E-ISSN: 2583-9667
Indexed Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal
https://multiresearchjournal.theviews.in/

Received: 01-12-2023
Accepted: 08-01-2024

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY

Volume 2; Issue 1; 2024; Page No. 230-237

Traditional knowledge protection in India: Examining multifaceted challenges and nuanced perspectives

[1]Vivek Trivedi and [2]Ramanand Sharma

[1]Research Scholar, Faculty of law, University of Delhi, New Delhi, India
[2]Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, University of Delhi, New Delhi, India

Corresponding Author: Vivek Trivedi

Abstract

India possesses rich traditional knowledge systems spanning diverse domains like medicine, agriculture and the environment. However, despite their enduring relevance, these collectively held intergenerational systems face complex challenges in today's changing milieu. This paper examines the multifaceted dimensions involved in protecting traditional knowledge in India through an academic inquiry attuned to legal, socio-economic and ecological perspectives. It analyses the limitations of prevailing intellectual property protocols and the risks of biopiracy. The research explores specialized documentation efforts and sui generis frameworks designed as defensive mechanisms against exploitative patenting, in addition to international accords on safeguarding traditional knowledge. However, eschewing misconceptions of homogeneity and stagnation, the paper advocates nuanced policies that integrate ecological integrity with commercial viability to sustainably harness the dynamism of living traditions. It concludes that a balanced strategy combining proactive archiving, legal innovation, commercial prudence and social equity is imperative for India to safeguard its traditional knowledge assets while benefiting from their contemporary potential. In summary, this academic study elucidates the complex challenges and nuanced approaches involved in protecting India's diverse traditional knowledge systems in a rapidly evolving globalized landscape.

Keywords: Biopiracy, Sui generis, knowledge, environment, agriculture

Introduction

Traditional Knowledge (TK) has been an integral part of India's rich cultural and intellectual heritage, deeply embedded in the practices of indigenous communities across the nation [1]. However, the protection of this invaluable asset has become a subject of increasing concern and complexity, especially in the wake of globalization and technological advancements. Despite India's commitment to international agreements like the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the country faces formidable challenges in safeguarding its traditional knowledge [2]. The situation is further complicated by the advent of modern scientific interventions, such as High Yielding Varieties (HYVs) and Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), which have disrupted ecological balances and posed threats to the sustainability of indigenous practices.

The legal landscape for the protection of TK in India is fraught with ambiguities and inadequacies. Existing Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) laws, including the Patent Act and the Copyright Act, are ill-equipped to address the unique characteristics of TK, which is often collective, orally transmitted, and inter-generational [3]. Moreover, international frameworks like the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) have often been at odds with the principles of TK protection, thereby exacerbating the challenges. This paper aims to explore the multi-dimensional challenges and complexities involved in protecting traditional knowledge in India. It delves into the legal, socio-economic, and ecological aspects that influence TK protection, scrutinizes the effectiveness of existing legal frameworks, and evaluates the impact of international agreements. The paper also addresses prevalent misconceptions about TK and highlights notable cases of biopiracy both in India and globally. Through a comprehensive analysis, this research seeks to contribute to the discourse on how India can develop a more robust and nuanced approach to safeguard its traditional knowledge.

Challenges and complexities in protecting traditional knowledge in India

The protection of Traditional Knowledge (TK) in India is a

complex issue that intersects with various dimensions, including legal frameworks, socio-economic factors, and ecological ethics. Despite being a signatory to international agreements like the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), India faces challenges in safeguarding its rich repository of TK [4]. Modern scientific interventions, such as High Yielding Varieties (HYVs) and Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), have led to environmental imbalances and have been detrimental to the sustainability of agriculture. These practices have necessitated the excessive use of pesticides, further deteriorated the agricultural landscape and mirroring the adverse impacts of the Green Revolution on farmers and their lands [5]. Farmers, commonly known as 'Kisan, find themselves burdened with increasing debts and health expenditures due to these unsustainable agricultural practices. The last two decades have witnessed an alarming rate of farmer suicides, especially post the implementation of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) in India. This grim reality underscores the urgent need for protective measures for TK and indigenous practices. International frameworks like WTO and TRIPS have had a significant impact on the agricultural sector, often to the detriment of TK. The introduction of Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) and the potential implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) further exacerbate the challenges faced by India in protecting its TK [6].

Another layer of complexity is added by the ambiguous definition of 'indigenous peoples,' who are frequently the primary custodians of TK. The absence of a universally accepted definition for this term complicates the establishment of ownership rights and undermines the effectiveness of legal measures designed to protect TK [7]. Additionally, the concept of 'prior art' in the realm of Indian patent law is insufficient in covering the scope of TK. This has led to contentious patents, such as those related to Neem and Ayahuasca, being granted without proper attribution or compensation to the indigenous communities that have nurtured this knowledge for generations [8].

As India navigates through these challenges, the role of ecological ethics and the advocacy for indigenous practices become increasingly crucial. It is imperative for India to integrate these elements into a comprehensive strategy for the protection of its rich traditional knowledge. This multifaceted challenge involves legal, socio-economic, and ecological dimensions. The adverse impacts of modern scientific interventions, the socio-economic burden on farmers, and the complexities introduced by international agreements make the protection of TK a daunting task. Therefore, a multi-pronged approach that addresses these various facets is essential for the effective protection of Traditional Knowledge in India.

Misconceptions regarding traditional knowledge

Traditional Knowledge (TK) in India has long been a subject of misconceptions that have far-reaching implications for indigenous communities, legal frameworks, and sustainable development. One of the most enduring misconceptions surrounding TK in India is the notion that it is unscientific or less valid than what is commonly understood as 'scientific knowledge.' This perspective is deeply entrenched in a dualistic framework that categorises knowledge systems into two distinct categories: 'scientific' and 'unscientific,' often relegating TK to the latter. This binary view is not only reductionist but also fails to appreciate the empirical foundations upon which many traditional practices are built [9].

Take, for example, Ayurveda, an ancient Indian system of medicine that has been in practice for over two millennia. Contrary to the misconception that it is unscientific, Ayurveda has a rich empirical basis. It employs a complex understanding of the human body, its interactions with the environment, and the properties of various plants and minerals to treat ailments. Over the centuries, Ayurvedic practitioners have meticulously observed the effects of various treatments, refining their methods based on empirical evidence. Modern scientific studies have also begun to validate the efficacy of several Ayurvedic treatments, further challenging the notion that they are unscientific [10]. Similarly, traditional agricultural practices in India, often dismissed as outdated or unscientific, have been shown to be remarkably sustainable and well-adapted to local ecological conditions. For instance, the concept of 'Agroforestry,' which integrates trees, crops, and sometimes livestock on the same plot of land, has been practised traditionally in various parts of India. These practices have improved soil quality, better water retention, and increased biodiversity

The misconception that Traditional Knowledge is unscientific is rooted in a flawed dualistic framework that fails to recognise the empirical basis of many traditional practices. Whether it's in the field of medicine, agriculture, water management, or architecture, numerous examples from India demonstrate that Traditional Knowledge often has a strong empirical foundation, refined over centuries, and increasingly validated by modern scientific research. Therefore, dismissing such knowledge as unscientific not only does a disservice to these rich traditions but also overlooks valuable insights that could inform and enrich contemporary practices.

Another misconception is that Traditional Knowledge is a homogeneous entity. This notion overlooks the rich diversity of cultures and communities across India, each possessing unique systems of TK adapted to local ecological and social conditions. The failure to recognise this diversity can result in ineffective policies that do not account for the specific needs and rights of individual communities [11]. The absence of a universally accepted legal framework for TK often leads to the misconception that it is 'free' knowledge that can be exploited without ethical or legal repercussions [12]. This view disregards the intellectual property rights of indigenous communities and can lead to bio-piracy. Moreover, it undermines the collective wisdom that has been nurtured over generations, reducing it to a commodity that can be appropriated without proper attribution or compensation.

Furthermore, TK is often erroneously viewed as static and unchanging. This misconception ignores its inherently dynamic nature. Traditional practices are not relics of the past but are continually evolving systems that adapt to changing environmental, social, and even political conditions. Recognising this dynamism is crucial for the sustainable management and protection of TK.

A nuanced understanding of Traditional Knowledge, informed by legal, socio-economic, and ecological perspectives, is essential for shaping policies and legal frameworks that respect the rights and contributions of indigenous communities. By critically examining these misconceptions, policymakers can contribute to a more equitable and sustainable approach to managing India's rich repository of Traditional Knowledge.

Misappropriation of TK around the Globe

Due to increase in the modern technology the cases of biopiracy have increased drastically in India and around the world, below are a few notable Biopiracy cases.

Neem Case (India)

The Neem tree, indigenous to the Indian subcontinent, has been traditionally utilized for its medicinal and pesticidal properties for centuries. However, the European Patent Office (EPO) granted a patent in 1994 to the United States Department of Agriculture and the multinational corporation W.R. Grace for a neem seed oil extraction method. This patent was seen as a blatant disregard for the traditional knowledge that had existed in India for generations. After a protracted legal battle spanning over a decade, the EPO revoked the patent in 2005, citing the existence of 'prior art' in the form of traditional Indian knowledge [13].

Turmeric Case (India)

Turmeric, a staple in Indian cuisine and Ayurvedic medicine became the subject of a U.S. patent granted to the University of Mississippi Medical Center in 1995. The patent claimed the "use of turmeric in wound healing," a property well-documented in ancient Indian texts. The Indian government successfully contested this patent, leading to its revocation in 1997 [14].

Hoodia Case (South Africa)

The Hoodia case in South Africa offers a perspective on biopiracy beyond the Indian subcontinent. The indigenous San people have used the Hoodia plant for appetite suppression for centuries. However, the South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) patented Hoodia's active ingredient without obtaining prior informed consent from the San community [15]. After extensive negotiations, an agreement was reached in 2003 to share commercial benefits with the San people, setting a precedent for benefit-sharing agreements.

Ayahuasca Case (Amazon)

The Ayahuasca plant, native to the Amazon and traditionally used for spiritual and medicinal practices, became the subject of a U.S. patent in the 1990s. The patent was eventually annulled after indigenous communities and activists raised objections, citing the plant's cultural and spiritual significance. This case highlights the ethical implications of biopiracy, particularly when the appropriated knowledge or resource has cultural or spiritual value.

Rosy Periwinkle Case (Madagascar)

The Rosy Periwinkle plant, indigenous to Madagascar, was traditionally used to treat various ailments. However, its anti-cancer properties were patented in Western countries, with no benefits shared with the local communities. This case illustrates the socio-economic implications of biopiracy, where the commercial benefits of biodiversity are monopolized by entities external to the community that have nurtured traditional knowledge [16].

The above cases examined underscore the multifaceted challenges posed by biopiracy, necessitating robust legal frameworks and ethical guidelines for the protection of traditional knowledge and biological resources. As the global community grapples with these complexities, it becomes imperative to develop mechanisms for equitable benefit-sharing and to recognize traditional knowledge as a form of intellectual property deserving of legal protection.

Role of Indian Judiciary in Addressing Biopiracy

The Indian judiciary has played a pivotal role in addressing the complex issue of biopiracy, which involves the unauthorized exploitation of biological resources and traditional knowledge. This paper aims to elucidate key cases adjudicated by the Indian judiciary that have set legal precedents in the realm of biopiracy.

The Czech Scientists Case

In a landmark case adjudicated by the Chief Judicial Magistrate (CJM) in Darjeeling, two Czech nationals were arrested and convicted on September 8, 2008. The individuals were found guilty of illegally collecting insects in Singhalila National Park, West Bengal. The conviction was grounded on the violation of Section 3 and 19 of the Biological Diversity (BD) Act [17]. This case is significant for several reasons. Firstly, it underscores the judiciary's commitment to enforcing the BD Act, a legislative framework aimed at the conservation of biological diversity and associated traditional knowledge. Secondly, it serves as a deterrent to potential violators, both domestic and international, who may seek to exploit India's rich biodiversity without proper authorization [18].

The Divya Pharmacy case

In another landmark case of Divya Pharmacy v. Union of India, the Uttarakhand High Court clarified a pivotal issue concerning the applicability of Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) and fair and equitable benefit sharing (FEBS) under India's Biological Diversity Act of 2002 [19]. The court ruled against Divya Pharmacy, an ayurvedic manufacturing unit operating under the Patanjali brand, which had argued that ABS and FEBS provisions were only applicable to foreign companies. The court held that all Indian companies involved in the extraction of biological resources are obligated to seek prior approval and share a portion of their revenue with indigenous and local communities that possess traditional knowledge [20]. This judgment dispelled the notion that Indian companies could exploit biological resources under the guise of nationalism, thereby reinforcing the legal framework for biodiversity conservation in India.

The Japanese Duo Case

Although not directly related to biopiracy, the case involving a Japanese duo sentenced to one year of imprisonment in Kerala for smuggling reptiles serves as

another example of the judiciary's role in protecting biological resources. The case was cited in the context of the broader discussion on biopiracy and the legal mechanisms in place to combat it [21].

The Indian judiciary has been instrumental in setting legal precedents that contribute to the broader discourse on biopiracy. Through rigorous legal scrutiny, the courts have upheld the principles enshrined in the Biological Diversity Act and other relevant legislations, thereby safeguarding India's rich biodiversity and traditional knowledge. These cases serve as a testament to the judiciary's proactive role in addressing the ethical, legal, and socio-economic dimensions of biopiracy.

India Legislative response for the protection of the TK

Traditional Knowledge (TK) in India, encompassing domains like agriculture, medicine, and biodiversity, is an invaluable cultural asset. However, existing Indian Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) laws, including the Copyright Act, Patent Act, and Trade Secrets Act, fall short in providing comprehensive protection for TK [22]. These laws are primarily designed for individual or corporate ownership and offer time-bound protection, making them incompatible with the collective and perpetual nature of TK. Moreover, they often fail to recognize TK as prior art due to its lack of formal documentation, thereby allowing unauthorized commercial exploitation [23].

The Indian Copyright Act, for instance, is limited by its focus on individual authorship and its fixed period of protection, which is incongruent with the collective and timeless aspects of TK. The Patent Act faces similar limitations, as it requires "inventive novelty" and does not recognize community ownership, both of which are often absent in TK. The Trade Secrets Act, although more flexible, does not offer robust protection against unauthorized use or commercial exploitation. Additionally, the Geographical Indications of Goods Act, which protects goods tied to specific geographical areas, is not comprehensive enough to cover the broad spectrum of TK.

Given these limitations, there is a compelling need for a sui generis system specifically designed to protect TK in India. Such a system should account for the unique characteristics of TK, including its collective ownership, perpetual nature, and the need for equitable benefit-sharing. Aligning with international agreements like the Convention on Biological Diversity could offer a framework for this specialized legal approach, acknowledging the role of indigenous communities in biodiversity conservation.

India's sui generis systems

Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL)

The Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL) stands as a sui generis system in the realm of intellectual property rights, particularly in safeguarding the traditional medicinal knowledge indigenous to India. Established through a collaborative effort between the Council of Scientific & Industrial Research (CSIR) and the Ministry of Ayurveda, Yoga & Naturopathy, Unani, Siddha, and Homeopathy (AYUSH), the TKDL serves a dual purpose [24]. First, it acts as a repository of traditional knowledge, meticulously documenting various formulations and practices. Second, it functions as a preventive tool against the misappropriation of this knowledge, commonly known as bio-piracy, by making this information accessible to patent offices around the world [25].

The inception of the TKDL was largely a response to a series of bio-piracy cases that drew international attention. Notable among these were the patents related to turmeric, neem, and basmati rice. These instances underscored the vulnerability of traditional knowledge, especially when such knowledge was either inadequately documented or documented in languages that are not globally understood. The absence of proper, accessible documentation has often been exploited by industrialists and researchers, leading to unauthorized patents and commercial benefits [26].

One of the most salient features of the TKDL is its multilingual database. The library has overcome significant language barriers by translating traditional knowledge, originally documented in regional languages like Sanskrit, Hindi, Arabic, Persian, and Urdu, into five international languages-English, French, German, Spanish, and Japanese. This multilingual approach not only makes the database globally accessible but also facilitates the work of patent examiners. The TKDL contains a wealth of information, including data from 150 books related to Ayurveda, Unani, Siddha, and Yoga. It includes around 1200 formulations used to treat 186 diseases, and the database is continuously updated to ensure its relevance and comprehensiveness.

While the TKDL has been instrumental in dismissing or amending numerous patent applications that sought to misappropriate traditional knowledge, its effectiveness is not without limitations. Several patent applications remain unresolved, indicating room for improvement in the system. Moreover, the TKDL's focus has primarily been on providing a defensive layer of protection by preventing wrongful patents. However, it does not offer a proactive strategy for the commercialization or broader application of traditional knowledge for the benefit of indigenous communities [27].

Despite its limitations, the TKDL has made significant strides in bridging the language gap by translating traditional knowledge into internationally recognized languages. This has not only facilitated the work of patent examiners but has also significantly reduced the time and cost involved in the patent denial process. The TKDL serves as a significant step toward the institutional protection of traditional knowledge. Providing a structured, multilingual, and accessible platform, not only aids in the preservation of traditional wisdom but also ensures that such knowledge is recognized and protected at a global scale. Future research should focus on these areas to make TKDL a more robust and effective tool for the protection of traditional knowledge [28].

Table 1: Major Milestones of the TKDL

Year	Major Milestone	Description
2001	Inception of TKDL	The TKDL project was initiated in response to prominent bio-piracy cases, primarily involving valuable Indian traditional knowledge. Its core objective was to systematically document and safeguard this knowledge from unauthorized exploitation.
2003	Multilingual Database	TKDL evolved into a sophisticated multilingual database, breaking language barriers by translating traditional knowledge into five internationally recognized languages: English, French, German, Spanish, and Japanese. This expansion significantly enhanced global accessibility.
2005	WIPO Endorsement	The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) officially endorsed TKDL, bestowing it with international recognition and validating its significance as a model for the protection of traditional knowledge.
2005	Legal Framework Establishment	TKDL established itself as a sui generis system within the intellectual property rights landscape. This marked a pioneering effort to address the unique challenges associated with protecting traditional knowledge.
2008	Free Prior Informed Consent	TKDL introduced the concept of Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) to safeguard the rights of indigenous and local communities. FPIC became a crucial element in ensuring that traditional knowledge was used with the consent of the communities that hold it.
2009	Access Agreements with International Patent Offices	TKDL took a significant step by signing access agreements with several prominent international patent offices, including Canada, Germany, the UK, and Australia. These agreements allowed these offices to benefit from TKDL's wealth of traditional knowledge data.
2022	TKDL Access Agreement with France	TKDL signed an Access Agreement with the National Industrial Property Institute of France, further expanding its international network and collaboration in protecting traditional knowledge.

***Source*:** Council of Scientific & Industrial Research

National Innovation Foundation

Apart from the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library, another major initiative taken by the Government of India is the establishment of the National Innovation Foundation. The National Innovation Foundation (NIF), an autonomous institution under the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, has been a cornerstone in fostering a culture of innovation and creativity at the grassroots level since its inception in 2000 [29]. While its role in promoting innovation is well-documented, a particularly noteworthy yet often understated aspect of NIF's mission is its commitment to the protection and promotion of traditional knowledge. NIF operates on a multi-faceted framework that includes scouting and documentation, value addition through Research and development (R&D), business development via a Micro Venture Fund, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) protection, and dissemination through various channels [30]. This framework serves as the backbone for NIF's initiatives in both innovation and traditional knowledge. The overarching objective of NIF is to transform India into an innovative nation by scouting, documenting, and disseminating grassroots innovations and traditional knowledge practices. One of the most salient aspects of NIF's work is its focus on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) as a tool for the protection of traditional knowledge. Traditional knowledge, often passed down through generations, is susceptible to exploitation and misappropriation. NIF takes proactive steps to document this knowledge and secure IPR, thereby providing a legal framework for its protection. This not only safeguards the rights of the knowledge holders but also ensures that the benefits accrued from such knowledge are equitably distributed [31].

In addition to its legal initiatives, NIF collaborates with esteemed research institutions like the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) and the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) to add value to the traditional knowledge it scouts. Particularly in the realm of herbal healing, NIF supports research on knowledge that has not been documented in classical texts, thereby filling a crucial gap in the existing literature.

Beyond the realms of legal protection and research collaboration, NIF also plays a pivotal role in the dissemination and commercialization of traditional knowledge. Through its extensive network of partnerships with government departments, academic institutions, and civil society actors, NIF ensures that traditional knowledge reaches the widest possible audience. It employs both commercial and non-commercial channels for this purpose, thereby ensuring that the knowledge is both preserved and utilized in a manner that benefits society at large [32].

The National Innovation Foundation stands as a testament to the power of institutional support in the protection and promotion of traditional knowledge. Through its multi-pronged approach that includes legal protection, research collaboration, and widespread dissemination, NIF has set a benchmark for how traditional knowledge can be safeguarded and propagated in the modern world. Its work serves as a model for other nations and institutions looking to achieve similar objectives. The foundation's initiatives, as documented in the 2013 publication "India Innovates," offer a comprehensive, academic analysis of its role in this critical area.

Table 2: Major Initiative taken by the National Innovation Foundation for the Protection of Traditional Knowledge

Initiative	Description	Implications for Traditional Knowledge
Grassroots Technological Innovation Acquisition Fund (GTIAF)	Operationalized to acquire socially useful grassroots technologies by paying a reasonable sum to the innovator.	Technologies including traditional knowledge are licensed at low cost or no cost for wider diffusion.
MOUs with International Agencies	Signed MOUs with innovation-related agencies of Malaysia, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe.	Sharing insights for strengthening grassroots innovation ecosystems, which include traditional knowledge.
Idea India Ka Innovation Pvt Ltd.	A for-profit company set up to provide financial, design, manufacturing, and marketing support to selected grassroots innovations.	Includes support for traditional knowledge-based innovations.
IGNITE - School Students' National Competition	A national competition to encourage school children to come up with innovative ideas and solutions.	Provides a platform for the younger generation to engage with and potentially contribute to traditional knowledge.
Partnerships with Academic Institutions and Civil Society	Encourages universities and colleges to set up National Innovation Clubs or support groups.	Includes adding value to local traditional knowledge.
Collaboration with Government	Works closely with different departments of the government to expand the knowledge base and add value to selected technologies.	Includes diffusion of traditional knowledge through commercial and non-commercial social channels.
Database Building	Built up a database of more than 1,74,000 ideas, innovations, and traditional knowledge practices.	Serves as a repository for traditional knowledge, aiding in its protection and promotion.

***Source*:** National Innovation Foundation website

International Protection for Traditional Knowledge

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights serves as a foundational multilateral treaty that underscores the right of all individuals to freely manage their natural wealth while concurrently imposing an obligation to preserve these resources. Notably, the Covenant goes beyond mere resource management to recognize the individual rights of investors and, importantly, the moral and material interests of indigenous communities. This dual focus makes it a significant instrument in the international legal landscape for the protection of traditional knowledge. Another pivotal international measure is the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) [33]. Established with the overarching aim of preserving global biodiversity, the CBD provides a comprehensive framework for the fair sharing of benefits that arise from the commercial utilization of genetic and biological resources [34]. The Convention empowers national governments with the exclusive authority to regulate access to these resources. Moreover, it mandates contracting parties to enact legislative or administrative measures to ensure that the benefits of commercial exploitation are shared in a fair and equitable manner.

Supplementing the CBD is the Nagoya Protocol, which offers a more focused legal framework for the fair and equitable sharing of benefits derived from genetic resources or associated traditional knowledge. The Protocol not only establishes a mechanism for regulating access to these resources but also sets up focal points to disseminate necessary information to parties interested in gaining such access. This structured approach significantly contributes to the protection of traditional knowledge at the international level [35]. The Bonn Guidelines, adopted in April 2002, further augment these efforts by assisting governments in formulating legislative or policy measures concerning access and benefit-sharing. These guidelines are comprehensive, covering all genetic resources with the exception of human genetic resources. They aim to inform both users and providers about best practices and approaches in access and benefit-sharing arrangements, thereby offering a practical tool for the implementation of the CBD's objectives [36].

The Trade-Related Aspects on Intellectual Property (TRIPS) Agreement, a World Trade Organization instrument, also plays a role in this context. It sets global standards for the patentability of inventions, including those related to genetic resources. Importantly, the agreement allows member states the discretion to exclude certain biological matters or processes from patentability, providing a layer of protection for traditional knowledge. Lastly, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (IT PGRFA) aims to conserve and promote the sustainable use of plant genetic resources specifically for food and agriculture. The treaty aligns closely with the CBD's provisions and emphasizes the fair sharing of benefits derived from the utilization of these resources [37].

The International initiatives collectively offer a multi-faceted approach to the protection of traditional knowledge and the prevention of biopiracy. Each initiative, while unique in its focus and application, contributes to establishing a fair and equitable global framework for the sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge.

Conclusion

The discourse on safeguarding traditional knowledge in India necessitates a perspective attuned to multifaceted challenges that span legal, socio-economic, and ecological dimensions. This paper has undertaken a comprehensive analysis to elucidate the complexities entailed in protecting India's traditional knowledge systems which constitute an invaluable facet of its intellectual and cultural heritage. The research underscores that despite the advent of modern scientific advancements, traditional knowledge systems, as evolved over centuries, maintain contemporaneous relevance. However, the sustainability of these time-tested practices stands imperilled in the absence of tailored mechanisms that account for their collective and

intergenerational essence. While prevailing intellectual property regimes may incentivize innovation in certain domains, their inability to recognize communal custodianship renders traditional knowledge vulnerable to appropriation and biopiracy, as evidenced by high-profile cases.

Therefore, the paper advocates the formulation of specialized sui generis frameworks along with documentation efforts that proactively integrate traditional knowledge within the ambit of prior art. This is necessitated by the limitations of conventional patent, copyright and trade secret statutes. The study analyzes pioneering institutional mechanisms such as the TKDL and NIF to highlight the efficacy of multilingual databases and research collaborations in valorizing traditional knowledge. However, consonant with its methodological emphasis on nuanced inquiry, the paper cautions against misconceptions of homogeneity and obsolescence in policy approaches.

At the international level, the research underscores India's commitment to preserving biodiversity and traditional knowledge under CBD and associated instruments. Ultimately, the paper concludes that a multifaceted strategy combining ecological integrity, legal innovation, commercial sustainability and social equity is imperative for India to comprehensively safeguard its traditional knowledge systems while also harnessing their contemporary potential. This balancing act is integral to upholding intergenerational pacts of cultural belonging in a rapidly evolving world.

References

1. Chakrabarty SP, Kaur R. A Primer to Traditional Knowledge Protection in India: The Road Ahead. Liverpool Law Review. 2021;42:401.
2. Sharma T, Raj P. Measures and Methods for Effective Protection of Traditional Knowledge: Rethinking the Protection Under A Model IPR Regime. SSRN Journal. 2021.
3. Jha A. Traditional Knowledge System In India. 2009.
4. Battiste M, Youngblood J. Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge. 2000.
5. OseiTutu JJ. A Sui Generis Regime for Traditional Knowledge: The Cultural Divide in Intellectual Property Law. Marq Intell Prop L Rev. 2011;15:147.
6. Ghosh S. Traditional Knowledge, Patents and the New Mechanisms (Part I). J Pat Trademark Off Soc'y. 2003;85:828.
7. Ullrich H. Traditional Knowledge, Biodiversity, Benefit-Sharing and the Patent System: Romantics v. Economics? Economics. 2005.
8. Baby TB, Suriyaprakash TNKS. Intellectual Property Rights: Bioprospecting, Biopiracy and Protection of Traditional Knowledge-An Indian Perspective. Intellectual Property. 2022:25.
9. Smith JP III, DiSessa AA, Roschelle J. Misconceptions Reconceived: A Constructivist Analysis of Knowledge in Transition. The Journal of The Learning Sciences. 1994;3:115.
10. Cavallo D. Emergent Design and Learning Environments: Building on Indigenous Knowledge. IBM Systems Journal. 2000;39:768.
11. Flyvbjerg B. Five Misunderstandings about Case-Study Research. Sosiologisk tidsskrift. 2004;12:117.
12. Ibid.
13. Singla A. Protection of Traditional Knowledge in India with Reference to Neem, Turmeric, Basmati Rice. 2020.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. Reid J. Biopiracy: The Struggle for Traditional Knowledge Rights. American Indian Law Review. 2009;34:77.
17. Kothamasi D, Kiers ET. Emerging Conflicts between Biodiversity Conservation Laws and Scientific Research: The Case of the Czech Entomologists in India. Conservation Biology. 2009;23:1328.
18. Ibid.
19. Biological Resources Are Property Of The Nation; Divya Pharmacy's Challenge To Fair And Equitable Benefit Sharing Dismissed - Financial Services - India [Internet]. [cited 2023 Sep 15]. Available from: https://www.mondaq.com/india/financial-services/785118/biological-resources-are-property-of-the-nation-divya-pharmacys-challenge-to-fair-and-equitable-benefit-sharing-dismissed
20. Ibid.
21. Japanese duo sentenced to one year imprisonment in Kerala for smuggling reptiles [Internet]. The Times of India. Dec. 4, 2015 [cited 2023 Sep 5]. Available from: https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/kochi/japanese-duo-sentenced-to-one-year-imprisonment-in-kerala-forsmuggling-reptiles/articleshow/50048251.cms
22. Cottier T, Panizzon M. Legal Perspectives on Traditional Knowledge: The Case for Intellectual Property Protection. Journal of International Economic Law. 2004;7:371.
23. Ibid.
24. Thomas PN. Traditional Knowledge and the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library: Digital Quandaries and Other Concerns. International Communication Gazette. 2010;72:659.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Sen S, Chakraborty R. Traditional Knowledge Digital Library: A Distinctive Approach to Protect and Promote Indian Indigenous Medicinal Treasure. Current Science. 2014;106:1340.
28. Ansari MS. Role of Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL) in Preservation and Protection of Indigenous Medicinal Knowledge of India. Herbal Medicine in India: Indigenous Knowledge, Practice, Innovation and its Value. 2020:609.
29. Fredriksson M. India's Traditional Knowledge Digital Library and the Politics of Patent Classifications. Law Critique. 2023;34:1.
30. Chakrabarty SP, Kaur R. A Primer to Traditional Knowledge Protection in India: The Road Ahead. Liverpool Law Review. 2021;42:401.
31. Ibid.
32. OseiTutu JJ. A Sui Generis Regime for Traditional Knowledge: The Cultural Divide in Intellectual Property Law. Marq Intell Prop L Rev. 2011;15:147.
33. Xue D, Guo L. On Concepts and Protection of

Traditional Knowledge. Biodiversity Science. 2009;17:135.
34. Biological Resources Are Property Of The Nation; Divya Pharmacy's Challenge To Fair And Equitable Benefit Sharing Dismissed - Financial Services - India [Internet]. [cited 2023 Sep 15]. Available from: https://www.mondaq.com/india/financial-services/785118/biological-resources-are-property-of-the-nation-divya-pharmacys-challenge-to-fair-and-equitable-benefit-sharing-dismissed
35. Reid J. Biopiracy: The Struggle for Traditional Knowledge Rights. American Indian Law Review. 2009;34:77.
36. Jha A. Traditional Knowledge System in India. c2009.
37. Ghosh S. Traditional Knowledge, Patents and the New Mechanisms (Part I). J Pat Trademark Off Soc'y. 2003;85:828.