This paper is based on a presentation made at the Asia
America Multitechnology Association (“AAMA”) Conference
on October 8, 2004. Intellectual property (“IP”) strategy
and practices are examined in the context of the currently
most common business transactions in drug discovery,
manufacturing and drug sales:

- research and testing services in China and India;
- manufacturing services in China and India; and
- product sales transactions in the U.S., China and India.

In 2003, U.S. pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies
invested about $33.2 billion in research and development
activities, amounting to about 18% of the total sales of their
products. The pre-tax cost of discovering, developing and
bringing to market a new drug increased from about $500
million in 1990 to about $880 million in 2003. Further, the
time to market has lengthened due to greater regulatory
approval requirements and because of slow enrollment
of patients in clinical studies in the U.S. and Europe. The
increased costs and slow enrollment is leading to greater
research and development (“R&D”) activities being
conducted outside of U.S. and Europe.

Up to a 50% cost savings may be possible on certain drug
discovery services in India. However, these lower costs
must be balanced against potential risks to the business
from inadequate intellectual property protection. Cultural
differences are also a factor. For example, China is a civil
law country and does not have a history of private property
ownership. Nevertheless, a business can take certain
practical measures to protect its IP in business transactions
in China and India. The measures depend on the specific
business activity, the stage of development in the drug
discovery process and the relevance of the final product to
the local population where the research is done.

Research and Testing Services in China and India:
Drug discovery research and testing services being done in
China and India for U.S. companies include pre-clinical and
Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) Phase I clinical trials.
Phase II and Phase III clinical studies are also currently
being done. However, they are few in number since the
FDA requires a “representative” sample of patients across
cultures in these studies rather than the homogenous group
of individuals available in China and India, and because the
disease patterns of the population in China and India differ
from those of the Western population.

Research and testing services can be provided either by
a wholly-owned subsidiary of the U.S. company or by an
independent contractor of the U.S. company. Eli Lilly, Pfizer,
Aventis, Novo Nordisk, GlaxoSmithKline, Merck, Johnson
and Johnson and others, for example, have established
R&D subsidiaries in India to control costs and compress
the development time. An advantage of having a subsidiary
is that the U.S. company has more practical control over
performance and IP protection. A disadvantage is that the
parent also must pay for the infrastructure costs of the
subsidiary. Regardless of the model being followed, there
must be a services agreement between the U.S. company
and the service provider.

The research and testing services produce data, processes,
methods, and other confidential information that may not
yet be patentable, but that needs to be protected. Further,
the ownership of the results must be assigned to the U.S.
company. The U.S. company can address these issues by
agreements and business practices as discussed below.

The IP risk in research and testing services may be mitigated
by the early stage of drug discovery. Since the drug target
must still be tested in clinical studies that are expensive
and carry a large likelihood of failure, the early stage data
is not as valuable as later stage data. Moreover, the IP risk
also depends on the therapeutic area under investigation,
_\textit{i.e.}, if the services and results relate to a product that has
a market in Asia, then the IP risks are higher. For example, HIV is not geographically limited and presents a growing problem in Asia, especially China and India. Therefore, HIV related activities in China and India carry a higher IP risk. In contrast, certain cancers prevalent in the U.S. and Europe have a much lower occurrence in Asia, therefore, research activities related to these therapeutic areas carry a reduced IP risk.

As a practical way to reduce IP risk, it is important to select a trustworthy business partner in China or India. This applies both to selecting an independent service provider and the management team of a subsidiary. Each prospective business partner should be carefully checked on the basis of its track record in both IP protection and contract performance (quality and timing of deliverables) in prior agreements, on their internal physical, electronic and other security controls for protecting IP and confidential information and on corporate IP policy and practices. A trusted partner should have a clearly communicated policy on protecting IP and its actions must be consistent with the policy.

The agreement with the trusted partner or subsidiary should be such that a U.S. court would enforce it, but also address certain local law provisions, particularly those relating to IP ownership assignments. The agreement also needs to include confidentiality provisions. The U.S. company needs to make sure it owns the results even when the service provider is its wholly-owned subsidiary. These obligations must also flow down into agreements with the service provider’s employees and subcontractors. The use of subcontractors should be minimized since each additional tier of development makes ownership issues more difficult to manage. At a minimum, the agreement should also include a non-compete provision, an audit provision (when, under what circumstances, and the extent to which the U.S. company can inspect the operations in China or India), and make the service provider liable for the actions of its employees and contractors. In addition, where feasible, the most practical method for protecting IP may be to restrict access to different steps of a process and use the audit provision to ensure that only authorized personnel have access to the IP.

Contractual requirements for obtaining ownership differ for contractors and employees. A subsidiary is treated as an independent contractor not an “employee.” Unless these requirements are met, the U.S. company may not own the results of the work even if it paid for them. The following chart summarizes ownership assignment requirements in China, India and the U.S. for both employee and independent contractor relationships. The factors in the columns from left to right address these issues:

- (1) whether a written assignment made prior to the completion of the results is effective or if a second written assignment is needed after completion of the results;
- (2) the geographical scope of the assignment;
- (3) if there is any obligation to exercise the rights assigned; and
- (4) the duration or time period of the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Following Completion of Work (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Copyright – Yes Copyright – No unless assigned in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Copyright – Yes Patent – No unless assigned in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Copyright – Yes Patent – No unless assigned in writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
India’s assignment requirements are materially different from those in the U.S. and China. Bioinformatics R&D, which tends to be protected by both copyright and patent laws is of particular concern, because of the Indian copyright law requirements. Assignment requirements in China are more like the U.S. requirements. The U.S. company must assure that the contractor’s agreements with its employees and subcontractors also have the proper assignment provisions.

The scope of patent protection in India will be expanded to include life sciences products on January 1, 2005 under TRIPS (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights). Products and processes will then both be eligible for patent protection. There is no judicial protection until a patent is issued. U.S. companies are not likely to see any increased patent protection in India for some time. The number and inexperience of patent examiners and the inexperience of India’s judicial system to deal with patent conflicts over products will delay the practical impact of these changes. This change may not have meaningful effect until the “equal dignity” rule takes effect in India for biotech products as it has for software. Respect for the IP of others seems to increase when local businesses and individuals understand the value of patent protection in the local market to provide a competitive advantage for the products they create or to protect their customers in service agreements.

In China, the Regulations of the People’s Republic of China on Technology Import and Export Administration became effective January 1, 2002. These regulations cover patent assignment and licensing, patent application right assignment, technology know-how assignment and licensing, and technical service and other means of technology transfer. These regulations should provide greater protection for life sciences intellectual property, however, their enforcement remains an issue.

While the best practice is to try to prevent an IP problem, the most practical remedy is to stop patent infringement or a breach of the agreement through injunctive relief. Contracts at all levels should provide for injunctive relief to increase the likelihood of a court ordering such relief. Injunctive relief for a contractual breach (as opposed to infringement of statutory patent protection) is not certain in China and is difficult to obtain in India. The IP risk should be evaluated in terms of how can infringement be proven and against whom the remedy can be obtained. Further, the governmental agencies whose cooperation will be needed in obtaining injunctive relief should also be identified.

The U.S. company should not expect any significant monetary recovery in either China or India. It takes about 4-7 years for a suit to be heard in China and longer in India and the dollar amount of any monetary damages is small. For example, Article 25 of China’s Anti-Unfair Competition Law, issued in 1995, permits the relevant control and inspection authority to award up to $25,000 for misappropriating trade secrets. Thus, monetary remedies do not provide a meaningful deterrent.

Manufacturing Services in China and India: Manufacturing service providers in Asia are almost always independent contractors rather than subsidiaries. There are over 60 FDA approved manufacturing plants in India, primarily for bulk drugs.

There is a greater IP risk in manufacturing services. At this stage, the drug is either on the market or data for regulatory approval is available. Patents are more likely to have been issued at this stage of the drug discovery process. A U.S. company will need to have patents issued in the country of manufacturing to protect manufacturing rights as well as the composition of the results. The IP risk also depends on the incidence of the type of disease in the local market.

The recommended practices under Research and Testing Services on selecting a trustworthy partner and the need for confidentiality and ownership assignment provisions in agreements are also applicable to manufacturing services. The injunctive relief strategy for enforcement is also equally applicable. The injunctive relief remedy can clearly be sought when statutory patent protection has been implemented. While the manufacturing services agreement should provide for injunctive relief, this remedy is less likely to be available for a breach of contract of a confidentiality or other provision.

There will be a TRIPS dispute mechanism available after January 1, 2005 if no local legal remedy is available but it remains to be seen if this remedy will have any practical effect. It is important to note that a patent must be issued in the country to have this potential remedy available.

Product Sales: This addresses IP protection for life sciences products currently being sold in the U.S. from China or India or sold into those countries from the U.S. The import flow of products is currently much more in the direction of to the U.S. The primary products being sold from India into the U.S. are generic drugs which are a growing presence in the U.S. market and other markets. This is a $16 billion-$17 billion market in the U.S. Indian companies had 4% of the
market share in 2003 and this market share is expected
to grow to 10% by 2008. In 2003, Indian companies filed
119 DMFs (drug master files) or 30% of the total DMFs with
the FDA, and 73 (20% of the total) abbreviated new drug
applications. A smaller but growing market in the U.S. is
traditional medicines from both India and China primarily for
the overseas (U.S.) Chinese and Indian population.

There are very few U.S. drug products being sold in China
or India because the pricing economics do not work. In
2003, China’s pharmaceutical drug market was valued at
only about $6 billion, with the over-the-counter drug market
accounting for about $1.2 billion. While IP protection in
these countries is a consideration, the pricing for most U.S.
products is too high for the China or India markets.

The U.S. has strong patent protection for life sciences
products. Indian generic manufacturers (such as Reddy
Labs and Ranbaxy) are savvy about the U.S. patent system
and are aggressively testing it. Rather than waiting for a
U.S. patent to expire, they are trying to create non-infringing
generics or find ways to invalidate patents on the basis
of prior art or other factors. They are also savvy about the
FDA process for generics, particularly for 180-day market
exclusivity. U.S. pharmas are trying to make their patents
stronger in response to the India generics challenge.

A U.S. company trying to protect its products in Asia must
have patents issued in China or India. Under TRIPS, this
will protect against infringement in the territory as well
as restrict exports from the territory into countries where
there is no patent protection. Strong U.S. import protection
against patent infringement helps protect U.S. pharmas from
imports into the U.S. market.

Conclusion:
Selecting a trusted partner in China or India with the right
IP practices and security infrastructure is a practical means
of protecting IP. Injunctive relief rather than damages is
the most realistic legal remedy in China or India. A patent
protecting the product or process must be issued in these
countries in order for the U.S. company to seek injunctive
relief for patent infringement. Injunctive relief is more readily
available for patent infringement than breach of contract.
While doing business in China or India has IP risks, the
risks need to be weighed against the economic benefits. A
practical IP strategy and set of best practices can reduce the
risk.

If you have any questions about this memorandum, please
contact Fred M. Greguras (fgreguras@fenwick.com) or
Narinder Banait (nbanait@fenwick.com) of Fenwick & West
LLP (telephone: 650.988.8500).