INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed JournalMulti Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed Edition :

www.ijlra.com

 ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

 ISSN: 2582-6433

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS

Megha Middha

Megha Middha, Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar

Megha Middha, is working as an Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar (Rajasthan). She has an experience in the teaching of almost 3 years. She has completed her graduation in BBA LL.B (H) from Amity University, Rajasthan (Gold Medalist) and did her post-graduation (LL.M in Business Laws) from NLSIU, Bengaluru. Currently, she is enrolled in a Ph.D. course in the Department of Law at Mohanlal Sukhadia University, Udaipur (Rajasthan). She wishes to excel in academics and research and contribute as much as she can to society. Through her interactions with the students, she tries to inculcate a sense of deep thinking power in her students and enlighten and guide them to the fact how they can bring a change to the society

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board

 ISSN: 2582-6433

Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India.India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020).Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr. Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi.Formerly Assistant professor of Law,Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration.10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.

Avinash Kumar

Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship.He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi.Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi.He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANLAYSIS ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

ISSN: 2582-6433

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND BIODIVERSITY: UNDERSTANDING THE COMPLEX INTERPLAY FOR SUSTAINABLE INNOVATION

AUTHORED BY - KRISHNAKANT CHOUBEY
& DR. AISHWARYA PANDEY
Amity Law School, Amity University, Lucknow Campus

ABSTRACT

The complicated relationship between Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) and biodiversity has emerged as a key focus in modern discussions about sustainable development. This abstract investigates the complicated relationship between intellectual property rights and biodiversity, focusing on the problems, opportunities, and ethical issues that occur from pursuing innovation while protecting the rich pattern of life on Earth.

The relationship between IPRs and biodiversity emerges at the point of intersection of technical innovation, economic incentives, and environmental conservation. This abstract explores the complexity of balancing the interests of inventors, indigenous people, and the global community in the context of intellectual property rights and biodiversity.

Biopiracy is a significant issue involving intellectual property rights (IPRs) and biodiversity conservation efforts. Indigenous knowledge, often rooted in traditional practices and ecosystems, is at risk of exploitation without fair compensation. A balance between incentivizing innovation and respecting indigenous communities' rights is required. However, effective integration of IPRs with biodiversity conservation can stimulate innovation for sustainable development. Patents can incentivize eco-friendly technologies, bioprospecting, and sustainable use of biological resources. Ethical considerations are crucial in shaping the discourse around IPRs and biodiversity. The abstract examines the ethical implications of patenting life forms, addressing questions about genetic resource commodification and potential erosion of cultural and ecological values. It advocates for a holistic approach considering the long-term impacts of intellectual property decisions on human societies and the natural world. In conclusion, finding a delicate equilibrium between IPRs and biodiversity conservation is essential for responsible and

 ISSN: 2582-6433

equitable innovation.

Keywords: *intellectual Property Rights, Biodiversity, Economic Incentives, Biopiracy.*

Introduction

The relationship between Convention on Biological Diversity CBD's objectives and intellectual property rights (IPRs) continues to be debated. Equally controversial is the impact of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPS Agreement), one of the agreements binding on World Trade Organization (WTO) Members, on the accomplishment of the CBD's objectives and on general sustainable development.

The progress in resolving these complicated issues has been slow. Our analysis examines the connections between legal systems and recommends actions for CBD parties and WTO Members, including many of the same nations, at both international and national levels. We urge the Conference of the Parties (COP) and CBD subsidiary organizations, as well as the WTO's TRIPS Council and General Council, to support these important initiatives.

The paper has been divided into four sections. Parts I and II address CBD and TRIPS Agreement provisions, respectively. The CBD and TRIPS parts focus on IPR and biodiversity, respectively. The analysis of these Part III covers important issues related to the CBD's objectives, intellectual property rights, and the TRIPS Agreement. Part IV provides suggestions for CBD Parties and WTO Members on international decisions and national legislative and policy measures to address these issues.

1. Intellectual Property & the Convention on Biological Diversity

The CBD aims to conserve biological diversity, encourage sustainable use of its components, and promote equitable sharing of benefits from genetic resources1. The CBD aims to achieve these objectives, which are often impacted by IPRs.

The relevance of IPRs stems from their role as one of society's principal mechanisms for protecting and enforcing control over information. Genetic resources hold commercial

[1] CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, June 5, (1992) Article 1 [hereinafter CBD].

 ISSN: 2582-6433

importance for developing new crops and plant varieties, medicines, herbicides, insecticides, and biotechnological products and processes.

Intellectual property rights are private rights. Patents allow proprietors to exclude others from particular behaviors, such as using a product or process, for a particular period of time, which encourages innovation. IP protection allows property holders to restrict access to resources, allowing them to reap commercial benefits with little competition. The patent system contemplated by the TRIPS Agreement, for example, allows the holder of a product patent to prevent third parties from making, using, offering for sale, selling or importing the product.

IPRs create exclusive rights on genetic resources, determining who can use the information and the way the benefits are distributed. IPRs impact who gains from genetic resources and the technology developed from them. This has consequences for biological diversity protection and application. Commercial interests are becoming more interested in intellectual property rights over genetic resources due to their high significance. Policymakers face difficulty in implementing the CBD's objectives due to a greater focus on intellectual property rights.

The CBD Conference of the Parties (COP) has made several types of rulings regarding the connection between the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and Intellectual Property Rights. They called on cooperation with the World Trade Organization (WTO) on IPR-related issues, pointed out the importance of a shared understanding of the relationship between IPRs, the TRIPS Agreement, and the CBD, and pointed out the need for consistency in implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity and World Trade Organization agreements, including the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights. While related to a number of aspects of biodiversity conservation, IPRs are proving particularly relevant to provisions of the CBD that govern the following four inter-related areas:

a. Access to and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits arising from the Utilisation of Genetic Resources

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) aims to promote biodiversity conservation by encouraging parties to provide access to and share benefits from genetic resources. The CBD's approach is based on the concept that nation states have sovereign rights over biological diversity within their territorial limits, and national governments have the power to regulate access to these resources. Access to genetic resources must be obtained with prior informed consent and on

 ISSN: 2582-6433

mutually acceptable terms. The CBD predicts using legal tools, such as intellectual property rights (IPRs), to ensure an equitable distribution of benefits from genetic resource research, development,and commercialization.

The Convention on Biological Diversity (COP) has established several subsidiary bodies to talk about access and benefit sharing. The Panel of Experts aims to create a common understanding of basic principles and to examine all options for access and benefit-sharing on terms that are mutually acceptable. The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group, which consists of members from states and regional economic integration organizations, creates guidelines and additional proposals for submission to the COP.

The CBD's work focuses on the important links between IPRs and access and benefit sharing, and the evolution of IPR systems, including those required by the TRIPS Agreement, may have significant consequences for achieving the CBD's objectives.

b. Preservation of and Respect for the Knowledge, Innovations, and Practices of Indigenous and Local Communities

The Convention on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (CBD) highlights the significance of maintaining and incorporating indigenous and local communities' knowledge, inventiveness, and practices. This "traditional knowledge" is often preserved through informal, collaborative practices that span several generations. It is useful for managing biological variety in the long run and developing goods that benefit society. The CBD encourages Parties to observe, protect, and maintain these practices while also promoting their wider applicability and the importance of fair access and benefit sharing.

There is some disagreement about the relationship between traditional knowledge and intellectual property rights (IPRs). Some argue that IPRs may promote continuous investment in conserving these techniques, while others state that traditional knowledge is typically not protected under present IPR provisions. However, there are increasing cases of IPRs being used to gain control overtraditional knowledge without benefit sharing requirements.

The issue of whether IPRs can and should protect indigenous and local communities' knowledge, innovations, and customs remains controversial. However, in order to comply with the CBD,

 ISSN: 2582-6433

IPRs shouldn't hamper efforts to protect equitable benefit sharing, as well as the preservation and respectfor these communities' knowledge, innovation, and practices.

c. Transfer of Technology

Intellectual property rights (IPRs) have a significant impact on access, benefit sharing, and traditional knowledge protection in the context of genetic resource-based technology development. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) requires that technology related to the protection and sustainable use of biological diversity, as well as the exploitation of genetic resources with minimal environmental impact, be transferred to developing nations on fair and advantageous terms.

The CBD recognizes that intellectual property rights (IPRs) will have an impact on technological development and transfer, and it requires access to IPR-protected technology to be provided on terms that are acceptable and effective. Furthermore, developing nations with access to genetic resources should have access to technology that utilizes those resources. Parties have to work together under national legislation and international law to ensure IPRs support the CBD's objectives.

The connection between IPRs and technology transfer under the CBD is complex, and IPRs and market incentives should be assessed for their impact on the nature of technology created from genetic resources and the transfer of such technologies. Further study of the effects of intellectual property rights on achieving the Convention's objectives, including reducing access and transfer of technology, is urgently required due to the rapid growth of technologies, particularly biotechnology.

d. Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) tries to promote the preservation and sustainable use of biological diversity components. It mandates that Parties include conservation and sustainable use considerations into national decision-making, implement measures to mitigate negative impacts on biological variety, and incorporate conservation into appropriate sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programs, and policies. Parties are also responsible for identifying processes and activities that have a major negative impact on biological diversity and evaluating their consequences.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

The CBD also includes requirements for the preservation of in situ biological variety, such as managing the hazards connected with the use and release of living modified organisms originating from biotechnology. Implementation of these responsibilities is especially critical in the context of agricultural biodiversity, as IPRs might drive the production of genetically modified plant varieties. Overall, the CBD tries to protect and encourage biodiversity conservation.

2. Intellectual Property & the WTO Agreement of Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement)

The TRIPS Agreement, developed during the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations, provides uniform rules for all WTO members to protect and enforce intellectual property rights (IPRs). The Agreement aims to strengthen efficient intellectual property protection while also reducing inefficiencies and barriers to international trade. It includes a wide variety of intellectual property rights (IPRs), including copyright, trademarks, geographical indications, trade secrets, and patents. Members have to provide IPRs to other members on the same terms as their own nationals and givethe same advantageous terms to one other's nationals. Patents and "sui generis systems" for plant variety protection are examples of intellectual property rights that have consequences for biodiversity conservation under the TRIPS Agreement.

a. Implementing the TRIPS Agreement

The WTO Agreement granted developing nations a five-year transition period until January 1, 2000, to meet their obligations. They will then have an extra five years to extend patent protection to products that were not protected when the Agreement went into effect. The least developed countries have ten years to implement TRIPS. However, due to a lack of ability and insufficient financial assistance, several countries have failed to meet their obligations.

b. Patent Protection

The TRIPS Agreement requires Members to provide patent protection for innovative, creative, and industrially relevant inventions in all fields of technology. However, there are few exceptions that might compromise the successful execution of the CBD objectives. Members may exclude inventions for public or moral reasons, such as preserving human, animal, or plant life or health. They can give patents on microorganisms and non biological processes used in plant and animal production, but not on plants or animals. Members may also make limited exceptions to exclusive rights, subject to specific restrictions. Furthermore, they can allow third parties to use patented inventions without the patent owner's permission.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

c. Sui Generis Systems of Plant Variety Protection

Article 27.3(b) of the TRIPS Agreement requires Member States to provide sui generis protection for plant varieties, whether through patents or an effective sui generis system. Members can select a combination of either or both. The interpretation and application of these provisions will have an impact on the implementation of Comprehensive Biodiversity Protection (CBD). The allocation of information rights under the TRIPS Agreement influences the distribution of benefits from genetic resources. Sui generis protection, if properly specified, can help the CBD achieve its objectives, such as access and benefit sharing and knowledge transfer. However, if not adequately specified, it could hamper objectives such as the preservation of local practices and the transmission of technology.

d. Reviewing and amending the TRIPS Agreement

The TRIPS Agreement provides two review processes that are important to policymakers attempting to accomplish the Global Compact's objectives: the review of Article 27.3(b) and the review of the complete TRIPS Agreement under Article 71.1. Article 27.3(b) obliged Members to evaluate its provisions in 1999, however the review was inconclusive. Developing countries insist on an in-depth examination of Article 27.3(b). The TRIPS Council meeting in March 2000 proposed a list of substantive issues brought up by Article 27.3(b), including the relationship between Article 27.3(b) and developing countries' developmental and economic interests, patentability exclusions, sui generis systems, ethical issues about patenting life forms, prior informed consent and benefit sharing, and traditional knowledge and farmer rights. The CBD's Conference of the Parties recognized the significance of the Article 27.3(b) review and asked that the WTO examine how to achieve these objectives in light of CBD Article 16(5). Article 71.1 calls for a second and larger assessment of the TRIPS Agreement, beginning in 2000, with the TRIPS Council reviewing its implementation.

e. Dispute Settlement

The TRIPS Agreement's substantial significance comes from its enforcement processes, which include the WTO's Understanding on the Settlement of Disputes (DSU), which established a binding dispute resolution system. If a member fails to comply, they may apply trade restrictions. Despite its power, the DSU has been criticized for lacking transparency, access to non-trade knowledge, and making wrong choices on trade liberalization and environmental protection. The

 ISSN: 2582-6433

creation of the DSU provides practical and political strength to WTO agreements, so it is critical to consider this factor while developing proposals to overcome disputes between the CBD and the TRIPS Agreement.

3. Key Issues

Policymakers and civil society activists are concerned about the TRIPS Agreement and Comprehensive Biodiversity Conservation (CBD). They argue that the TRIPS Agreement supports private economic interests at the expense of public policy objectives, such as those stated in the CBD. The TRIPS Agreement presents challenges to the CBD's successful implementation, particularly in terms of access and benefit sharing, traditional knowledge protection, technological transfer, and biological diversity conservation and sustainable use. This section combines CBD-related IPR elements with TRIPS-related biodiversity features, highlighting the most pressing challenges raised by the connections between CBD objectives, IPRs, and the TRIPS Agreement.

a. The TRIPS Agreement may affect access to and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources

The TRIPS Agreement-mandated Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) systems may have an impact on Comprehensive Biodiversity Protection (CBD). IPRs are frequently issued to individuals from one country over genetic resources obtained from another, and if the CBD's objectives are to be fulfilled, IPR holders should have gained access to genetic resources with prior informed consent, mutually agreed terms, and provisions to ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits. However, in other cases, IPRs could hamper efforts to promote equitable benefit sharing in both countries that use and offer access to genetic resources.

Countries that exploit genetic resources in formal innovation processes (often industrialized countries) have an incentive to limit efforts to promote benefit sharing. In some circumstances, IPRs have given a means for individuals and organizations to get access to the genetic resources of others while avoiding sharing the advantages. These types of claims are certainly inconsistent with the CBD's objectives and should be addressed through international collaboration to bring them into conformity.

Countries that provide access to genetic resources (often developing countries) have an incentive

 ISSN: 2582-6433

topursue substantial benefit-sharing mechanisms. However, the TRIPS Agreement may be used to compromise efforts to develop and implement benefit-sharing measures, such as national legislation requiring patent holders to share their profits with genetic resource providers or to issue licenses for the use and development of patented products or processes.

Sui generis systems, when combined with other policy measures, may be an effective instrumentfor ensuring that communities that offer access to genetic resources receive a portion of the benefitsresulting from their use.

b. The TRIPS Agreement may affect preservation of and respect for the knowledge, innovations, and practices of indigenous and local communities

The relationship between intellectual property rights (IPR) and the preservation of indigenous knowledge and local communities is a difficult subject. Existing IPR systems, such as patents, may raise the danger of misappropriation of traditional knowledge while failing to create positive incentives for local communities to maintain and capitalize on their expertise. Supporters of the TRIPS Agreement say that intellectual property rights provide incentives for took investment in biodiversity-related cultural heritage conservation. However, some indigenous organizations contend that commercialization is not always desirable and that intellectual property rights are culturally inappropriate. To protect traditional knowledge, new approaches are needed at both the national and international levels.

Measures must be developed at the national level while keeping national interests in mind, as well as indigenous and local community requirements. At the international level, a minimal structure will be required to prevent misuse and ensure equitable benefit distribution. The degree of flexibility allowed to WTO Members in executing Article 27.3(b) will determine the creation of appropriate sui generis systems. Indigenous and local communities must drive discussions on protecting traditional knowledge, which should reflect diverse stages of development.

c. The TRIPS Agreement may affect the transfer of technology

WTO Members' implementation of International Trademarks and Designs (IPRs) systems under the TRIPS Agreement presents two major concerns about the CBD's technology-related objectives. First, IPRs can have a considerable impact on the sorts of technologies created and whether they are appropriate for biological diversity conservation and sustainable usage, as well

 ISSN: 2582-6433

as the exploitation of genetic resources without causing significant environmental damage. Market-based IPR incentives may promote the development of technology that is more concerned with the interests of the private sector in the North than with the requirements of poor communities. This can result in the development of potentially harmful technologies, such as genetic usage restriction technologies, which threaten biological variety and the environment. Second, IPRs can have an impact on the fair transfer of technology to developing nations, as demanded by the CBD. However, little has been done to put these provisions into practice, and questions have been expressed about Article 27.3(b)'s requirements for IPR protection of plants, microorganisms, and micro-biological processes. Parties to the CBD should carefully assess the role of IPRs in technology transfer.

d. The TRIPS Agreement may affect the conservation and sustainable use ofbiological diversity

The TRIPS Agreement creates intellectual property rights (IPRs), which may have an indirect impact on biodiversity protection and sustainability. In agriculture, IPRs can provide economic incentives for conservation, inspire conservation technology, and promote effective land use. However, present IPR systems, when combined with subsidies, may favor the spread of monocultures based on genetically uniform types, displacing biologically diversified traditional agricultural systems. Commercial priorities may lead to the removal of varieties from circulation, damaging more diversified agricultural systems.

New genetically modified varieties may represent a risk of genetic pollution, with undetermined implications. More research is needed to determine the precise impact of intellectual property rights to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. However, IPRs perform an important role inindustries and corporate control over agricultural biotechnology research, making their impact on biodiversity conservation and sustainable usage crucial.

4. Recommendations of Actions

Policymakers play a crucial role in ensuring that intellectual property rights (IPR) and biodiversity conservation policies complement one another. To implement the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CBD), governments must take an integrated strategy across national and international fora. Other international fora, such as the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), UN human rights bodies, UNCTAD, UNESCO, and WIPO, should also help to resolve

 ISSN: 2582-6433

IPR issues.

a. Action at International Level

The CBD and the WTO should take procedural and substantive actions to improve the implementation of their agreements. To achieve the CBD's goals, Parties should insist on permanent observer membership in the TRIPS Council, which the WTO has yet to give. They should also have strong specific requirements for access and benefit sharing, as well as promote technology transfer, respect for traditional knowledge, and biological variety protection and sustainable use.

Parties should request that the CBD Secretariat prepare additional case studies and empirical evidence regarding the relationship between intellectual property rights (IPRs), the TRIPS Agreement, and the CBD. This includes offering more remarks on the function of IPRs in access and benefit sharing, building up experience with IPRs' impact on technology transfer relevant tothe CBD, and building new case studies on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

In conclusion, both the CBD and the WTO should take these steps to ensure the successful implementation of the CBD's goals.

b. Action at the National Level

The guidelines advise that governments take an integrated approach to policymaking in areas such as intellectual property rights (IPRs), the CBD, and the TRIPS Agreement. This includes developing Access and Benefit Sharing Schemes, processes for prior informed permission, precisely defining essential intellectual property ideas in national legislation, and prohibiting life patenting under Article 27.3(b). This would ensure that the TRIPS Agreement promotes the fulfillment of the CBD's objectives while preventing the strengthening of IPRs beyond the TRIPS Agreement's requirements. This will also help to safeguard traditional knowledge while ensuring equitable access and benefit sharing.

Conclusion

To summarize, the relationship between intellectual property rights (IPR) and biodiversity is complex and multifaceted, requiring a comprehensive understanding in order to ensure sustainable repair. IPR can promote or slow down biodiversity conservation and sustainable

 ISSN: 2582-6433

development, depending on how they are implemented and enforced.

On the one hand, IPR may promote innovation and investment in biodiversity conservation by ensuring legal protection for new technology, goods, and processes. This may result in the creation of innovative solutions for sustainable refurbishment that benefit both the environment and society.However, IPR may restrict access to genetic resources and traditional knowledge, reducing local communities' ability to benefit from their own resources.

References

1. CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, June 5, (1992) Article 1 [hereinafter CBD].
2. THE AGREEMENT ON TRADE RELATED ASPECTS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS, World Trade Organisation (1995) Article 28 [hereinafter the TRIPS agreement].
3. The Times of India Online India Business, 24 July (2000) available at http://www.timesof india.com/240700/24busi2.htm