

Test Data Protection – The UNCTAD Perspective

WIPO Symposium on the Evolution of the Regulatory Framework of Test Data — From the Property of the Intellect to the Intellect of Property

8 February 2010

Christoph Spennemann, Legal Expert Intellectual Property Unit Division on Investment and Enterprise UNCTAD



Overview of Presentation

- Scope of presentation
- Protection under TRIPS & implications
- Data exclusivity in FTAs & implications
- Linkage provisions in FTAs & implications
- Conclusions



Scope of presentation

- Article 39.3, TRIPS Agreement: test data related to the marketing approval of
 - Pharmaceutical products
 - Agricultural chemical products
- Involves different stakeholders and different public interests
- Focus on test data related to the marketing approval of pharmaceutical products

What are pharmaceutical test data?

- Data proving safety & efficacy of medicines
 - Pre-clinical trials on computers, animals
 - Clinical trials on humans
- Clinical data submitted to drug regulatory authority (DRA) for marketing approval
- Distinguish regulatory patent issues
 - Trials are subsequent to patent grant
 - Trials require financial & administrative effort
 - But not necessarily creativity/intellectual effort



Protection of test data under TRIPS Art. 39.3

- Origination of test data may require considerable (non-intellectual) efforts
- Significant commercial value (marketing approval)
- Those data shall be protected, inter alia against « unfair commercial use »
 - Disclosure by DRA to competitors
 - Espionage by competitors



Test data and generic producers

- Clinical trials too expensive (no patent to recoup costs)
- Cheaper to show bioequivalence
 - Same amount of active ingredients in same amount of time as originator drug
 - Safety & efficacy already proven by originator → DRA reliance (controversial)
- Rapid marketing approval



Reliance - some implications

- Early marketing approvals: checks & balances on weak patents
 - Regulatory approval independent of patent status of originator drug → Need for patent holder to enforce his IPR
 - Generic competitor may challenge weak patent as defense in litigation
 - Important number of weak pharmaceutical patents
 - 73% success rate of patent challenges in US courts (2002): FTC study
 - 62% success rate of patent challenges in EU courts (2000-2007): EU Commission Pharmaceutical Sector Inquiry



Protection of test data under FTAs (1)

- US FTAs (e.g. Chile; DR-CAFTA; Peru); EU proposals to Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, India: exclusive rights in test data
- Rationale for IP protection
 - Incentives for innovation & creativity
 - Data exclusivity: incentive for investment
 - Property of intellect → intellect of (creating non-intellectual) property
- Impact on generic competition: no bioequivalence during term of protection → full clinical trials dossier



Protection of test data under FTAs (2)

- US FTAs: 5 years from marketing approval (US-Peru more flexible; EU Andean proposals: 10 years + 1 for new indications)
- Even if originator only has foreign approval
- Plus 5 years after domestic approval = max 10 years
 - Exception: US-Peru
- Even for off-patent substances



Example: Implementation of data exclusivity (DE) in Chile

- Termination of DE if no domestic commercialization of product within 12 months after domestic approval
- No DE if no domestic application for approval within 12 months from first approval in any other country



DE: General Implications

- Delays in marketing approvals (only after expiry of DE)
- Loss of important opportunity to challenge poor quality patents
 - No marketing of generics prior to DE expiry
 - Lower motivation to challenge weak patents: DE as additional barrier



Implications for public health (1)

- In case of compulsory licensing (CL)
 - Need for marketing approval
 - CL applies to patent only, not to DE
 - Example EU legislation:
 - specific exception from DE in case of draft Art 31bis exports
 - but no other exception
 - US-Peru FTA, EU proposals: subordinate DE to Doha Declaration/right to protect public health



Implications for public health (2)

- In case of regulatory review (« Bolar ») exception:
 - Use of patented substance to submit generic copy to DRA
 - But DRA cannot approve before expiry of DE
 - → no legal security for generic producer
 - - chilling effect on investment decisions
 - → late market entry
 - May diminish effect of regulatory review exception



Linkage provisions in FTAs (1)

- Marketing approvals by DRA are based on criteria of safety & efficacy
- No need (and often no capacity) to check patent status
 - IPRs = private rights, including enforcement
- Introduction of linkage in most US FTAs: no approval during patent term, unless consent
 - DRA is turned into IP enforcement agency



Linkage provisions in FTAs (2)

- Public health concerns: effect on CLs and Bolar exception
 - comparable to DE: no approval without patentee's consent
- US-Peru; US-Colombia; US-Panama: linkage optional
 - Instead: effective remedies for patent infringement litigation
 - Peru's implementing legislation: Decreto Legislativo 1074 of 28 June 2008



Linkage: Implications

- Mandatory linkage means DRA (rather than IP holder) enforces patents → reduced risk of negative finding by court on weak patents
- US-Peru; US-Colombia; US-Panama: primary responsibility of IP enforcement back on IP holder



Conclusions

- TRIPS permits various forms of data protection (exclusive/non-exclusive)
- TRIPS permits distinction between regulatory issues and patent law
 - Safety & efficacy are decisive for drugs approval
 - Private enforcement of private IPRs
- FTAs: DE & linkage with patent status
 - DE: exclusive rights in non-intellectual assets
 - Linkage means public assistance in enforcement of private IPRs
 - Impact on generic competition & poor quality patents



Contact

Christoph Spennemann

Legal Expert

Intellectual Property Unit

Division on Investment and Enterprise (DIAE)

UNCTAD

E-mail: Christoph.Spennemann@unctad.org

Tel: ++41 (0) 22 917 59 99

Fax: ++41 (0) 22 917 01 94

http://www.unctad.org/tot-ip