliest days of the 2020 pandemic, the sorts of protective gear and machinery vaccine researchers and makers require have been in short supply, exacerbated by trade tensions between the United States and China. Swabs used for COVID-19 testing and all aspects of equipment cleaning in sterile conditions are held up in a grotesque family dispute in Maine. There aren’t enough centrifuge tubes made worldwide to spin down cell samples. Moderna and Pfizer are constantly scrambling to find the ingredients used to make the microscopic fatty balls, called liposomes, that house the mRNA molecules and carry them safely into the bloodstream. Even the nucleic acids used to construct mRNA and a long list of special enzymes used to purify those samples are in horribly short supply, largely because their use overlaps with the manufacture of COVID-19 tests. Because such delicate chemicals and proteins must be handled at deep-freeze temperatures and transported swiftly for immediate use, the entire supply chain is vulnerable to the simplest of catastrophes: weather at an airport, a car crash that blocks truck traffic, power outages, or competition for cargo space.

Although waiving TRIPS requirements on COVID-19 vaccines is a spectacular, historic gesture, would-be generic makers worldwide will soon discover their efforts are stymied not by patents but for want of Avanti Polar Lipids’ liposome ingredients, Flexsafe RM special bags to hold liquid vaccines in bulk, phosphate-buffered saline solution, Distearoylphosphatidylcholine for liposome-making, 5’ cap for mRNA made by TriLink BioTechnologies, RNA polymerases—the list goes on, and on, and on. As the number of would-be vaccine makers grows, so will demand for thousands of such items, putting pressure on companies that are, in many cases, mom-and-pop operations. Worse, pressure on supplies critical for COVID-19 vaccine making is already resulting in a production loss of vital medicines for other diseases.

#### Recent evidence confirms

Hillman and Tippett 21 [Jennifer A; Senior fellow for trade and international political economy; Alex; Research associate for international economics, at the Council on Foreign Relations; “Europe and the Prospects for WTO Reform,” CFR; 3/10/21; <https://www.cfr.org/blog/europe-and-prospects-wto-reform>] Justin

The WTO has been in the clutches of a slow-moving crisis for years. At its heart are a series of disputes about the role of the WTO’s Appellate Body, the final arbiter in the WTO’s Dispute Settlement System. Today, the Appellate Body sits empty, severely undermining the capacity of the WTO to resolve trade disputes.

Since the start of the Trump administration, the United States has refused to appoint any new members to the body, effectively allowing countries to avoid compliance with WTO rulings. The primary driver of this drastic action has been American frustration at perceived judicial overreach. U.S. policymakers, starting with the George W. Bush administration, have repeatedly voiced their displeasure with Appellate Body decisions, contending that certain decisions have reached beyond the text of existing WTO agreements.

#### Companies will just obtain a patent in a different sector.

Thomas 15 [John R; Visiting Scholar, CRS; “Tailoring the Patent System for Specific Industries, Congressional Research Service,” CRS; 2015; <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R43264/7>] Justin

In view of the concerns noted above, commentators have gone so far to say that “it has become increasingly difficult to believe that a one-size-fits-all approach to patent law can survive.”75 To the extent the current patent system creates a blanket set of rules that apply comparably to distinct industries, it likely over-encourages innovation in some contexts and under-incentivizes it in others.76 Further, some observers have asserted that the need of firms to identify and access the patented inventions of others may differ among industries.77 As a result, the case can be made that distinct industrial, technological, and market characteristics that exist across the breadth of the U.S. economy compel industry-specific patent statutes. However, others have questioned the wisdom and practicality of such line-drawing.78 The following concerns, among others, have been identified:

• Over its long history, the U.S. patent system has flexibly adapted to new technologies such as biotechnology and computer software. Legislative adoption of technology-specific categories may leave unanticipated, cutting-edge technologies outside the patent system.79

• Defining a specific industry or category of technologies may prove to be a contested proposition.

80 • Over time, new industries may emerge and old industries may consolidate. The dynamic nature of the U.S. economy suggests greater need for legislative oversight within a differentiated patent regime.

81 • Even if an industry or technology remains relatively stable, the innovation environment within it might change. For example, technological or scientific advances might open new possibilities for research and development within hidebound industries—but also increase expense and risk for those firms.

82 • Distinct patent rights among industries or technologies may lead to strategic behavior on behalf of patent applicants. For example, a computer program that controls a fuel injector within an automobile could possibly be identified as either an automobile-related or a computer-related invention.

83 •The legislative effort to enact sector-specific patent laws may provide an opportunity for politically savvy firms to exert more lobbying and political power, at the possible expense of less sophisticated firms.

#### Patent waiver is extra topical.

Tom Lee 21 (Data and Policy Analyst at the American Action Forum) And Christopher Holt (the Director of Health Care Policy at the American Action Forum), 5/10/21, Intellectual Property, COVID-19 Vaccines, and the Proposed TRIPS Waiver, <https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/intellectual-property-covid-19-vaccines-and-the-proposed-trips-waiver/#ixzz75KTH1nPx> SJEP

**In October 2020, India and South Africa requested the World Trade Organization (WTO) suspend certain intellectual property (IP) protections for COVID-19 vaccines and related products.** Both countries claim these IP protections, part of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), have slowed production of and access to COVID-19 vaccines. As of May 2021, over 100 countries, mostly in the developing world, have joined India and South Africa in calling for a waiver of TRIPS for COVID-19 vaccines and related products. At the same time, a handful of developed nations—specifically the European Union, Switzerland, Norway, Australia, Canada, Japan, and the United Kingdom—have signaled their opposition to a waiver. In the United States, the Biden Administration recently [announced](https://thehill.com/policy/healthcare/551992-biden-backs-covid-19-vaccine-patent-waivers) that it will support the TRIPS waiver request after intense pressure from progressive activists and Democratic lawmakers in Congress—over 100 of whom have signed a series of letters calling on President Biden to support the proposed TRIPS waiver.[[1]](https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/intellectual-property-covid-19-vaccines-and-the-proposed-trips-waiver/" \l "_edn1) The pressure campaign clearly had an impact on the administration, as its actions conflict with the recent [statement](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/transcript-ron-klain-on-face-the-nation-may-2-2021/) of White House Chief of Staff Ron Klain, who argued “really, manufacturing is the biggest problem. We have a factory here in the U.S. that has the full intellectual property rights to make the vaccine. They aren’t making doses because the factory has problems.”[[2]](https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/intellectual-property-covid-19-vaccines-and-the-proposed-trips-waiver/" \l "_edn2) Also being ignored in the IP debate are logistical distribution challenges and lack of sufficient frontline workers, which contribute to a slow rollout.[[3]](https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/intellectual-property-covid-19-vaccines-and-the-proposed-trips-waiver/" \l "_edn3) Public posturing aside, the Biden Administration surely knows that a TRIPS waiver for COVID-19 related IP will likely be futile. Scaling up production, as Klain alluded to, has proven to be the main challenge to manufacturing larger quantities of vaccine.[[4]](https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/intellectual-property-covid-19-vaccines-and-the-proposed-trips-waiver/" \l "_edn4) Waiving TRIPS would do nothing to address this constraint. Waiving TRIPS would instead encourage IP abuse and distort market forces and innovation. **TRIPS Provisions** The TRIPS agreement is an international trade agreement among all 164 members of the WTO. It is one of three founding and central components of the WTO, along with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). The purpose of the TRIPS agreement is to unify trade and provide increased certainty in international economic relations. Among other things, TRIPS specifically: Provides minimum IP protections and standards that apply to all WTO members; Outlines enforcement actions that countries can undertake to remedy violations of the above standards; and Establishes dispute settlement procedures to allow countries to negotiate an end to disagreements. TRIPS does, however, allow for compulsory licensing where in a public health emergency, a country may copy patented drugs without the permission of the original manufacturer with WTO approval. Proposal to Waive TRIPS The recent proposal submitted by India and South Africa and signed on by over 100 developing countries would waive four specific protections of COVID-19 vaccines and related medical products and services: Copyrights; Patents; Trademarks; and Undisclosed information procedures. The first three protections allow companies to prevent foreign companies from copying their products. They require the original company to disclose information about the product, however. Foreign companies are free to study the disclosed information of the patent but cannot copy it unless given a licensing agreement from the original company. Contrarily, companies can choose not to get patents for their products and instead keep their information secret. The fourth protection prevents the theft of trade secrets of foreign companies. While TRIPS has been waived previously, if approved, this would be the broadest waiver since the agreement’s enactment in 1995.[[5]](https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/intellectual-property-covid-19-vaccines-and-the-proposed-trips-waiver/" \l "_edn5) TRIPS and Manufacturing Capacity The primary justification for waiving TRIPS is that IP protections cause underutilized manufacturing capacity. By removing TRIPS, developing nations could copy patented drugs and use their own manufacturers to produce vaccines, thereby increasing access. This rationale, however, is flawed. Adar Poonawalla, CEO of the Serum Institute of India—currently the largest producer of COVID-19 vaccine doses in the world—has argued that access to IP is not limiting vaccine production, rather it is the time involved in scaling up manufacturing capacity.[[6]](https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/intellectual-property-covid-19-vaccines-and-the-proposed-trips-waiver/" \l "_edn6) It should also be noted that Moderna has already pledged not to enforce its own COVID-19 vaccine patents during the pandemic.[[7]](https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/intellectual-property-covid-19-vaccines-and-the-proposed-trips-waiver/" \l "_edn7) In addition, COVID-19 vaccines such as those produced by Pfizer and Moderna use emerging and very complex technologies and processes. These technologies and processes are essential to producing and increasing scale of COVID-19 vaccines. They are not published in patents but rather kept as trade secrets. The fourth protection mentioned above only prevents theft of trade secrets; it does not allow or disallow a company from keeping trade secrets. Waiving TRIPS therefore does nothing to speed up vaccine production even if there were excess manufacturing capacity, as manufacturers would not receive the essential trade secrets they would need. The issue at present is not underutilized manufacturing capacity, rather scaling up production has been the largest difficulty of vaccine manufacturing. It takes anywhere from 60 to 120 days to produce a single batch of vaccines. Even with manufacturing challenges, between 9.5 and 13.5 billion doses of COVID-19 vaccines are projected to be produced in 2021. Eleven billion doses would be sufficient to vaccinate 70 percent of the world population and reach heard immunity, assuming 2-dose vaccinations.[[8]](https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/intellectual-property-covid-19-vaccines-and-the-proposed-trips-waiver/" \l "_edn8) TRIPS and Compulsory Licensing Separate from a broad IP waiver, TRIPS includes a compulsory licensing process. Foreign manufacturers are free to ask a patentee for a voluntary licensing agreement to manufacture a product. This process can be long, however, and the patentee can ultimately refuse. When this happens, TRIPS allows the manufacturer through its national government to grant a compulsory license provided the manufacturer has first sought a voluntary licensing agreement. This compulsory license is issued by that national government to the manufacturer to produce a patented drug without the original patentee’s permission. Each compulsory license must apply to a specific product. It is important to note that TRIPS does not have a governing body which oversees this process. At the same time, if a country grants an internationally unpopular compulsory license, it will face economic, political, and retaliatory ramifications from other governments and private firms, so governments must weigh these costs. In addition, if a country declares a national emergency or other circumstances of extreme urgency, TRIPS allows a foreign manufacturer to immediately apply for a compulsory license, skipping the process to apply for a voluntary license. A TRIPS waiver, like the one suggested for COVID-19-related IP, is therefore entirely unnecessary—even if IP protections were an obstacle to vaccine access. In the case of COVID-19, compulsory licensing would not, however, address the real issues related to scaling manufacturing capacity. The Vagueness of the Proposed TRIPS Waiver **Under the broad language of the proposed TRIPS waiver, any drugs that have use for patients with COVID-19, including those that predate the pandemic, could lose patent protection**. Thus, a foreign company could produce a specific drug under the auspices of COVID-19 but sell it for another disease. Moreover, the foreign company would not have to provide any financial compensation to the company from whom they took the IP. **The proposal’s language is so broad that other patented medical products beyond pharmaceutical drugs such as masks, non-pharmaceutical chemical compounds, and respirators would also be subject to the waiver.**