

Edited by Prabuddha Ganguli,  
Rita Khanna, and Ben Prickril

 WILEY-VCH

# Technology Transfer in Biotechnology

A Global Perspective



# Technology Transfer in Biotechnology

A Global Perspective

*Edited by*

*Prabuddha Ganguli, Rita Khanna, and Ben Prickril*



WILEY-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA

#### **The Editors**

***Dr. Prabuddha Ganguli***

CEO, VISION-IPR, 101-201  
Sunview Heights, Plot 262  
Shere-e-Punjab  
Andheri East, Mumbai 400101  
India

***Dr. Rita Khanna***

International Technology  
Transfer Management, Inc.  
6533 Kenhill Road  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
USA

***Dr. Ben Prickril***

National Cancer Institute  
Office of International Affairs  
6130 Executive Boulevard, Suite 100  
Rockville, MD 20852  
USA

■ All books published by Wiley-VCH are carefully produced. Nevertheless, authors, editors, and publisher do not warrant the information contained in these books, including this book, to be free of errors. Readers are advised to keep in mind that statements, data, illustrations, procedural details or other items may inadvertently be inaccurate.

**Library of Congress Card No.:** applied for

**British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

**Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <<http://dnb.d-nb.de>>.

© 2009 WILEY-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

All rights reserved (including those of translation into other languages). No part of this book may be reproduced in any form – by photoprinting, microfilm, or any other means – nor transmitted or translated into a machine language without written permission from the publishers. Registered names, trademarks, etc. used in this book, even when not specifically marked as such, are not to be considered unprotected by law.

Printed in the Federal Republic of Germany  
Printed on acid-free paper

**Composition** Asco Typesetters Ltd., Hong Kong

**Printing** Strauss GmbH, Mörlenbach

**Bookbinding** Litges & Dopf GmbH, Heppenheim

**Cover Design** Winkler

**ISBN** 978-3-527-31645-8

**Technology Transfer in  
Biotechnology**

*Edited by  
Prabuddha Ganguli,  
Rita Khanna, and  
Ben Prickril*

## ***Related Titles***

Lu, M., Jonsson, E., Speser, P. L. (eds.)

### **Financing Health Care**

**New Ideas for a Changing Society**

2008

ISBN: 978-3-527-32027-1

Speser, P. L.

### **The Art and Science of Technology Transfer**

2006

ISBN: 978-0-471-70727-1

Junghans, C., Levy, A.

### **Intellectual Property Management**

**A Guide for Scientists, Engineers, Financiers, and Managers**

2006

ISBN: 978-3-527-31286-3

Budde, F., Felcht, U.-H., Frankemölle, H. (eds.)

### **Value Creation**

**Strategies for the Chemical Industry**

2006

ISBN: 978-3-527-31266-5

## List of Contributors

### **G. Steven Burrill**

Burrill & Company  
Chief Executive Officer  
One Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111-3776  
USA

### **Claudia Ines Chamas**

Oswaldo Cruz Foundation  
Ministry of Health  
Av. Brasil 4365, Gomes Faria, sala 211  
Rio de Janeiro, RJ 21045-900  
Brasil

### **Marc Cornelissen**

Bayer CropScience  
Head of Research Operations–  
Bioscience  
Technologiepark 38  
9052 Gent  
Belgium

### **Carlos Correa**

University of Buenos Aires  
Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of  
Industrial and Economic Law  
Av. Figueroa Alcorta 2263  
1425 Buenos Aires  
Argentina

### **Prabuddha Ganguli**

CEO, VISION-IPR  
101-201 Sunview Heights  
Plot 260 Sher-e-Punjab  
Andheri East, Mumbai 400093  
India

### **Florent Gros**

Novartis Pharmaceuticals  
25 Old Mill Road  
Suffern, NY 10901-4106  
USA

### **Gerald T. Keusch**

Boston University  
Associate Provost and Associate Dean  
for Global Health  
715 Albany Street  
Boston, MA 02118-2531  
USA

### **Rita Khanna**

International Technology Transfer  
Management, Inc.  
6533 Kenhill Road  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
USA

**Lita Nelsen**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Technology Licensing Office  
Five Cambridge Center Kendall Square  
Cambridge, MA 02142-1493  
USA

**Yukiko Nishimura**

University of Tokyo  
Research Center for Advanced Science  
and Technology  
4-6-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku  
Tokyo 153-8904  
Japan

**Ben Prickril**

KenGar Consulting  
14, Rue Lavoisier  
69003 Lyon  
France

**Mark L. Rohrbaugh**

Currently  
The REDANDA Group, Inc.  
PO Box 305  
Monrovia, MD 21770  
USA

Formerly  
National Institutes of Health  
Office of Technology Transfer  
6011 Executive Boulevard  
Rockville, MD 20852  
USA

**Brian R. Stanton**

Currently  
The REDANDA Group, Inc.  
PO Box 305  
Monrovia, MD 21770  
USA

Formerly  
National Institutes of Health  
Office of Technology Transfer  
6011 Executive Boulevard  
Rockville, MD 20852  
USA

**Ashley Steven**

Boston University  
Office of Technology Development  
53 Bay State Road  
Boston, MA 02115  
USA

**Katsuya Tamai**

University of Tokyo  
Research Center for Advanced Science  
and Technology  
4-6-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku  
Tokyo 153-8904  
Japan

**Michiel M. van Lookeren Campagne**

Bayer CropScience  
Head of Bioscience Research  
Technologiepark 38  
9052 Gent  
Belgium

**Jianyang Yu**

Liu, Shen & Associates Law Firm  
Hanhai Plaza, 10th Floor  
10 Caihefang Road  
Beijing 10080  
China

## Contents

### List of Contributors XI

#### 1 Defining the Future: Emerging Issues in Biotechnology, Intellectual Property Rights and Technology Transfer 1

*Prabuddha Ganguli, Ben Prickril, and Rita Khanna*

- 1.1 Introduction 1
- 1.2 Historical Evolution of Intellectual Property Regime in Biotechnology 1
- 1.3 Issue of Patentability of Gene Sequences, Antibodies, Early-Stage Technology/Platform and 'Insufficient Support for Claims' 2
- 1.4 Scope of Patent Claims 4
- 1.5 Institutional Arrangements for Technology Transfer 7
- 1.6 Policy Issues and Challenges 8

#### Part I Technology Transfer Policy Considerations and Country/Regional 13

#### 2 Technology Transfers in Europe within the Life Sciences 15

*Jacques Warcoï*

- 2.1 Biology and the Development of Technology Transfers 15
- 2.2 Involvement of Public Bodies 16
- 2.3 Initial Contacts 17
- 2.4 Non-Disclosure Agreements 17
- 2.5 Preliminaries to Negotiations for a Technical Transfer Agreement 20
- 2.6 Memorandum of Understanding or Letter of Intent 20
- 2.7 Material Transfer Agreements 21
- 2.8 Founder Contracts in Technology Transfers 22
- 2.9 The Technology Transfer Agreement Contract Itself 24
- 2.10 Ownership of the Rights 25
- 2.11 Subject Matter of the Contract 26
- 2.12 Domains 26
- 2.13 Territory 27



- 2.14 Know-How 27
- 2.15 Financial Considerations 28
- 2.16 Financial Clauses 29
- 2.17 Improvements 30
- 2.18 Rights of First Refusal 32
- 2.19 Circulation of Contracts 32
- 2.20 Antistacking Clause 32
- 2.21 Various Clauses 33
- 2.22 Conclusions 34

### **3 Technology Transfer at the National Institutes of Health 35**

*Mark L. Rohrbaugh and Brian R. Stanton*

- 3.1 Introduction 35
- 3.2 Technology Transfer Legislation 36
- 3.3 Impact of Bayh–Dole and Stevenson–Wylder Acts 38
- 3.4 Growth of Technology Transfer in Government and Academic Laboratories 39
- 3.5 NIH Efforts to Transfer Technology Globally 45
- 3.6 International Technology Transfer by Publicly Funded Research Organizations 46
- 3.7 Patent Harmonization and Access to Medicines 55
- 3.8 Final Notes on the Global Expansion of Bayh–Dole-Type Intellectual Property Regimes 57

### **4 Current Intellectual Property Management Situation in Japan 59**

*Yukiko Nishimura and Katsuya Tamai*

- 4.1 Introduction 59
- 4.2 IP-Related Government Measures and Projects 59
- 4.3 Life Sciences/Biotechnology-Related Projects 63
- 4.4 Medical Patent/Patentability 65
- 4.5 Policies related to University–Industry Collaboration Incorporation of National Universities 70

### **5 Technology Transfer in China 79**

*Jianyang Yu*

- 5.1 Introduction 79
- 5.2 Overview 79
- 5.2.1 Technology Import 79
- 5.2.2 Importing Sources and Industry Dissemination 80
- 5.2.3 Biotechnology 81
- 5.2.4 Technology Export 82
- 5.2.5 Government Policy 82
- 5.3 Legal Protection of Technology in China 84

5.3.1	Patent Protection	84
5.3.1.1	Patent Filing and Prosecution	84
5.3.1.2	Patent Enforcement	84
5.3.1.3	Patent Enforcement Data	87
5.3.1.4	Strategic Considerations	88
5.3.2	Trade Secret Protection	88
5.3.2.1	Contractual Protection	88
5.3.2.2	Protection under the Anti-Unfair Competition Law	89
5.3.2.3	Criminal Sanctions	89
5.3.2.4	Strategic Considerations	89
5.3.3	Other Forms of Protection	90
5.4	Technology Transfer in China	90
5.4.1	Technology Import and Export	90
5.4.1.1	Contract Law	91
5.4.1.2	Import and Export Regulations	91
5.4.2	Technology Import and Export: Government Regulations	92
5.4.2.1	Three Categories	92
5.4.2.2	Technology Prohibited to Import or Export	92
5.4.2.3	Technology Restricted to Import or Export	92
5.4.2.4	Technology Free to Import or Export	93
5.4.2.5	License and Registration Certificate	94
5.4.2.6	Technology as Investment	94
5.4.2.7	Legal Liabilities and Judicial Review	94
5.4.2.8	Import or Export of Dual-Use Technologies	94
5.4.3	Technology Import and Export: Important Issues	95
5.4.3.1	Definition of Technology Contract	95
5.4.3.2	Forms of Contract	95
5.4.3.3	Content of Contract	95
5.4.3.4	Technology Supplying Party's Obligations	96
5.4.3.5	Confidentiality and Contract Term	96
5.4.3.6	Restrictive Clauses	96
5.4.3.7	Taxation	98
5.4.3.8	Governing Law	98
5.4.3.9	Dispute Resolution	99
5.4.3.10	Statute of Limitations	99
5.5	Conclusions	99

## **6 Technology Transfer in Latin-America 101**

*Claudia Ines Chamas*

6.1	Introduction	101
6.2	Academia, Industry and Technology Transfers	101
6.3	Support Structures for Investments in Biotechnology	106
6.4	Policies for Marketing Biotechnological Knowledge	112
6.5	Conclusions and Final Remarks	119

**Part II Perspectives from Different Participants/Players 121****7 Technology Transfer in Agricultural Biotechnology: Impact of Applied Plant Sciences on Industry 123***Marc Cornelissen and Michiel M. van Lookeren Campagne*

- 7.1 Introduction 123
- 7.2 Historical Perspective 124
  - 7.2.1 First-Generation Crops 124
  - 7.2.2 New Innovation Wave 124
  - 7.2.3 Third Innovation Wave 125
- 7.3 Market Development 126
  - 7.3.1 Overwhelming Success 126
  - 7.3.2 Full Potential Not Reached 127
  - 7.3.3 Future Developments 127
- 7.4 Technology Transfer Through Open Innovation Platforms as a Key to Success 128
  - 7.4.1 Introduction 128
  - 7.4.2 Need for Innovative Raw Materials as a Driving Force 128
  - 7.4.3 Intensification of Coordination and Communication 128
  - 7.4.4 Involvement of Society 129
  - 7.4.5 Responsible Industry 130
  - 7.4.6 Common Interests 130
  - 7.4.7 Open Innovations Platforms 131
  - 7.4.8 Coordinator Role in Industry 131
  - 7.4.9 Opportunities for Academia and Start-Ups 132
  - 7.4.10 Key Factor: Technology Transfer 132
- 7.5 Specifics of Technology Transfer in Agricultural Biotechnology and Their Consequences 132
  - 7.5.1 Introduction 132
  - 7.5.2 Transition Points 133
    - 7.5.2.1 Transfer to Agricultural Biotechnology 133
    - 7.5.2.2 Downstream from Agricultural Biotechnology 133
    - 7.5.2.3 To End-Consumers 134
  - 7.5.3 Expression of Traits 135
- 7.6 Technology Transfer and Start-Up Companies in Agricultural Biotechnology 135
  - 7.6.1 Introduction 135
  - 7.6.2 Less-Favorable Prospects 135
  - 7.6.3 Stimulatory Measures 137
- 7.7 Future 137
  - 7.7.1 Introduction 137
  - 7.7.2 Diversification and Specialization 137
  - 7.7.3 Evolution in R&D 138
  - 7.7.4 Shifts in National Budgets 138

7.7.5 The 'Stimulating Government' 139

7.7.6 Self-Sustaining Process 139

## **8 Technology Transfer Issues in Biotechnology: The Industry Point of View 141**

*Florent Gros*

8.1 Introduction 141

8.2 Diversity of Legal Frameworks 142

8.3 Intellectual Property Dangers 147

8.4 Industry Out-Licensing Prospects 148

8.5 Industry In-Licensing Practices 150

8.6 Challenges Related to Biotechnology 154

8.6.1 Experimental-Use Exemptions 154

8.6.2 How Essential are Patented Genes? 155

8.7 Biodiversity Convention 157

8.8 Industry Motivation Driving R&D Investments 158

## **9 A Quarter Century of Technology Transfer in US Universities and Research Institutions 161**

*Lita Nelsen*

9.1 Introduction 161

9.2 Enabling Legislation 162

9.2.1 Public Purpose of Bayh–Dole 162

9.2.2 Returns and Economic Development 163

9.2.3 Start-Up Companies and Entrepreneurship 164

9.3 Lessons Learned in a Quarter Century of Technology Transfer 165

9.3.1 Expectations in Setting Up a Program 166

9.3.1.1 Licensing Income 167

9.3.1.2 Building a Program Takes Time and Money 167

9.3.1.3 Culture Change 167

9.3.1.4 Defining the Mission 168

9.3.1.5 Setting the Ground Rules: Policies and Practices 168

9.3.1.6 Conflicts of Interest 168

9.3.1.7 Talent 169

9.4 Conclusions 170

## **10 Technology Transfer Issues in Biotechnology: The Future of Global Health Networks 173**

*Gerald T. Keusch and Ashley J. Stevens*

10.1 Introduction 173

10.2 Knowledge for All 174

10.3 Knowledge Sequestration 175

10.4 New Research Models 175

10.5	Changing Role of Patents in Academic Research	177
10.6	Triple Helix and Economic Impact of the New Paradigm	177
10.7	Contributions of Public Sector Research to New Drug Discovery	178
10.8	Spread of the New Paradigm Worldwide	178
10.9	Role of Patents in the Academic Mission	179
10.9.1	Patents and Publishing	179
10.9.2	Patents and the Power to Dictate the Terms of Development	179
10.9.3	Patents versus Licensing	180
10.10	Managing IP in Research Networks	180
10.11	Conclusions	182

### **Part III New Frontiers 183**

<b>11</b>	<b>Biotechnology in the Midst of a Global Transformation</b>	<b>185</b>
	<i>G. Steven Burrill</i>	
11.1	Introduction	185
11.2	Healthcare	187
11.3	Financing Environment	188
11.4	Signs of Growth in 2007	190
11.5	Mergers and Acquisitions Now Part of the Industry Scene	190
11.6	Deal Making Slows Slightly	190
11.7	Weak Initial Public Offering (IPO) Market Does Not Deter Hopefuls	191
11.8	Venture Capital: Deals Continue to Flow	192
<b>12</b>	<b>Technology Transfer in Biotechnology: International Framework and Impact</b>	<b>195</b>
	<i>Carlos M. Correa</i>	
12.1	Introduction	195
12.2	International Framework for Technology Transfer	196
12.3	Transfer of Technology to LDCs	198
12.4	Favoring the Transfer Technology to Developing Countries	200
12.5	Transferring Agro-Biotechnologies	202
12.6	Transfer of Biotechnology for Industrial Production	205
12.7	Conclusions	208
	<i>References</i>	209

### **Index 211**

# 1

## **Defining the Future: Emerging Issues in Biotechnology, Intellectual Property Rights and Technology Transfer**

*Prabuddha Ganguli, Rita Khanna, and Ben Prickril*

### 1.1

#### **Introduction**

Since the formation in 1976 of the first modern biotechnology company, Genentech, the biotechnology industry has grown to become one of the major engines of innovation in virtually all developed economies. Indeed, biotechnology's growth in areas ranging from health, agriculture, environment and industrial processes has been phenomenal. This expansion has been paralleled by mounting public concerns because of potential ethical issues and impact on our health, food and the environment.

The importance of innovation in biotechnology and its widespread applications in health, agriculture and commerce has helped bring issues related to intellectual property (IP) rights and technology transfer into sharp focus. The ongoing global debate on IP rights, especially related to health and agriculture, has hinged on proprietorship of knowledge and its ethical and political implications for innovation, knowledge sharing and technology transfer. The means by which knowledge and technologies are moved from basic research up the value chain to become commercial products is critical to the ability of biotechnological innovation to reach those who need it.

### 1.2

#### **Historical Evolution of Intellectual Property Regime in Biotechnology**

There has been a marked paradigm shift in the field of IP rights itself, especially in the areas of patents and copyrights. The modern patent system originated in 1474 as a means of providing inventors the right to block others from using their inventions in return for registering them with the government.

Early inventions usually dealt with the creation of inanimate and tangible objects, but as understanding of basic phenomena progressed, inventions relating to intangibles became fairly common. The field of biotechnology IP rights is

often intangible and became even more so when the field was transformed by the advent of molecular biology in the 1960s and 1970s. The tools of molecular biology began to enable production of completely new therapeutic drugs, vaccines, diagnostic tools and plant breeding methods starting at the level of individual genes. The seminal US Supreme Court Case *Diamond v. Chakrabarty* was the turning point in the history of IP rights related to biotechnology. Since the Supreme Court's ruling in *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, certain non-naturally occurring organisms are eligible for patent protection and the patent system has played a critical role in stimulating an emerging biotechnology industry. This decision led the way to patenting life forms provided they were created by human intervention, and met the requisite criteria of novelty, inventive step and utility. Patent exclusivity for biotechnology inventions catalyzed further investments in R&D in biotechnology and marked the dawn of a new biotechnology industry. The tremendous development of this industry and the concomitant increase in the proprietorship of knowledge through IP rights has raised contentious issues in knowledge transactions in a competitive environment.

### 1.3

#### **Issue of Patentability of Gene Sequences, Antibodies, Early-Stage Technology/Platform and 'Insufficient Support for Claims'**

The growth of biotechnology has presented new challenges to the patent system. As noted above, right from the outset issues of what is patentable and how it should be patented have been particularly important and contentious in the biotechnology field. Some aspects have been clarified and resolved, while others still remain to be addressed and new issues continue to emerge. This section will review the history and remaining issues with respect to the patentability of genes, antibodies, research tools and platform technologies.

A subject in biotechnology that has attracted critical attention is the subject matter of erythropoietin. A 2004 UK House of Lords Decision invalidating Kirin-Amgen's erythropoietin patent questioned the patentability of gene sequences as the court observed that 'gene sequences are to be assessed as "discoveries" or just "information about the natural world"'. This decision suggests that the bar to patentability in matters related to gene sequences needs to be regularly reassessed.<sup>1)</sup>

The patentability of antibodies has also been questioned in several recent decisions as in *Noelle v. Lederman* [355 F.3d 1343, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2004)] and *Smith-kline Beecham v. Apotex* [403 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2005)]. In the case of *Noelle v. Lederman*, the court observed that the written description of the specification did not provide sufficient support for claims to a human antibody because it failed to disclose the structural elements of the human antibody or antigen. In the *Smith-*

1) Crespi, R.S. (2005) Erythropoietin in the UK: a setback for gene patents? *Nature Biotechnology*, 23, 367–8.

*kline Beecham v. Apotex* matter, the court observed that there was 'inherent anticipation'.<sup>2)</sup>

The ongoing case of *Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.* [05-1887, 2007 WL 2669338 (DNJ 6 September 2007)]<sup>3)</sup>, addressing issues related to obviousness, provides insight regarding the importance of references that teach away from an invention. The question being addressed is whether a specific article teaches away from penciclovir, but the prior art 'as a whole' did not teach away from using penciclovir as a lead compound.

Patenting of early-stage technologies such as target identification, pathway analysis, platform technology development and even generation of putative biotherapeutic compound leads have also been subject to debate. In several cases that have come before the courts especially in the United States, such as *The University of California v. Eli Lilly* [119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d (BNA) Fed. Cir. 1997], cert. denied 523 US1089 (1998)], *Amgen v. Chugai* [927 F.2d 1200, 18 USPQ2d (BNA) 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991)] and *Fiers v. Revel* [984 F.2d 1164, 25 USPQ2d (BNA) 1061 (Fed. Cir. 1993)], it has been clearly shown that when such patents are challenged, they have not stood the test of validity regarding an adequate written description of the invention.<sup>4)</sup>

The field of genomic diagnostics and IP rights is also becoming embroiled in controversy. Most debates have centered around the patents on *BRCA1* and *BRCA2*, questioning the intent of the patent holders to unreasonably restrict access to the important diagnostic tests. In an article titled 'Emerging patent issues in genomic diagnostics',<sup>5)</sup> Barton raises several questions especially on the problem of royalty stacking. There could be a series of patents claiming the use of a specific gene sequence to identify a specific biological property that may make it difficult for the integrator of a microarray/chip device to assemble the rights to use the different patented sequences that are relevant to the clinical or research application. In principle, each holder of a patent on a diagnostic sequence marker used in the array could traditionally block marketing or the use of the array. Similarly, patents may be issued on sequences that might identify drug efficacy or side-effects. Such patents may cover sequences as biomarkers of an effect on drug metabolism, or the use of sequences to make decisions about drug regimes. Barton suggests that the patent law needs to be assessed keeping in mind such developments in the field of biotechnology and to improve access to the pool of available knowledge.

Another issue that is gaining prominence is the question of 'patenting race'. An article by Khan<sup>6)</sup> raises issues related to the strategic use of race as a genetic category to obtain patent protection and drug approval as they are increasingly

2) Lu, D.L., Collinson, A.M. and Kowalski, T.J. (2005) The patentability of antibodies in the United States, *Nature Biotechnology*, **23**, 1079–80.

3) Lu, D.L., Collinson, A.M. and Kowalski, T.J. (2007) Patentability issues surrounding antivirals, *Nature Biotechnology*, **25**, 1403–4.

4) Suster, M.J., Su, H. and Blaug, S. (2003) Protecting rights to early-stage technology, *Nature Biotechnology*, **21**, 701–3.

5) Barton, J.H. (2006) Emerging patent issues in genomic diagnostics, *Nature Biotechnology*, **24**, 939–1.

6) Kahn, J. (2006) Patenting race, *Nature Biotechnology*, **24**, 1349–51.



being evoked in biotechnology patents. Between 1976 and 1977 there were no issued patents in the United States that mentioned racial and ethnic categories. However, during the period 1998–2005, there were a total of 12 instances in issued patents in which race and ethnic categories were mentioned. Further, in patent applications from 2001 to 2006, there were 65 instances in which race and ethnic categories were mentioned. In June 2005, BiDil became the first drug approved by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) with a race-specific indication. Underlying BiDil's New Drug Application for FDA approval is a 2002 race-specific patent specifying use of the drug for treatment of heart failure in an African-American patient (US 6465463). Interestingly NitroMed, BiDil's corporate sponsor, also holds an earlier patent (US 4868179) to use BiDil in a general population, regardless of race. The earlier patent expired in 2007, whereas the race specific patent expires in 2020.

Similarly in Europe, in June 2005, the European Patent Office upheld a patent owned by Myraid Genetics relating to the testing for *BRCA2* genetic mutation for 'diagnosing a predisposition to breast cancer in Ashkenazi Jewish Women'.<sup>7)</sup> Such patents will have profound sociological and economic consequences in due course.

#### 1.4

#### Scope of Patent Claims

As in other areas of IP rights, the appropriate term, breadth and specificity of patents has been a continuing and, indeed, a growing concern. The number of patents issued has grown exponentially. Proponents of more stringent IP rights have stressed the importance of a robust system of patents for biotechnology. On the other hand, many have raised concerns about the excessive number and breadth of patents, and their growing complexity of knowledge sequestration is discouraging efficient diffusion of knowledge and undermining research. Striking a balance between adequate IP rights protection and the efficient availability of knowledge with spillover effects remains a continuing challenge.

Patenting of research tools has been at the center of an important debate over the last decade, without much clarity of date. These tools are generally recognized as embracing the full range of resources that scientists use in the laboratory, including such items as cell lines, animal models and reagents.<sup>8)</sup>

Several areas such as patenting of expressed sequence tags (ESTs), which are essentially research tools, have been perceived to severely restrict research, while being unlikely to result in discrete commercial products. One means of addressing these concerns has been to raise the bar to utility, as was done through the

7) Kienzien, G. (2005) *The Scientist*, July 1, <http://www.the-scientist.com/article/display/22719>.

8) NIH (1998) *Report of the NIH Working Group on Research Tools*, June 4, NIH, Bethesda, MD. Available at <http://www.nih.gov/news/researchtools/>.