



From Biopiracy to Biojustice: Legal Reforms for Traditional Knowledge and Agrobiodiversity in India

Pragya Mishra[†]

Department of Law, University of Allahabad, Prayagraj — 211 002, India

Received: 8th June 2024; revised: 5th May 2025

This paper critically examines the intersection of intellectual property rights, biodiversity and traditional agricultural knowledge in India. It addresses significant challenges posed by biopiracy, exploring legal conflicts, ethical dilemmas, and practical considerations inherent in harmonizing these domains. Key international instruments such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the TRIPS Agreement, and the Nagoya Protocol are analyzed in context with India's legislative framework, highlighting gaps and opportunities. Through concise analyses of prominent case studies—including the Basmati rice, Neem, and Turmeric patent disputes, as well as Bt Brinjal—the paper illustrates how the commercialization of traditional knowledge undermines biodiversity conservation and communal rights. It argues for a shift towards 'biojustice', advocating for stronger integration of community-based initiatives and innovative legal mechanisms, such as sui generis protections and benefit-sharing agreements. The paper recommends policy reforms that emphasize cross-sector collaboration, practical recognition of traditional knowledge within legal frameworks, and responsive regulation of technological advancements in agriculture. Ultimately, this analysis seeks to balance agricultural innovation with the ethical imperative to protect biodiversity and indigenous knowledge systems, thereby fostering a more equitable and sustainable agricultural future for India.

Keywords: Intellectual Property Rights, Biodiversity, Traditional Knowledge, Biopiracy, Biojustice, India

In recent decades, the intersection of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), biodiversity, and traditional agricultural knowledge has gained significant global attention, particularly in the context of Indian agriculture. As agriculture remains the backbone of India's economy and cultural identity, the implications of applying westernized IPR standards—primarily designed for incentivizing innovation through exclusivity—have raised substantial concerns regarding biodiversity erosion and the marginalization of indigenous knowledge systems. This paper aims to navigate these complexities by critically examining legal frameworks, ethical considerations, and policy challenges involved in harmonizing these domains.

India's rich biodiversity, characterized by extensive genetic variability and agro-climatic diversity, plays a crucial role in food security, ecological balance, and climate resilience. Traditional agricultural knowledge, developed through generations of localized empirical observations and community practices, complements this biodiversity by preserving genetic resources and promoting sustainable agricultural practices. Yet, this knowledge remains vulnerable due to its communal,

intergenerational, and uncodified nature, which starkly contrasts with conventional IP frameworks advocating individualistic, clearly delineated rights.¹

The global proliferation of patents on genetic resources has led to controversial episodes of biopiracy—unauthorized appropriation of biodiversity and traditional knowledge by multinational corporations. For instance, attempts by foreign entities to patent Indian-origin biological resources such as Neem and Basmati rice highlight conflicts between commercial interests and indigenous rights, exposing ethical gaps within international IP regulations.² Similarly, the turmeric patent dispute underscores the inadequacy of current IPR frameworks in protecting traditional knowledge that is well-documented in indigenous systems.³

The advent of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), such as Bt Brinjal, further complicates this narrative by intensifying tensions between modern agricultural innovations and traditional biodiversity conservation practices.⁴ Technological advancements, while promising increased yields and pest resistance, often lead to monoculture farming and reduction in biodiversity, raising ecological and social sustainability concerns.⁵

[†]Email: pragya@allduniv.ac.in

Internationally, frameworks like the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), TRIPS Agreement, and Nagoya Protocol attempt to reconcile these competing interests. India, being party to these instruments, has enacted corresponding national laws, including the Biological Diversity Act, 2002, and the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001. Despite these measures, significant gaps persist, particularly concerning equitable benefit-sharing and effective protection against biopiracy⁶

In response to these shortcomings, there is growing scholarly and policy-oriented advocacy for the adoption of innovative legal approaches, such as *sui generis* systems, that specifically recognize communal rights over traditional knowledge. Such mechanisms aim to protect indigenous wisdom and ensure equitable sharing of benefits derived from its commercial utilization.⁷ Moreover, integrating community-based initiatives and public education campaigns into policy frameworks offers promising pathways towards sustainable agriculture and biojustice.

This paper critically explores these interconnected issues through selected case studies and theoretical analyses, advocating for reforms that balance the imperatives of innovation, biodiversity conservation, and ethical respect for traditional knowledge. It contributes to ongoing academic and policy dialogues by proposing specific legislative and practical measures to achieve harmony among IPR, biodiversity conservation, and traditional agricultural practices in India.

Literature Review

Scholarly discussions surrounding Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), biodiversity, and traditional knowledge have expanded significantly, reflecting growing global awareness of ethical and sustainability concerns. Academic debate broadly divides into three interconnected strands: analyses of international IP frameworks, critiques of biopiracy, and explorations of indigenous knowledge protection mechanisms.

The first strand critically examines international treaties such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the TRIPS Agreement, and the Nagoya Protocol, emphasizing their implications for biodiversity conservation and traditional knowledge protection. Dutfield (2005) highlights inherent tensions between the CBD's objectives of conservation, sustainable use, and equitable benefit-

sharing, and the market-driven ethos underpinning the TRIPS Agreement, creating conflicts that national legal systems struggle to reconcile.² Correa (2018) similarly underscores the inadequacies of international treaties in addressing the collective and communal nature of traditional knowledge, arguing that prevailing IP frameworks inherently privilege individual innovation and private rights, marginalizing communal knowledge systems.⁸

The second strand specifically critiques the phenomenon of biopiracy. Vandana Shiva's seminal work identifies biopiracy as a systematic exploitation of biological resources and indigenous knowledge by corporate entities, driven by globalization and patent-centric IP regimes.¹ Biopiracy, according to Shiva, undermines ecological balance and cultural sovereignty by commodifying resources traditionally regarded as community-owned. This critique is echoed by Gupta (2011), who outlines how India's rich repository of traditional knowledge remains vulnerable despite existing legislative measures, primarily due to gaps in international legal enforcement and awareness among indigenous communities.³

The third scholarly strand focuses on mechanisms for protecting traditional knowledge within national legal frameworks. Scholars such as Philippe Cullet argue that current IP laws inadequately address traditional agricultural knowledge's communal and intergenerational dimensions. Cullet advocates for *sui generis* legal protections that explicitly recognize communal ownership, collective rights, and equitable benefit-sharing from knowledge exploitation.⁴ Similarly, Robinson (2010) emphasizes geographical indications (GIs) as practical instruments for safeguarding traditional practices, noting successful cases like Darjeeling tea, where GIs have secured economic benefits for local communities while preserving traditional farming practices.⁹

Recent scholarship increasingly addresses technological advancements in agriculture, critically examining their impact on traditional biodiversity. Studies highlight dual outcomes: advancements such as genetically modified organisms (GMOs) significantly boost productivity but simultaneously pose threats to genetic diversity and ecological stability. Choudhary and Rana (2016) illustrate this dualism through Bt Cotton's experience in India, documenting initial productivity gains but also subsequent ecological and socioeconomic challenges,

including genetic monoculture and biodiversity erosion.⁵

Despite extensive literature, significant gaps remain, notably in systematically analyzing Indian cases through an integrated lens of biojustice—a framework advocating equitable integration of biodiversity conservation, traditional knowledge protection, and agricultural innovation. Existing studies often compartmentalize IPR, biodiversity, and traditional knowledge, rarely examining them cohesively. This fragmentation limits comprehensive understanding of the nuanced interactions and holistic policy solutions needed for sustainable agriculture in India.

Moreover, scholarly discourse lacks sufficient practical policy analyses, especially regarding how national legislation and international obligations align or conflict. Few studies robustly evaluate India's legislative responses to international treaties, particularly regarding the Nagoya Protocol's benefit-sharing provisions and their practical implementation at community levels.

This paper addresses these critical gaps by systematically integrating prominent Indian case studies (Neem, Basmati, Turmeric, and Bt Brinjal) with theoretical frameworks of biojustice and biocultural rights. By synthesizing existing critiques of international IP frameworks, examining the ethical and ecological implications of biopiracy, and proposing concrete legal and policy reforms, this study contributes a cohesive and practical analysis, aiming to move beyond conventional scholarly boundaries toward innovative solutions.

Theoretical Framework

To critically examine the intersection of intellectual property rights, biodiversity, and traditional agricultural knowledge, this study employs the theoretical frameworks of biojustice, biocultural rights, and the concept of the commons. Each theory provides distinct analytical insights that collectively offer a robust foundation for exploring and addressing the complexities inherent in harmonizing these domains.

Biojustice

The concept of biojustice emerges as a response to the inequitable consequences arising from contemporary biotechnological advancements and intellectual property regimes. Biojustice emphasizes the ethical imperative to ensure fairness, equity, and

sustainability in utilizing biological resources and associated traditional knowledge. According to Vandana Shiva, biojustice counters biopiracy by recognizing biodiversity as a community-managed commons, advocating the protection of community rights against monopolization and commodification driven by corporate patents and profit-centric globalization practices.¹⁰

Biojustice is integral to this paper as it directly addresses conflicts between commercial and communal interests. It asserts that biodiversity and traditional knowledge, as inherently communal resources, must not be subjected to exclusive private appropriation without equitable benefit-sharing with indigenous and local communities. The biojustice framework further argues for reforming existing IP systems to recognize and integrate traditional communal stewardship over genetic resources, thereby fostering ethical and sustainable agricultural innovation.

Biocultural Rights

Closely related to biojustice is the framework of biocultural rights, which articulates the interconnectedness of cultural and biological diversity. Biocultural rights acknowledge that traditional knowledge and cultural identities are intricately tied to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. This framework recognizes indigenous communities as custodians who hold collective rights to manage, protect, and benefit from their biological and cultural heritage.¹¹

The concept of biocultural rights is rooted in international agreements like the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol, which advocate equitable benefit-sharing arising from biodiversity utilization. These rights highlight the necessity of protecting not only genetic resources but also the traditional ecological knowledge and cultural practices vital to maintaining biodiversity. For instance, the preservation of traditional agricultural systems in India's Western Ghats through sacred groves (Kavus) exemplifies biocultural rights in practice, linking conservation with cultural and spiritual values integral to local communities.¹²

This theoretical lens is particularly valuable in analyzing India's legislative and policy responses, illuminating whether current approaches sufficiently respect and operationalize biocultural rights, or merely pay lip service without genuine enforcement and protection.

Commons Theory

The concept of the commons, extensively elaborated by Elinor Ostrom, complements biojustice and biocultural rights frameworks. Commons theory argues for community-based management of shared resources, emphasizing collective governance arrangements rather than privatization or state-centric control. Ostrom's seminal work demonstrates how communities successfully manage common-pool resources sustainably through cooperative practices and collective action, challenging the traditional "tragedy of the commons" narrative.¹³

Applied to biodiversity and traditional knowledge, the commons approach highlights how indigenous and local communities have historically managed genetic resources sustainably through collective practices, shared knowledge, and social norms that promote conservation. However, globalization and modern IP regimes threaten these community-managed commons by imposing individualistic property rights paradigms, facilitating private monopolies and undermining sustainable communal management practices.

The commons framework thus provides critical insights into policy reform options. It supports the development of legal mechanisms, such as *sui generis* protection systems and geographical indications, which explicitly recognize communal management practices and provide legal safeguards against privatization and misappropriation.¹⁴ This theoretical perspective underscores the importance of community participation, collective governance, and locally adapted regulatory systems in sustainably managing biodiversity and protecting traditional knowledge.

Integration and Application

Integrating biojustice, biocultural rights, and commons theory provides a cohesive analytical framework to critically evaluate case studies involving biopiracy, genetic patenting, and conflicts between commercial exploitation and communal conservation in India. Collectively, these frameworks advocate moving beyond traditional individualistic IP paradigms toward more inclusive and equitable systems, balancing innovation with ethical considerations and ecological sustainability.

In analyzing case studies such as the Neem, Turmeric, and Basmati rice patent controversies, and the debate surrounding Bt Brinjal, these theoretical lenses collectively reveal deeper issues of justice, cultural integrity, ecological balance, and communal rights.

Furthermore, they guide policy recommendations toward innovative approaches, such as benefit-sharing arrangements, *sui generis* protections, and recognition of traditional ecological knowledge, ensuring that policy measures are responsive to the ethical and cultural contexts of Indian agriculture.

Through this integrated theoretical framework, this study aims to propose meaningful reforms that align India's biodiversity and traditional knowledge protections with global best practices, ultimately fostering a fairer, sustainable, and culturally respectful agricultural system.

Case Studies

This section systematically analyzes four prominent Indian cases—Neem, Basmati rice, Turmeric, and Bt Brinjal—highlighting critical issues arising from biopiracy, patenting controversies, and conflicts between intellectual property rights, biodiversity conservation, and traditional knowledge. These cases illustrate how current IP regimes inadequately protect traditional resources, emphasizing the need for reforms based on biojustice, biocultural rights, and commons theory.

Neem Patent Controversy

The Neem tree (*Azadirachta indica*) holds significant ecological, cultural, and medicinal value in India. For centuries, Neem derivatives have been integral to traditional agricultural practices, medicinal treatments, and pest control methods.¹⁵ In 1994, the European Patent Office (EPO) granted a patent to the American multinational W.R. Grace and the U.S. Department of Agriculture for a Neem-based fungicide. This sparked international controversy, widely seen as a classic example of biopiracy—appropriating indigenous knowledge without consent or compensation.²

India successfully challenged this patent, highlighting the existing traditional knowledge of Neem as "prior art." In 2005, the EPO revoked the patent, recognizing that Neem's fungicidal properties were publicly known in Indian communities long before patent application.¹⁶ This case underscores inherent conflicts between IP laws designed to reward novel inventions and the protection of traditional ecological knowledge, emphasizing the necessity of legally recognizing communal traditional practices.

Basmati Rice Patent Dispute

The Basmati rice patent dispute illustrates another critical instance of biopiracy involving agricultural

genetic resources. In 1997, Texas-based company RiceTec Inc. obtained a U.S. patent on hybrid strains of Basmati rice, claiming exclusive rights to commercialize rice labeled "Basmati." This was problematic, as authentic Basmati rice is traditionally grown in specific regions of India and Pakistan, involving unique agricultural practices rooted deeply in indigenous knowledge.¹⁷

Following intense opposition from India and Pakistan, arguing that RiceTec's patent misappropriated geographical and traditional knowledge, the patent was significantly narrowed in 2001. RiceTec was restricted from claiming exclusivity over the term "Basmati," thus preserving the geographical indication (GI) and communal heritage of authentic Basmati cultivation practices.¹⁸ This dispute illustrates the effectiveness of GI as an innovative legal mechanism to protect traditional agricultural knowledge and highlights gaps within conventional IP regimes regarding the communal and geographical nature of traditional knowledge.

Turmeric Patent Case

Another critical instance involves turmeric (*Curcuma longa*), widely utilized in India for medicinal and culinary purposes. In 1995, the University of Mississippi Medical Center received a U.S. patent for turmeric-based wound healing properties. India contested this patent, asserting that turmeric's medicinal properties constituted well-documented traditional knowledge, widely recognized in ancient texts such as Ayurveda.³

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office eventually revoked the patent in 1997, affirming turmeric's wound-healing uses as prior art, thus precluding claims of novelty required under patent law.¹⁹ This case highlights how communal knowledge, though widely documented within local traditions, remains vulnerable due to gaps in international IP protection. It demonstrates the necessity of more robust legal frameworks that explicitly recognize communal and traditional knowledge to prevent misappropriation.

Bt Brinjal Controversy

The Bt Brinjal case exemplifies contemporary tensions arising from genetically modified organisms (GMOs). Bt Brinjal is a genetically engineered eggplant variety developed by Monsanto and its Indian partner Mahyco, incorporating a bacterial gene to enhance pest resistance. Despite potential agronomic benefits, Bt Brinjal raised severe concerns

regarding biodiversity loss, genetic monoculture, and displacement of traditional brinjal varieties, which are integral to India's biodiversity and agricultural heritage.²⁰

In 2010, following extensive public consultation and scientific debate emphasizing potential ecological risks and socioeconomic consequences, India's government imposed an indefinite moratorium on commercial cultivation of Bt Brinjal.²¹ This case highlights complexities surrounding biotechnological advancements in agriculture, illustrating significant conflicts between corporate-driven IP interests and the sustainable management of biodiversity through traditional farming practices.

Synthesis and Analytical Insights

Collectively, these cases demonstrate critical shortcomings within conventional IP frameworks regarding communal and traditional knowledge. Despite successes in challenging individual patents, systemic vulnerabilities persist, emphasizing the urgency for comprehensive reforms based on biojustice and biocultural rights. Cases such as Neem and Turmeric underscore the need for international IP systems to recognize traditional ecological knowledge explicitly as legitimate prior art. Similarly, the Basmati case demonstrates how geographical indications can offer practical, legally enforceable protections aligning with the communal nature of traditional knowledge.

Moreover, the Bt Brinjal controversy reveals deeper systemic tensions between modern biotechnological advancements and sustainable biodiversity management, highlighting the critical need for inclusive policy-making that balances innovation with ecological conservation and cultural integrity. These case studies reinforce the theoretical argument for transitioning toward innovative legal mechanisms that respect communal ownership, integrate traditional ecological wisdom, and ensure equitable benefit-sharing—essentially moving from a regime of biopiracy toward biojustice.

Technological Advancements: Impacts and Challenges

This section examines three critical technological developments—digital documentation systems, genomic technologies, and big data analytics—analyzing their implications for traditional knowledge governance in Indian agriculture.

Digital Documentation of Traditional Knowledge

Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL)

The Traditional Knowledge Digital Library represents India's pioneering effort to use digital technologies for defensive protection of traditional knowledge. Established in 2001, the TKDL addresses fundamental challenges in documenting traditional knowledge through a novel classification system (Traditional Knowledge Resource Classification) and sophisticated translation technology.²²

By 2023, the TKDL had documented over 400,000 formulations from traditional medicinal systems. Access is provided to patent offices worldwide through non-disclosure agreements, allowing examiners to search for prior art while preventing unauthorized commercial exploitation.²³

The TKDL's impact on patent examination has been substantial, facilitating the cancellation or withdrawal of over 230 patent applications based on Indian traditional knowledge between 2009 and 2022.

However, limitations exist: while the system effectively prevents misappropriation through formal IP systems, it does not necessarily ensure positive benefits to original knowledge holders; it focuses primarily on codified medical knowledge rather than agricultural.²⁴

Blockchain Applications for Provenance Tracking

Blockchain technology offers novel possibilities for protecting traditional knowledge through secure, transparent, and immutable record-keeping. The Farmer Producer Company Blockchain project in Karnataka enables farmers to record traditional cultivation practices on a distributed ledger, creating a verifiable record of traditional knowledge applied in production.²⁵

Similarly, the Traditional Knowledge Blockchain Registry pilot in Kerala documents traditional rice varieties and associated cultivation knowledge, enabling community validation of knowledge claims and triggering benefit-sharing mechanisms through smart contracts.²⁶

These blockchain applications offer several advantages: real-time updating of knowledge records; direct benefit-sharing without intermediaries; and mechanisms for community validation. However, challenges remain in scaling these technologies, including technical barriers and governance questions.²⁷

Genomic Technologies and Traditional Agriculture

Digital Sequence Information (DSI) Debates

The digitization of genetic information represents a profound challenge to traditional approaches to genetic resource governance. DSI effectively decouples the information content of genetic resources from their physical embodiment, challenging premises underlying access and benefit-sharing frameworks.²⁸

India has taken a nuanced position in international negotiations, advocating for benefit-sharing obligations for DSI utilization while supporting open science principles for non-commercial research.²⁹

The case of DSI derived from traditional rice varieties illustrates these complex dynamics. While research contributes to the public knowledge base, commercial applications derived from these sequences raise questions about appropriate attribution and benefit-sharing with communities who developed the original varieties.³⁰

The regulatory landscape for DSI remains uncertain, with neither the Biological Diversity Act nor the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act explicitly addressing digitized genetic information.

Gene Editing Technologies and Farmer Varieties

Gene editing technologies, particularly CRISPR-Cas systems, enable precise modifications to plant genomes without introducing foreign DNA. In India, research institutes are exploring CRISPR applications for improving traditional varieties, such as enhancing disease resistance in traditional rice varieties.³¹

These applications present both opportunities and challenges: potential to enhance resilience of traditional varieties while preserving valued cultural and nutritional traits, but also concerns regarding ownership of improved varieties and potential disruption of traditional seed systems.³²

The regulatory status of gene-edited crops derived from traditional varieties remains ambiguous in India. Draft guidelines for gene editing were released in 2020 but have not yet been finalized, leaving uncertainty regarding the regulatory pathway for such products.³³

Big Data and Algorithmic Agriculture

Ownership of Agricultural Data

The proliferation of digital technologies in agriculture has generated unprecedented volumes of agricultural data, raising questions about ownership,

control, and benefit-sharing for information derived from traditional agricultural contexts.³⁴

Several initiatives have emerged to harness big data for agricultural development in India, from the Ministry of Agriculture's Digital Agriculture Mission to private sector initiatives like Microsoft's AI for Earth program and ITC's e-Choupal 4.0.

These initiatives raise complex questions regarding data ownership and control. Traditional farmers contribute valuable knowledge that becomes incorporated into these data systems, but terms of data collection often leave ambiguous the ownership status of this information.³⁵

In response, community-based initiatives have emerged, such as the Karnataka Agricultural Price Commission's Farmer Database project, which explicitly recognizes farmers' ownership rights over data generated from their fields and requires consent for each specific use.³⁶

AI Applications in Traditional Farming Systems

Artificial intelligence applications in agriculture range from image recognition systems for pest identification to predictive analytics for weather forecasting. These technologies interact with traditional knowledge systems in complex ways.³⁷

The Digital Green initiative has incorporated machine learning algorithms to analyze data from traditional farming practices and generate location-specific recommendations, seeking to integrate traditional knowledge with data-driven insights.

However, concerns persist regarding algorithmic bias and power dynamics in AI-driven agricultural systems. Algorithms trained primarily on data from industrial farming systems may systematically undervalue or misinterpret the logic of traditional agricultural practices.³⁸

Harmonizing Approaches: Innovative Legal and Policy Mechanisms

This section examines emerging approaches that move beyond conventional dichotomies to develop more nuanced, contextually appropriate mechanisms for knowledge governance in Indian agriculture.

Sui Generis Protection Systems

Biocultural Community Protocols

Biocultural Community Protocols (BCPs) represent an innovative bottom-up approach to traditional knowledge governance. Developed by communities themselves, these protocols articulate community

values, procedures, and priorities regarding their knowledge and resources.³⁹

The Raika Biocultural Protocol, developed by pastoral communities in Rajasthan, exemplifies this approach. The protocol documents the community's traditional livestock breeding knowledge, establishes procedures for seeking prior informed consent, and articulates expectations regarding benefit-sharing.⁴⁰

BCPs derive legal recognition from multiple sources, including the Nagoya Protocol. Their effectiveness depends significantly on recognition by external actors, but resource constraints, power asymmetries, and limited legal enforcement mechanisms remain challenges.⁴¹

Open Innovation Models for Agriculture

Open innovation models adapted to agricultural contexts offer another promising approach. The Open Source Seed Initiative model, adapted in India through the Centre for Sustainable Agriculture's Open Source Seed Network, makes varieties available under a pledge that prohibits restrictive patenting while allowing continued use, sharing, and adaptation.⁴²

Similarly, the Farmers' Rights Information System employs a tiered access approach to traditional knowledge documentation, distinguishing between general knowledge that communities wish to share freely, knowledge shared under specific conditions, and sensitive knowledge that should remain confidential.⁴³

Defensive Protection Strategies

Defensive protection strategies aim to prevent misappropriation of traditional knowledge through formal intellectual property systems. India's Patent (Amendment) Rules, 2020, incorporate a novel mechanism by requiring patent applicants to submit a declaration regarding the use of traditional knowledge in their inventions.⁴⁴

Another innovative strategy involves the strategic use of publications to establish prior art. The Journal of Traditional Knowledge publishes detailed documentation of traditional practices in a format specifically designed to meet the technical requirements of patent offices worldwide.⁴⁵

Policy Reform Recommendations

Disclosure Requirements in Patent Applications

Mandatory disclosure requirements in patent applications represent a critical policy mechanism for preventing biopiracy and ensuring equitable benefit-

sharing. These provisions require patent applicants to disclose the origin of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge used in their inventions.⁴⁶

Potential reforms include expanding the scope of disclosure to explicitly include digital sequence information, strengthening consequences of non-compliance, and harmonizing requirements across different IPR regimes.²⁹

Prior Informed Consent Mechanisms

Effective prior informed consent (PIC) mechanisms are essential for ensuring that traditional knowledge holders can meaningfully control access to their knowledge. Policy reforms could include development of standardized yet flexible protocols that accommodate diverse community governance structures while providing legal certainty.⁴⁷

Additionally, technological innovations could support more effective PIC implementation through digital platforms that document consent processes, maintain records of agreements, and facilitate ongoing communication between knowledge holders and users.⁴⁸

Equitable Benefit-Sharing Frameworks

Several innovations could enhance benefit-sharing effectiveness: differentiated rates based on the nature and extent of traditional knowledge utilization; collective management organizations to reduce transaction costs; and expanded recognition of non-monetary benefits including technology transfer, capacity building, and research collaborations.⁴⁹

The Kerala model of benefit-sharing for Kani tribal knowledge regarding the Arogyapacha plant offers instructive lessons, including both monetary benefits through a trust fund and non-monetary components including training programs and research partnerships.⁵⁰

Public-Private Partnership Models

Innovative public-private partnerships can create value from traditional knowledge while ensuring equitable outcomes for knowledge holders. The CSIR-led Traditional Knowledge-Based Drug Development program connects tribal communities with public research institutions and pharmaceutical companies, with benefit-sharing arrangements negotiated at the outset.⁵¹

Similar models could be adapted for agricultural knowledge, connecting farmer communities, agricultural universities, and seed companies in

developing improved varieties based on traditional germplasm.⁵²

Capacity Building Initiatives

Legal Literacy for Farmer Communities

Enhancing legal literacy among farmer communities regarding their rights under various IPR and biodiversity laws represents a critical dimension of effective traditional knowledge protection. The National Innovation Foundation's Grassroots Innovation Augmentation Network has developed a promising model for legal literacy programs tailored to traditional knowledge contexts.⁵³

These programs could be expanded through integration with existing agricultural extension systems, simplified guides in local languages, mobile applications providing basic legal information, and peer-to-peer learning networks.⁵⁴

Institutional Strengthening for TK Documentation

Strengthening institutional capacity for documentation could involve enhanced technical and financial support for Biodiversity Management Committees, development of standardized yet flexible documentation protocols, and expanded training programs for documentation facilitators drawn from local communities.⁵⁵

Cross-Sectoral Collaboration Strategies

Effective traditional knowledge protection requires collaboration across multiple sectors and disciplines. The Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Authority's collaboration with Krishi Vigyan Kendras demonstrates the potential of cross-sectoral approaches, connecting the formal IPR system with grassroots agricultural extension networks.⁵⁶

Similar collaborative models could be developed across other interfaces, creating institutional linkages across different domains—environmental protection, intellectual property, agricultural development, cultural heritage—to promote more coherent and effective approaches.⁵⁷

Conclusion

The complex interplay between intellectual property rights, agricultural biodiversity, and traditional knowledge in India represents a critical frontier in sustainable development governance. India has developed one of the world's most comprehensive regulatory architectures for traditional knowledge protection, biodiversity conservation, and farmers'

rights, but implementation gaps, jurisdictional overlaps, and coordination challenges limit the effectiveness of these frameworks in practice.⁵⁸

The case studies demonstrate diverse manifestations of traditional knowledge conflicts and protection efforts. Biopiracy challenges highlight fundamental tensions between conventional IPR systems and the communal, intergenerational nature of traditional knowledge. Success stories illustrate the potential for innovative governance arrangements that create economic value while preserving cultural heritage.⁵⁹

The examination of technological developments reveals both unprecedented opportunities and novel challenges. Digital documentation systems, blockchain applications, genomic technologies, and big data analytics offer powerful tools for knowledge preservation and valorization, but also create risks of decontextualization, misappropriation, and power concentration.⁶⁰

Most significantly, the research underscores the importance of moving beyond binary oppositions—traditional versus modern, protection versus access, rights versus commons—toward more nuanced, contextually appropriate governance models.⁶¹

Despite significant legislative developments, current legal frameworks face several limitations: they often embody a "protectionist paradigm" emphasizing defensive measures rather than proactively supporting knowledge holders' innovation systems; they struggle with identification of appropriate rights-holders and benefit recipients; they exhibit insufficient integration across different policy domains; and implementation frequently faces practical constraints including limited awareness and institutional capacity.⁶²

The innovative approaches examined offer promising pathways, though each presents implementation challenges. The most promising models combine different governance mechanisms rather than relying exclusively on any single approach, creating layered protection systems that address different dimensions of traditional knowledge.⁶³

The path forward lies not in privileging either formal IPR or customary systems but in developing governance innovations that facilitate their productive coexistence, creating a more equitable and sustainable agricultural knowledge ecosystem for future generations.⁶⁴

References

- 1 Shiva V, *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge* (North Atlantic Books, 2016).
- 2 Dutfield G, Biopiracy and the international legal framework on genetic resources and traditional knowledge, *European Intellectual Property Review*, 27 (6) (2005) 238.
- 3 Gupta V K, Protecting Indian traditional knowledge from biopiracy, *WIPO Magazine*, February 2011, https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2011/01/article_0005.html.
- 4 Cullet P, Plant Variety Protection and Farmers' Rights: Towards a Broader Understanding, *Delhi Law Review*, 24 (2002) 41.
- 5 Choudhary A K & Rana V, Bt cotton and Indian agriculture: Socioeconomic, agronomic, and environmental impact, *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science*, 202 (2) (2016) 107.
- 6 Convention on Biological Diversity, Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing, <https://www.cbd.int/abs/about/default.shtml>.
- 7 Correa C M, Traditional knowledge and intellectual property: Issues and options surrounding the protection of traditional knowledge, Quaker United Nations Office Discussion Paper, 2001, <https://quono.org/resource/2001/4/traditional-knowledge-and-intellectual-property>.
- 8 Correa C M, Access to knowledge: The case of indigenous and traditional knowledge, in *Research Handbook on Intellectual Property and Climate Change*, ed. Joshua Sarnoff (Edward Elgar Publishing), 2018, 158.
- 9 Robinson D, Locating Biopiracy: Geographical Indications and Traditional Knowledge, *Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 3 (2) (2010) 127.
- 10 Shiva V, *Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability, and Peace* (Zed Books, 2016), 85.
- 11 Bavikatte K & Robinson D F, Towards a people's history of the law: Biocultural jurisprudence and the Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit sharing, *Law, Environment and Development Journal*, 7 (1) (2011) 35.
- 12 Subash Chandran M D & Dhanesh D M, Sacred Groves of India: Ecological Heritage and Conservation, in *Conservation Biology in Asia*, ed. Navjot Sodhi et al. (Springer, 2006), 269.
- 13 Ostrom E, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action* (Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- 14 Robinson D, Locating biopiracy: Geographical indications and traditional knowledge, *Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 13 (2) (2010) 127.
- 15 Shiva V, *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge* (North Atlantic Books, 2016), 69.
- 16 European Patent Office, Decision T0416/01 – Neem Tree, 2005.
- 17 Sahai S, India's Plant Variety Protection and Farmers' Rights Act, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36 (39) (2001) 3707.
- 18 Rai S, India-U.S. Fight on Basmati Rice is Mostly Settled, *New York Times*, 2001.
- 19 United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Re-examination Certificate B1 (3509th), April 1998.
- 20 Stone G D, Field versus farm in Warangal: Bt cotton, higher yields, and larger questions, *World Development*, 39 (3) (2011) 387.

- 21 Ministry of Environment & Forests (India), Decision on Commercialisation of Bt-Brinjal, 9 February 2010.
- 22 Gupta V K, Traditional knowledge digital library: A tool to prevent misappropriation of traditional knowledge, *World Patent Information*, 43 (2015) 85.
- 23 Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, "Traditional Knowledge Digital Library: Annual Report 2022-23, Government of India, New Delhi, 2023.
- 24 Reddy T & Chandrashekar S, Creating a knowledge commons: The case of the traditional knowledge digital library, *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, 22 (3) (2017) 178.
- 25 Narayanan V & Kumar S, Blockchain technology for agricultural supply chains: Case study of FPC-chain in Karnataka, *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 76 (3) (2021) 457.
- 26 Raj K G & T Nandakumar, Traditional Knowledge Blockchain Registry: A Case Study from Kerala, *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, 27(1) (2022) 56.
- 27 Veeramani S, Blockchain for traditional knowledge: A systematic review of potential applications, *Journal of Information Technology in Agriculture*, 5 (2) (2022) 112
- 28 Scholz A H, *et al.*, Multilateral benefit-sharing from digital sequence information will support both science and biodiversity conservation, *Nature Communications*, 13 (2022) 1086.
- 29 Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, India's Position on Digital Sequence Information on Genetic Resources, Government of India, New Delhi, 2022.
- 30 Singh N, *et al.*, Identification of stress resistance traits through genome sequencing of traditional rice varieties, *Scientific Reports*, 11 (2021) 4294.
- 31 National Agri-Food Biotechnology Institute, Annual Report 2022-23, NABI, Mohali, 2023.
- 32 Tadele Z, Sustaining the evergreen revolution through genome editing of orphan crops, *Genome Biology*, 23 (2022) 131.
- 33 Department of Biotechnology, "Draft Guidelines for Safety Assessment of Genome Edited Plants," Government of India, New Delhi, 2020.
- 34 Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Digital Agriculture Mission 2021-2025, Government of India, New Delhi, 2021.
- 35 Agarwal S & Sengupta I, Agricultural data Governance in India: Legal and policy challenges, *Asian Journal of Law and Economics*, 13 (1) (2022) 20.
- 36 Karnataka Agricultural Price Commission, Guidelines for Farmer Database, Government of Karnataka, Bengaluru, 2021.
- 37 Digital Green, Annual Report 2022-23, Digital Green, New Delhi, 2023.
- 38 Kumar P, Responsible AI for agriculture: Governance challenges and policy pathways, *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 5 (2) (2022) 154.
- 39 Bavikatte K & Jonas H, Bio-cultural community protocols: A community approach to ensuring the integrity of environmental law and policy, *Natural Justice*, Cape Town, 2009, 12.
- 40 Kohler-Rollefson I, The Raika Biocultural Protocol for Promoting Socio-ecological Development in Rajasthan, India, *People's Biodiversity Register*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2018, pp. 67-74.
- 41 Delgado N A, Community protocols as tools for balancing out power asymmetries, *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 49 (2021) 29.
- 42 Srinivas K R, Intellectual Property Rights and Bio Commons: Open Source and Beyond, *International Social Science Journal*, 58 (188) (2006) 319.
- 43 M S Swaminathan Research Foundation, Farmers' Rights Information System: A Model for Protection of Traditional Knowledge, MSSRF, Chennai, 2019.
- 44 Patent (Amendment) Rules, 2020, Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3(i).
- 45 Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Journal of Traditional Knowledge: Guidelines for Contributors, CSIR, New Delhi, 2020.
- 46 Dufield G, Disclosure of origin: Time for a reality check?, in *Protecting Traditional Knowledge: The WIPO Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore*, edited by Daniel Robinson *et al.*, Routledge, London, 2019, 81.
- 47 National Biodiversity Authority, Guidelines on Access to Biological Resources and Associated Knowledge and Benefits Sharing Regulations, NBA, Chennai, 2019.
- 48 Chhattisgarh State Biodiversity Board, Traditional Knowledge Management System: Technical Report, CSBB, Raipur, 2021.
- 49 Ravi S B, Implementation of the Biological Diversity Act in India: Process and progress," *Environmental Policy and Law*, 51 (1-2) (2021) 99.
- 50 Anuradha R V, Sharing with the Kanis: A Case Study from Kerala, India, in *Biodiversity and Traditional Knowledge: Equitable Partnerships in Practice*, edited by Sarah A Laird, *Earthscan*, London, 2002, 244.
- 51 Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Traditional Knowledge Based Drug Development Program: Progress Report, CSIR, New Delhi, 2021.
- 52 Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, National Agrobiodiversity Policy (Draft), Government of India, New Delhi, 2022.
- 53 National Innovation Foundation, Grassroots Innovation Augmentation Network Annual Report 2022-23, NIF, Ahmedabad, 2023.
- 54 Kumar N A & Nair K N, The rice diversity of Kerala: A socio-historical and economic analysis, in *Agricultural Biodiversity and Biotechnology in Economic Development*, edited by Joseph Cooper *et al.*, *Springer*, Berlin, 2005, 389.
- 55 National Biodiversity Authority, People's Biodiversity Register: Implementation Status Report," NBA, Chennai, 2022.
- 56 Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Authority, Annual Report 2022-23, PPVFRA, New Delhi, 2023.
- 57 National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Farmer producer organizations: Status and policy recommendations, NABARD, Mumbai, 2022.
- 58 Sahai S, Biodiversity and intellectual property rights: Can the Two co-exist?, *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, 13 (5) (2008) 315.
- 59 Posey D A & Dufield G, Beyond intellectual property: Toward traditional resource rights for indigenous peoples and local communities, *International Development Research Centre*, Ottawa, 2021, 95.

- 60 Prabha Sampath, Regulating digital trade & knowledge governance, South Center Research Paper No. 143, South Center, Geneva, 2021.
- 61 Robinson D F, Confronting biopiracy: Challenges, cases and international debates, *Earthscan, London*, 2010, 182.
- 62 Bhutani S & Kohli K, Implementation issues in biodiversity legislation: The Indian experience," *Critical Issues in Environmental Taxation*, 12 (2022) 76.
- 63 Oguamanam C, Tiered or Differentiated Approach to Traditional Knowledge and Traditional Cultural Expressions: The Evolution of a Concept," CIGI Papers, No. 185, Centre for International Governance Innovation, Waterloo, 2019.
- 64 Kamau E C & Winter G, Genetic resources, traditional knowledge and the law: Solutions for access and benefit sharing, *Earthscan, London*, 2020, 251.