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The law of patents of invention has, for centuries, been shaped by vigorous policy debate and by the development and refinement of the law through contentious proceedings in court. The Anglo patent law tradition, which has partly shaped the law of Hong Kong, is conventionally viewed as being founded on the 1623 Statute of Monopolies; this law was itself passed by the English Parliament amid a roiling political debate about trade and commercial policy and the prerogative of the sovereign to grant monopolies – it therefore sets out the essence of the law of patents of invention in the form of a specific exception to an overarching abolition of monopolies. The more elaborated principles of patent law today can largely be sourced to the jurisprudence developed through historic judicial decisions, by definition in the context of commercial disputes. Contentious policy debate and adversarial judicial proceedings have not only accompanied the evolution of patent law over the centuries, they have in critical ways help to shape the modern law and its practical application.

And this is for good reason. There is much at stake, and the modern patent of invention is a conscious, policy-driven creation of the legislature, not a fundamental artefact of natural law. To be sure, many would share the sense that, in principle, an inventor is entitled to due recognition for the contribution to society of a beneficial new technology – a sense by no means limited to the domain of Western cultures, finding also expression in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet the modern system of patent law is a more specific, more complex contrivance, crafted and refined as a utilitarian mechanism for producing public knowledge goods, in the form of usable and transmissible new technologies. At first blush, its
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normative logic is counterintuitive – using exclusive private rights to produce inclusive public goods – and reconciling this apparent paradox is the very essence of patent policymaking. Ensuring that exclusive rights are such as to promote public welfare was the thrust of the Statute of Monopolies nearly four centuries ago, and remains the central task of the contemporary policy maker in this domain. Technologies, forms of innovation, and means of developing and disseminating new technologies evolve by their very nature, and patent law – while remaining true to certain core principles – has to adapt if it is to continue to serve creators and beneficiaries of new technologies. Informed policy debate, grounded in empirical research, is an invaluable foundation for the necessary elaboration and refinement of patent law.

When it comes to patents on medicines, the policy debate is all the more intense, and the public welfare interests are fundamental. It is self-evident that pharmaceutical innovation and equitable access to the fruits of such innovation are vital for both human well-being and social welfare. And we have strong expectations that policy mechanisms to enable innovation of, and access to, new medicines should deliver in practice – underscored by the articulation of specific targets for 2030 in the 2015 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDG).

The entry into force, more than two decades ago, of the WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) established a new principle at the level of international law that patents should be available for pharmaceutical inventions. This principle was contentious during the negotiations on TRIPS, and the adoption and implementation of the principle has hardly stilled policy debate in this area. To the contrary – the implementation of TRIPS in more than 130 distinct jurisdictions has sharpened and focused debate; equally, it has produced a rich trove of empirical data – in the form of distinct legislative
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approaches, patent examination guidelines and judicial decisions – from numerous established and emerging patent law jurisdictions seeking to apply the same broad principles in diverse economic, technological and social contexts. This dynamism and diversity opens up new prospects for informed policy debate, despite the formidable challenges of analyzing the data available from numerous national and regional systems. The experience of implementation has also underscored a practical reality that was not well reflected in early debate over TRIPS and public health – that TRIPS articulates general principles to be adhered to, but leaves open considerable latitude at the domestic level on a host of legal and procedural matters that are, in turn, vital for the successful attainment of the ambitious goals set for the patent system in this area.

The 2001 Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health responded to the intensification of policy debate over patents and medicines that had been spurred by the implementation of TRIPS in national laws; it has, since then, helped to frame that debate, making clear that the objectives of intellectual property systems (the patent system in particular) and of public health policy are not inherently at odds, but that the TRIPS Agreement must “be part of the wider national and international action to address” the public health problems afflicting developing countries and least developed countries (LDCs), and that it “does not and should not prevent members from taking measures to protect public health.” Further, while the principles of TRIPS are essentially technology neutral, there is a certain recognition that – because of policy and regulatory dimension – pharmaceuticals do require distinct treatment: hence, the TRIPS provisions for protection of clinical trial data, the extended exception in this domain (to at least 2033, reaching beyond the SDG target date) for LDCs (and an earlier extended implementation period for patent protection of pharmaceuticals in developing countries in general), the amendment to the Agreement itself, which created an additional pathway for access to generic medicines for countries particularly reliant on international trade for their pharmaceutical needs, and the broader framing of TRIPS and public health policy articulated in the Doha Declaration.

Professor Mercurio’s past scholarly work has contributed extensively to the literature on intellectual property law in its international legal and policy context, and especially as it is framed by the TRIPS Agreement and subsequent regional and bilateral trade agreements. The present volume helpfully distills and builds upon this work to yield a monograph that is focused, systematic and closely informed on the central choices that confront policy makers today as they seek to adapt the patent
system to the demands of today in the pharmaceutical sector in particular. In doing so, Professor Mercurio has mapped out the current policy choices generally presented to the practical policy maker in a national jurisdiction in a comprehensive and structured manner. He has effectively distilled the developments – often challenging for analysts to follow – in bilateral and regional trade agreements that have significantly altered the legal and regulatory landscape for many national jurisdictions. This work can therefore be abstracted from the individual jurisdiction it discusses and can serve as a practical taxonomy of policy choices faced by many countries – and can serve, also, as a selective guide to the background literature in this inherently complex and necessarily difficult domain of policymaking.

While the present writer would differ – respectfully, collegially and productively – with some of the lines of analysis, policy assumptions and conclusions presented in this volume, he has already benefited from the privilege of reading through the manuscript, an illuminating reading which has precipitated new insights in response, and will continue to refer to the book to assist in understanding the evolving context, and content, of law and policy in relation to patents and public health. Coming as it does from the perspective of an international civil servant, this Foreword is appropriately silent on the specific context of Hong Kong and does not venture to suggest that reform is necessary or called for in any of the areas discussed, or to advocate that the specific recommendations in this book are appropriate or optimal for this or any other jurisdiction. However, in the light especially of continuing practical experience with technical assistance and outreach undertaken in partnership within the multilateral system and with regional and national counterparts, it is clear that attaining improved outcomes for innovation and access to medicines requires situating patent law and related areas (such as test data protection) within their broader policy context: the changing, and diversifying, innovation landscape (including, with relevance for Hong Kong, the recognition of traditions of medical knowledge other than Western pharmacology), the interaction of the patent system with international trade (considering, for instance, the potential role of Hong Kong as an exporter of medicines, including under the system established by the TRIPS public health amendment), and the specifics of national medicines policy (procurement and innovation strategies, the regulatory system, pricing and other market policies, the application of competition policy in this domain, and statistics on actual access to medicines as well as projections of the future disease burden). An optimal, coherent set of policies requires a
comprehensive grasp of each of these policy domains and their interaction with one another.6

The following work therefore provides the policy maker with a critical and informed guide to navigation through a demanding policy landscape; its elaboration and analysis of the legal and policy issues lay out the contours and central features of the landscape, and to engage with its advocacy of certain lines of approach through this journey provides for a rich and informative dialogue about the appropriate path to take.