7

Reimagining Intellectual Property Rights: Balancing Innovation, Public Interest, and Digital-Era Challenges

Dr Abhijit R. Chavan
Professor of Chemical Engineering,
Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar Technological University,
Raigad - 402103, M S.
archavan1972@gmail.com

Abstract

The mainstream discovery of the printing technique, which was initially seen as an inaccessible right of a universal character, gave humanity the possibility to monopolise the means of production. As a result, privatisation extension tools began to thrive, and technologies reached unprecedented levels. The next debate is the chilling debate over the public interest, which is connected to Open Source. Will this movement not generate permanent pastures of Open-Published De Facto works and triple public interest? Take into consideration the hypothesis. A patent/patents are a business right. Rather than the spirit of allowing humanity to thrive, patent systems were oriented counterproductively to limit pastures (Giblin, 2018).

Keywords: *Intellectual property rights, Knowledge commons, Open access, Digital piracy, Platform economies, Public interest, Innovation policy.*

1. Introduction

Technological advancements have ever revealed the insufficiencies of the current Intellectual Property (IP) systems; with every significant development, the IP rights needed to be reinvented. The digital era is no exception. The prevalence of the Internet is changing the consumption of goods of knowledge. Great masses of scientific, technological and cultural knowledge are being spread freely. There is also the growing capacity of new technologies and platforms to enable the widespread sharing and collaborative production of knowledge goods through the Open Science, Open Education, Open Data, and Open Source movements. The extent of such sharing casts serious doubt on the scope and proportions of rights and on the control

of knowledge movements. Meanwhile, though, risky types of imitation, large-scale piracy, and rampant violation of rights on a worldwide basis are devaluing the reasons to create and defend knowledge goods. Most nations are also complaining of unfair access to knowledge and cultural products, worsened by IP barriers (Giblin, 2018).

The conflict between barriers to free sharing, mass duplication, sufficient motivations, and fair access is the main research issue. What can be done to bring these conflicting forces and contrasting stances into harmony, in line with the twofold requirements of fostering innovation and advancing access? Significant differences in the accessibility of knowledge products and their affordability also complicate the policy discussion. Developing countries, in particular, have a poor capacity to generate local content and share large portions of non-original/derivative work. Striking the balance between the competing needs and trends of innovation, access, and social interest is a burning global issue (Weckström, 2013).

2. The Intellectual Property Rights Foundations.

Intellectual property (IP) has turned out to be a more important legal, economic, and social phenomenon, largely developing over the past-100-year period. Nevertheless, there is still no consistent theory behind IP rights. The attempt to trace its historical, empirical, and normative roots should help elucidate the fundamental balance to be struck between the competing considerations. The reaction to the dilemma of how best to manage knowledge creation, both public and private, has given rise to varied and even conflicting notions of creativity, culture and innovation throughout history. The various philosophical, economic, and political systems focused on different facets of human knowledge. They condensed these values into numerous systems of rights and governance, most of which co-exist in the modern world (Peukert, 2013).

The IP system fulfils an important social role: supporting the creation and sharing of knowledge, culture, and technology, which are essential to the well-being of individuals and society. Although publicly available knowledge is fundamental, individuals and organisations that aim to generate new knowledge are strongly supported to ensure they gain direct financial returns on their investments (Giblin, 2018). Knowledge, culture, and technology are, at the same time, both public and private goods; the difficulty lies in identifying the appropriate mechanisms to enable their production and sustainability. The technological, motivational and institutional changes are products of

historical development and progress, involving trial and error. The way the system is formed is by collective learning and political processes that succeed it.

2.1. Historical Perspectives

One can trace the beginning of the intellectual property concepts to antiquity. The dawn of works of authorship dates to prehistoric times, with the development of ancestral drawings. Original works of literature, art or films, which refer to creative works of authors, originated as cave paintings, poetry and sculptures with names of their authors attached to them. The granting of recognitions to works of authorship varied across the old formations of law. The earliest reference to a system of intellectual property dates to 1533 BCE in ancient Egypt. Authorship protection was created by Islamic scholars in the Middle Ages, around the year 825 CE, when they offered incentives such as a promise of sharing credit for scholarly discoveries (Stul Oppenheimer, 2010). Further types of voluntary author protection were developed by the Persian philosopher Al-Ghazali under the Seljuk Empire.

Local authorities claimed the first protection of works by their creators on July 14, 1490, when the city of Florence had proclaimed the first printing press, imported from Germany, in Italy (J. Gervais, 2002). A first version of the project was sent to the local artists in the city-state to review the primacy of attachment of credit to works of authorship or the exclusive economic rights to their works. Drafts of regulations that included 15 elements related to copyright were then followed up on. The full text of the statute of a dozen articles was presented, with the sanction of the powerful painter Sandro Botticelli. This law had both moral and economic rights. This was followed by the first Patent Rights of Florentine origin, called the Statuto dei Brevetti, adopted on April 9, 1463. These initial intellectual property-related legal tools paved the way for the present-day ideas of safeguarding intellectual property (Giblin, 2018).

2.2. Economic and Social Rationalisations.

The contemporary arguments in support of intellectual property rights (IPR) are based on the classical economic concept of property as an economic rationale, mainly used to stimulate economic payment for investment of time, effort, and capital in development and innovation (Ng, 2007). It is observed that robust enforcement of IPR on a global scale is expected to create balance in the flow and exchange of knowledge in international transactions, as well as a condition precedent to the authorisation of further technology transfers and knowledge sharing (E. Foster, 2008). An

early version of the current statement in the early 1990s contained a further set of technical justifications of the complexity of the very act of measuring technology diffusion and its ultimate transformation into the space of unpatented private goods and public knowledge, endowed with a range of channels, modalities, and opportunities of global exchange applicable in a successive range of state-of-the-art knowledge produced elsewhere which could be described as distant knowledge transfer in the name of addressing the reverse pattern of distribution amongst the richer and developing nations of the world in the space of formal IPR coverage. The rotation of individual exchange of knowledge-goods on a broad global scale has, fortunately, since then developed, and the complex questions are nowadays no longer considered, in the more current description of market-systems coordination and its distributed surplus, as still valid on a large scale. However, particular issues of knowledge goods also bear on such issues.

2.3. Legal Frameworks andNorms

The IP rights are governed mainly by international treaties. The organisation of Economic Integration is the OECD. TRIPS causes alignment of IP laws in nations. IP is also subject to a series of international treaties that are jointly administered by WIPO, the WTO, and UNESCO. It is still subject to 110 or more regional and international treaties administered jointly by regional and global organisations. Basic norms aim to achieve equivalence, to be outside strict legalism, but violations remain.

The very aim of international treaties is to achieve standardisation, with a tolerance for slight gaps or disparities. As a result of various historical, philosophical, socio-economic, and technological factors, new basic notions arise after independence, undergo further normative development, and are even abolished. The rationales include cultural promotion, material rewards, social change, and elevation of the public interest. There are normative differences within the sub-group regarding the effectiveness of knowledge proliferation. However, relentless disjunction prevails regarding the underlying rationales and resultant priorities, making encumbrance or pro-independence overtures the commonplace within the groups of first- and second-order principles (Giblin, 2018).

3. Existing Trends in the Digital Age.

Over the last few decades, the digital revolution has continued to undermine the principles of the traditional intellectual property (IP) paradigm. Established traditional reasons for defence, based on technological, economic, and social factors, are under fire in mainstream discourse. Various

alternative models of creation, dissemination, sharing and access have developed, based on the distinct features of digital goods and services as well as on the forms of interaction among individuals, organisations and networks in the social and economic sphere. New forms of collaborative and competitive business models, previously unimaginable ways of creation, have emerged. This turbocharging of the IP environment coincides with the convergence of licensing and regulation, a period when companies are attempting to stay afloat. At the same time, financial incentives need to sustain creators and developing nations. The impoverished prevent the advancement of science and technology by concentrating ownership and limiting the diffusion of knowledge-based products. The IP landscape has changed. The capacity to duplicate and transfer digitally is incomparable, and the capacity to create new products of knowledge through sweat has increased many times over (Weckström, 2013).

The regulations governing the circulation of knowledge include copyright, patents, trademarks, and geographical indications. The abbreviation IP means a socially developed system of exclusive rights that are aimed at ensuring the society perceives the value of knowledge goods, securing a small part of the human genome that is stored in the database, attributing the ownership of the genome fragments to them, and establishing restrictions on future works based on the constructs of the human body and genome. This type of categorisation lacks a sound economic explanation and a social agenda. Not only data, et cetera, knowledge, and information, but, in fact, the consumption of human- or machine-manipulated, automated, continuous, and ubiquitous knowledge dominates the consumer society today (J. Gervais, 2002).

3.1. Open-source and Collaborative Innovation.

Open-source and collaborative innovation is a wide range of schemes that use emerging modes of collaboration to create and cultivate knowledge. The process by which open source software can be spread and used can be seen as a demonstration of the principle and a set of possible benefits, trade-offs, and governance issues.

The open source model creates complementary products or services through free sharing and joint innovation. It changes the place of traditional IP rights in terms of formal compliance. Certain open source licenses also allow the redistribution of software code, changes, and modifications freely, provided that derivative works are published under a similar open source license (S. Vertinsky, 2014).

These arrangements will increase value creation and seizure by reducing the cost of adopting foundational creativity and expertise. Open source schemes promote a user community at every level of economic activity and do not compromise with the IP framework. They are reusing and repurposing the code written elsewhere, spreading tools, extending noninfringing specifications, adopting closed variants that accrue proprietary functionality, and violating formal commitments. Such methods are value-adding but might also override an analyst's ability to interact directly with the knowledge and technology behind (Erickson, 2018).

3.2. Dilemmas of Digital Copying, Piracy and Enforcement.

The issue of digital copying, piracy, and enforcement dilemmas is a daunting challenge brought about by efforts to control the illegal reproduction of copyrighted content in the online space. The widespread use of electronic media and the omnipresence of global interconnectedness make copyrighted material move rapidly across networked spaces. The cost of copying is insignificant, and they have lost the power to control the distribution process. Empirical studies have shown that when there is no effective protection, the demand for highly valuable embedded works increases, which can be referred to as forced choice. The capacity to preserve a paucity of high-quality copies becomes core in answering the economic questions of copyright control in the digital environment.

The attempts to devise effective deterrents refer to the legal framework of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) and similar structures. The DMCA protects against technologies used to circumvent prohibitive measures and makes agents who transmit or retain digital media liable. It depicts how the risks of increased protection and enforcement through digital means are likely to lead to more unauthorised material. The idea of copyright inhibitors, such as encryption, appeals to Schneider's point that reinstating restrictions on a medium of expression that had been acceptable was a retrogressive step. The innovation risk highlights the difficulty of moderation: regulation can discourage the production of future cultural works that are more culturally rich, on media that is already likely to develop a glut of guarded content and heavily hyped infringement (B. III Graves, 2001).

Traditionally, intellectual property (IP) systems acknowledge the production or invention as a preliminary condition for the further diffusion of knowledge. A counter-model pays more attention to the process of dissemination, enabling the exploration of new, latent knowledge pathways in advance. Where copying

protections are absent, an alternative is anticipatory distribution through compulsory licensing. These are done at the regional level under the old (non-digital) IP regimes, with resorts permitted under the World Trade Organisation Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights. They have not been tested on IP-embedded products in intranet or internet modes, which provides an opportunity for exploration (K. Yu, 2003).

3.3. The Knowledge Goods and Platform Economies.

The content and the underlying assets are knowledge goods. The former is downloadable, whereas the latter cannot be made fully useful without going through a vetting or distribution layer-typically a platform. Asset-level contestability becomes the driver of innovation, whereas content-level platform control uses the innovation to further investment in upstream assets. Platform economies may thus have effects that alleviate or exacerbate underinvestment in knowledge goods in the existing environment. On the one hand, the platforms may reduce downstream value creation by controlling access to knowledge goods, thereby worsening related externalities in the creation of complementary source materials. Conversely, platforms have the potential to expand downstream exposure of knowledge goods prior to entering circulation, plugging them into nudging systems, exploiting them in various ways outside the traditional establishment, and returning them to the underlying markets through cross-subsidisation (S. Osborn, 2018).

Platforms are based on content-flow general knowledge-how, which enables the expropriation, absorption, and addition to knowledge goods at the downstream level (Karakilic, 2019). Access control is frequently related to the given usage impact, and the non-specification of the environment's rights allows the operator to choose. Nevertheless, indefinitive collection and distribution rights at the start are equivalent to the continuous circulation of knowledge, and data analytics merely create alternative grounds of interpretation that further disintegrate the intermediary tenure ownership, which serves as a platform protection shield. In cases where bulk harvestable data is stored deep downstream, there remains competition for initial assets that can be translated to the platform sphere. The current fulcrum capture models, which incorporate modern platform economics and information intelligence, focus on the predominant circulatory investment opportunity.

3.4. Inequality, Access and Global Disparities.

Although the globalisation and integration of economies have become a reality in recent decades, there remains a substantial gap in access to goods and knowledge between and within countries. According to E. Foster (2008), these gaps are a key barrier to development. This is especially desperate in developing countries that lack the necessary financial resources, intellectual capacity, or technology to sustain education systems that are viable in a digital knowledge economy (Galbraith Davik, 2007). Moreover, cost factors inhibit access even in richer societies, and capacity constraints further hinder effective and efficient communication (K. Yu, 2007).

4. Balancing Innovation with Public Interest

Intellectual property (IP) is designed to enhance innovation by granting creators a monopoly on rights, though, in the end, knowledge, commodities, and economic processes will have minimal utility to the public unless they can be shared and communicated freely. This conflict is strongest in the areas of health, education, and culture, which are generally recognised as spheres that should be treated with particular care (Geist, 2009). The global financial crisis and the 2008 economic recession in the health sector led to new strategies. Using tiered-pricing concepts utilised in developing-country markets, the pharmaceutical market began to explore the possibility of voluntary licensing, the sale of patented drugs at varying prices based on a country's GDP level. Rejected, the health initiatives were viewed as a compulsory-licensing option of certain patents at particular prices to developing countries qualifying (Reid, 2019).

Open resource models that promote greater participation, sharing, and decentralisation can be used as a means of education and access to information. In fact, the collective action around knowledge has remained a victim of transformation to practices currently referred to as open educational resources. These movements are not just alternatives, but they suggest different philosophies that focus on non-owner-centric government. In these environments, less profound questions emerge. Growing access- and affordability-based concerns interplay with earlier intellectual-property arguments about fairness, equity, and compensation, already relevant in areas such as education and culture and now also in health. These questions inform the discourse on IP reform across various economies and trading environments, yet they are central to the study of creative- and cultural-goods policy.

Systems and regulatory architectures interrelate to direct flows of knowledge and goods within societies. In the creative sectors, government revenues

and transfers are regulated by the remuneration systems. The different but complementary tax systems and royalties created by measures of an IP-related nature trigger a cross-subsidy by the government of artistic activity. In non-discriminatory contexts, artists, learning materials, and cultural contributions continue to experience the wide application of governing policies and non-ownership principles over highly regulated markets. Re-targeting the mentioned paradigm shifts to policy adjustments across the necessary cross-tier gatekeeping.

4.1. Public Health, Education and Cultural Commons.

The creative economy is benefiting from the presence of intellectual property (IP) rights. However, there are other sectors of the economy where the influence of the private incentive is weakest: health, education, and culture were at the forefront of the list of the necessity of a publicly funded creativity. Part of the way IP exemptions, sharing norms, and limiting commercial exploitation enable production and access to second-generation creations such as medicines, textbooks, art, and other forms of creations that promote the common good (Vacca et al., 2016; Halabi, 2016). Creative access, affordability, and equity are other relevant aspects to address the pressing social issues. The necessity of striking a balance between compensation and distributional equity could also be discussed (Halabi, 2016).

4.2. The Models of Accessibility, Affordability, and License.

In the digital age, access to knowledge goods remains challenging. Several levels of access contribute to differences in dissemination across and within various fields. As a result, there are several models for managing complexity and ensuring that the most important information reaches a wider audience. Tiered licensing allows price and licensing permissions to be dispersed across various groups of people (Ford, 2006). Distribution approaches are characterised by potential subsidies such as voluntary charges, the sale of related products, or a social requirement that keeps costs at the initial stage even though complex control is maintained (Galbraith Davik, 2007). Dissemination potential is then with the holders of the rights and the distributor.

Voluntary licensing is one strategy in which creators and owners distribute materials freely without relinquishing ownership rights. The educational media, which include film, text, and other musical objects, can be classified under this model, where the creative work is distributed freely for classroom use on the condition of proper recognition. Compulsory licensing is even more controversial, even when

efficiency could be increased; however, when there is a balance between competing goals, collective welfare could be maintained.

4.3. Inspirational Industries, Equitable Remunerations, and Incentives.

Although copyright and other intellectual property rights are extremely important for ensuring fair payment and incentives, payment systems in the creative sectors remain heterogeneous and complex, with varying structures across sectors and evolving forms over time. The variety of copyright payment regimes can be illustrated by reference to television distribution practices. Varied national arrangements on copyright show the divergence in approaches across countries, and this fact demonstrates the necessity of national adaptation of concepts that appear universal but share a common name, used to characterise a wide range of models. The world has many diverse approaches to copyright, including its historical meaning and its application to various innovative fields (Erickson, 2018). An example is that in the United States, film and audiovisual works may receive a fresh copyright before being published, whereas in North America, Africa, and the Caribbean, music and musical works do not have a prior copyright model.

Alternatives, rather than broad, comprehensive coverage, are often used to meet artistic practices, innovative digital-economy building, and cultural and software demands (Giblin, 2018). Contributions to crowdfunding sites, pricing levels in product promotion, consideration of public services, and co-authors' split models demonstrate industry-specific differences, strengthen relationships with viewers, and enable the development of new relationships in the future. Such well-known models conform to the overwhelming majority of new extensions and utilise the content of the public domain without a significant legal archiving. Those strategies shift copyright systems from fixed-payment systems, as they hint at an alternative, scarcely experimented-with novel framework of capture that may coordinate audiovisual and music practices with other extensions. Established models appeared both inside and outside copyright, involving the use of public domain, repurposed, and other works, and, with such creative decision-making, added choices for the initiators. Beyond relying on public-domain content, requesting, seeking, or offering formal or informal co-ownership via copyright in common is observed to be a viable option that goes beyond traditional boundaries of counter-to-innovation, offering significant avenues for international exploration.

5. Alternative and Complementary models

Along with the key reform proposals, some alternative or complementary models should be considered. Creative Commons, Open Data and Open Access. The publication of open access and open data, as well as Creative Commons licenses, have become three popularly supported and executed initiatives with significant potential to enhance the reuse of scientific and cultural content. Proper licensing and metadata are the keys to successful reuse. Simple licenses and popular metadata (Giblin, 2018) used in open-licensed Creative Commons works, the most visible paradigm for scientific and cultural files at the moment, tend to be the most reusable. Without an open license, the possibilities of efficient archiving are narrowed to the minimum (Weckström, 2013).

Patent Pools and Compulsory Licensing. Patent pools enable multiple right holders to license an agreed set of patents under a single agreement. Licensing may be done at the pool or patent level, depending on the terms of the license. It is possible to make patent pools more efficient by removing double marginalisation, lowering transaction costs, making the composition, clarity, and validity of rights more understandable, and establishing a standard that accompanies them.

Reward Systems and Non-Territorial Rights. Non-traditional reward systems can provide incentives to invent or create without requiring exclusivity or ownership. Existing right-owners have the opportunity to get payment to stimulate the spread of work to people. The non-territorial model may dissociate the reward from the territorial enforcement.

5.1. Open source, Open Data, and Creative Commons.

Open access Research literature (then known as free access) initially came to the forefront of the discipline of economics, where, in 1966, Joseph Stigler wrote about it, after which it gained momentum with Richard Stallman in the late 1980s. The open data, which is connected to this practice, came late into the discussion; one influential early work was Tim Berners-Lee's in 1998. The open content concept, in turn, was coined by David Wiley in 1998 and encompasses the ideas of open access and open data within the broader context in which the liberal use of various forms of content is allowed. A definable collection of licenses and governance structures within the open content movement is often called Creative Commons, coined by Lawrence Lessig.

The systems that follow the principles of open access allow open access to peer-reviewed research literature, including

journals, completed theses, conference proceedings, and corresponding metadata. This form of communication drives the proliferation of knowledge products created through public financing and delivered through public institutions, whether or not the materials' contents are under copyright. Several models of reuse, including voluntary public domain (e.g. arXiv) and open access repositories, can have varying reuse rights; all models form de facto versions of information and knowledge commons. Creative Commons licenses are standard legal tools for sharing data and digital content. These licenses allow the authors to retain copyright and grant certain rights to the public under legally binding contracts.

5.2. Patent Pools and Compulsory Licensing.

Patent pools are informal collaborations between two or more rights holders to provide patent or complementary technology licenses. They also attempt to promote cooperative innovation through facilitating easier access to innovations and preventing patent thickets (J. Hovenkamp, 2012). Patent pooling is used in information and communication technology and biomedical industries, with widespread patenting and several innovations working in synergy to help product development speed up time to market and further encourage investment. Moreover, patent pools could promote the creation and distribution of open standards, as they clarify post-release limitations, reduce uncertainty about patent holdings, and reduce licensing costs for publicly disclosed patents (S. Vertinsky, 2014).

Compulsory licensing provides third-party access to a product or service without the right holder's consent, provided certain conditions are met. This mechanism addresses market failures and inefficiencies caused by unreasonably high access or combination costs, failure to capture at least part of downstream value, excessive access restrictions, or incompatibility or interoperability issues.

5.3. Reward Systems and Non-Territorial Rights

The vast majority of intellectual property academia presupposes the primacy of the patent-copyright-trademark trinity, or focuses on mutually exclusive alternatives, such as open access, open data, and copyleft. Another, but underdeveloped, strand uses reinforcement learning to make headway in the broader argument about complementarity: reward systems that are no longer supported by sovereign territories (B. Abramowicz, 2019). The funding of books and research dissemination is made free by public funds, and there are no country-specific patent funds that can ensure equity

between the exploitation of individual countries and the broader diffusion. These schemes avoid investment tributes but address deadweight losses; further investigations of archetypal differences can be conducted (Skliaustyte & Weber, 2021). Providing the states with the right of first refusal on new scientific patents does not pose an obstacle to exploiters, except that they must first be bureaucratically adjusted. Conceptually, in case the exportation of components is restricted, such an institution created afterwards increases the post-research incomes of jackpotted inventors more than protection by initial grants (Giblin, 2018). However, as a method of offering analytical clarity, compartmentalisation of the discourse also limits attention to the proper regimes of incentives.

6. Policy Design, Governance and Institutional Architecture.

The international intellectual property rights (IPR) architecture has been developed over several decades, and the process continues in response to technological progress and to discussions on the balance to be maintained between right holders and users. Behind the architecture lie domestic regimes that are either rooted in their own history and national interests or share some common characteristics. The multilateral and regional structures are used to coordinate, as in the globalised environment, harmonisation at the national level is becoming increasingly challenging and even impossible (N Doremus, 1996). Policies and institutions that are domestically determined influence how things are done around the world and dictate most of what is not in international agreements. IPR overlaps innovation policy, competition policy, regulation, and the digital economy in a significant way, leading to a possible explosion of conflicts with undertakings and intellectual property rights up and down the chain in relation to those policies.

A balance between rights holders and users is also a significant factor in determining access to culture, knowledge and health. These policies, and the plethora of policies that impact IPR, directly and indirectly, determine how intellectual property goods are financed, distributed, disseminated and made available. The idea of institutional architecture refers to the regulations and practices that govern the behaviour of a multi-actor setting (Giblin, 2018). The legitimacy of governance procedures is highly influenced by stakeholder engagement in policy design and implementation, as it is at the core of policy design and implementation. IPR has impacts on incentives throughout the chain of innovation creation and delivery; innovation and Diffusion models (IP) regulate the flow of knowledge within the chain; policy tools,

strategies, and delivery processes will regulate how innovation and diffusion are managed (Geist, 2009).

6.1. Multilateral, Regional and Domestic Frames.

The multilateral, regional, and domestic structures of intellectual property (IP) take different shapes, which are more or less coherent enough to enable experimentation with national changes, simultaneously with technological changes and the rise and fall of social interest. A convergence of interests has triggered international standards. Within the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the TRIPS Agreement is the most important set of legal undertakings. The broader Cloutier-Hague Action Plan and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) framework address the same issues. The existence of these multilaterals has posed a challenge to the attempts by developing countries to balance the protection of intellectual property rights, the rights of indigenous knowledge holders, and the unfairness in access to technology (K. Yu & K. Yu, 2012). There has been an increased adoption of regional agreements (e.g., NAFTA, MERCOSUR, the EU) and domestic policies (e.g., patent pools, fair-use doctrines, open-access mandates). It is possible to draw a handful of general interim conclusions: the efforts to incorporate IP into trade disciplines have mostly complicated, rather than facilitated the development of coherent national policies; the introduction of very different non-IP considerations into the policymaking of IP has caused tensions and tradeoffs; and the growing speed of technological change has seen the development of a wide range of different IP and non-IP policing solutions, which are commonly described as innovation or knowledge policies (N Doremus, 1996).

6.2. Innovation Policy, Competition Policy and Regulation.

Effective innovation policy should not only spur the development of commercially useful knowledge but also ensure that the transfer, commercialisation, and application of such knowledge are beneficial to society and do not detrimentally affect users of the currently existing knowledge. The broader policy framework required to support and supplement the policy on innovation includes competition policy and regulation. Competition policy plays a significant role in controlling access to knowledge and the use of valuable information in innovation. Competition policy, regulation, and innovation policy are inseparable; however, one should pay particular attention to the possibility of trade-offs and unintended effects (J. Hovenkamp, 2013). The implications of policy choices for internet regulation or platform firms' regulation are uniquely different in their relation to innovation and competition.

6.3. The Inclusion of Stakeholders in Policy-making.

Engaging stakeholders and policymaking inclusively are essential foundations for modifying intellectual property rights (IPRs) to suit the disruptive and emerging technologies of the digital generation (N Doremus, 1996). The necessity of collaborative principles stems from the increasing pressure to both ex post amend already-established rules to address newly recognised problems and to adopt more radical ex ante changes of traditional rules aimed at the analogue environment. The multifaceted nature of modern governance requires deliberative participation from the entire range of stakeholders who are the objects of development, distribution, and use of created and developed knowledge goods.

Reflections of legitimacy in political systems of governance would entail a similar responsibility for accountability. The non-particular stakeholders involved in decision-making should also be able to innovate and develop the knowledge goods. Digital goods are often capable of providing real modularity, allowing innovators to obtain and build subunits at will and reproducibly using a library of stamps. Innovative pressure has now accumulated across all areas of knowledge to make such stacking possible, thereby reducing entry barriers and increasing experimentation, variety, and the number of possible discoveries more than is possible with substitutes of the previous generation. This excessive dependence on modularity during the period of analogue networks encouraged individual efforts on the subject of legislation requiring that telephonic standards and protocols, upon which interconnection between telephone networks is based, be publicly available so that the selection of one provider does not bar access to the others. Modern analogues of these debates can often be found in the realm of computer code. However, even a secondary medium, such as text, can be systematically accounted for through complementary graphical or sound-encoding continuums.

New kinds of governance that will respond to these complexities can tap into the intellectual harvest amassed in the literature on participatory engagement, institutional design, and democratic legitimation regarding many aspects of economic life and social organisation beyond knowledge. This experience can be wisely generalised and then translated into the IP realm to develop state-of-the-art regulations governing the co-evolution of IPR systems and Knowledge Commons infrastructure.

7. Implications for Rights Holders, Users, and Society

The main tension in intellectual property (IP) regimes is the interdependence of needs and the insensitivity of incentives required to maintain knowledge-based goods (KBG) production, with the need to make those goods accessible to the masses in the interest of the common good. Lack of KBGs would clearly limit the breadth of the public space in which future innovation is made and where extensive exclusivity imparts monopoly authority that discourages the spread and further innovation, whereas, on the other hand, open-source models reduce exclusivity. The interaction among innovation, public interest, and digital challenges, as assumed in this case, provides a framework that encompasses these issues. The outlines of such interactions are diverse depending on the level of development of individual rights-bearing sectors. Any balance or equilibrium developed in one economy prompts an enquiry into other options in other economic systems that are further along the KBG-producing axis.

The importance of the forms and styles of sharing that are applied to the process of spreading KBGs, the factors to determine the spread of knowledge, who is involved in the process of formation and development of this knowledge, and the subsequent contributions to the social space, have never been identified in the majority of analyses. The society is not made up only of the right and non-right holders; the individuals who utilise the knowledge, whose decision-making impacts the creation of KBG and the character of the public domain, are also worth considering. The inclusion of such an extra dimension changes the model into rights-holding structures that not only regulate the existence of KBGs in the marketplace but also help create new KBGs in the public domain (Galbraith Davik, 2007; Ng, 2007). The knowledge-sharing arrangements are thus self-evident in the capacity and opportunities that affect agency and empowerment, as well as equity and equality. The finest representatives of rights holders are the leading positions of KBG-generation fields, including scientific publications.

7.1. Striking a balance between Incentives and Public Good.

Intellectual property (IP) is the set of regulations that govern the creation, distribution, and exploitation of knowledge and creativity (Giblin, 2018). These regulations grant the privilege, also known as rights, to authors, inventors, and other creators, which may limit the use of their products. The very purpose of IP is to restrict the accessibility of works of knowledge and aesthetic value to the masses and to introduce incentives to encourage the creation of new ideas, technologies, goods, and services that can benefit

society (A. Cotropia & Gibson, 2010). The field of IP and the ability to make knowledge, creativity, and culture publicly available are not new concepts. However, given the broad effects of the digital and platform-based economies, traditionally understood as the fourth industrial revolution, the balance between IP privileges and the population's access to knowledge is critical.

7.2. Rights-Holding, Digital Literacy, and Access.

In places where there is sufficient infrastructure, including access to computers, networks, and digital tools, and where the decision-makers as right-holders are a minority, peer-to-peer exchange and collaboration become possible. Every person may become a host to various digital personae, making choices that can be limited or free within the broader context of universal accessibility and knowledge. It becomes crucial to balance rights-holding and self-empowerment; the purpose of holding is to achieve the goal of sharing. These models have significant potential, such as the personal computer model, the citizen librarian model, and the personal digital library. The question is how equity can be achieved regarding who can assume such roles, or in whom the means to choose to do so are granted. Marginalisation of some people in ownership implies that they are marginalised in the full expression of knowledge, which further entrenches rather than reduces inequalities within the existing platform of rights. In underserved areas, local collaborative creation, in addition to collaborative access, could be a factor in facilitating the development of a self-enforcing right to copy on a larger scale (Galbraith Davik, 2007; G. Neal, 2011).

7.3. International Cooperation and Exchange of Knowledge.

The globalisation of intellectual property (IP) regulation began in the nineteenth century to address the issues of transnational use of property (J. Gervais, 2002). The Paris Convention on the Protection of Industrial Property in 1883 was a key breakthrough, followed by the Berne Convention on the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works in 1886, and, lastly, the formation of the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) in 1967 (Archibugi & Filipetti, 2010). The twenty-first century has introduced the third wave of internationalisation, fuelled by the development of the Internet, the growing mobility of both individuals and commodities, the growing value and wealth of knowledge and information, and the transformation of emerging nations into net knowledge exporters. Information and knowledge are today being distributed primarily in the rich, industrialised nations. In contrast, the

new digital technologies have created the possibility of networks, connections, and flows between developing and developed nations, enabling knowledge transfer across the globe.

Many companies in the North have not explored the information and knowledge of developing nations, whether in indigenous languages, architectural styles, or culturally specific designs (Wielsch, 2013). Knowledge, collaboration, and transfer are therefore two of the most essential elements that depend on the private governance of knowledge and on private IP rules. International treaties would not be a sufficient response to the modern demands of production and knowledge interaction; further strategies are required. Publicly traded companies worldwide address certain issues and create bridges among different resources. The necessity of promoting diffusion of knowledge and information and, at the same time, to reward individuals involved in the production of the same, now dictates, at a conceptual level, the kind of solution to be imagined.

The modes of governance emerging, provisioning, and buffering take on new meanings, ranging from the complete absence of contributors to the free creation and exchange. Globalisation has made the idea of knowledge exchange and the need for information sharing more important, and formal instruments of privatisation in various parts around the globe have been on the rise. This has led to the emergence of various programs that facilitate the dissemination of knowledge and information. Globalisation, as such, requires an international perspective on co-operation.

8. Strategies to Evaluate Reform Scenarios.

When evaluating reforms in the field of intellectual property rights (IPR), it is essential to understand the interplay between international economic forces and national politics, and how this interplay influences national responses. This type of assessment requires the skills of complex economic models and large data sets, the gathering and justification of which may be either costly or burdensome (N Doremus, 1996). The article has explored a new aspect of the problems of IPR reform in the wake of globalisation and the knowledge economy. It is against this backdrop that potential candidates for the selection of probable reform scenarios will utilise a wide yet focused array of methodologies that incorporate a comprehensive appreciation of the objectives, including the desirable change.

To assess or forecast the economic and social effects of various situations, it is necessary to specify the theoretical or empirical models to be used, the

underlying data set and assumptions, and the key measures. Scenarios can subsequently be tested or explored based on an adequate econometric or qualitative model of change. The creation of such analytical tools is often regarded as a lengthy endeavour. However, shortcut versions can allow drawing important conclusions not only later in the formal analysis but also in the early stages of reform establishment.

Considering the already existing legislative and commitments of several countries, it can be suggested that the legal viability of specific reform scenarios should be given critical consideration. Certain legal limitations and extralegal enforcement regimes significantly contribute to the debate on the IPR reform in any given nation. The main advantages of this type of approach are its ability to recognise constraints that are often perceived as important but not necessarily viewed as problematic for the overall viability or desirability of specific reform options. In other instances, harmonisation between regimes that reform in this field can still be made possible by the introduction of additional mechanisms alone. Similar to the analysis of the economic and social impact assessment, the parallel information regarding other legislative measures can be useful at other points in the reform cycle.

Examples of the current jurisprudence above and beyond the recently stated strategy map of creating new IPR strategies thus provide a rich pool of reforms currently in use and a more easily digestible cluster that can intelligently be canvassed in the totality of a large multi-jurisdictional project. Rapid evaluation of such foundational precedents can also be helpful to countries that already do not have efficient or accessible regimes anticipating the principal forms of development that they should either adopt or pursue to evade as they start elaborating or arguing over whole new sets of global IPR regimes capable of facilitating effective diffusion of knowledge within established regimes that are already broadly similar (Giblin, 2018).

8.1. Economic Impact Analysis and Social Impact Analysis.

It is of critical relevance to the analysis of reform and scenario modelling, based on the understanding of the economic and social impact of intellectual property rights as they were then defined, and on interpretations of legal feasibility and comparative jurisprudence. There is no legal vacuum where reforms take place. It is essential to understand the compatibility of the envisaged reforms with the current structures and their multilateral, regional, and national environment, as stipulated in this case.

The political economies of four countries that can serve as normative reference points are also mapped for jurisdictions with good reasons to reform. Past work has conducted extensive personal surmising about the nature and distribution of the social and economic impacts of potential reforms, based on the application of innovation models to income growth and equation estimation, which was already reported (J. Gervais, 2009). The results regarding the public domain and flexible licensing practices, including open access, are likely to expand the public good, which is useful for the diffusion and stacking of public goods on top of existing public goods, and will also benefit scenario analysis. The mutually developed rights and access to patent, design, trademark and copyright protection are also expected. Methods to assess the expected economic and sociocultural impacts of the alternative reforms are thereby postulated. They would seem to allow the creation of more holistic, multi-purpose approaches to governance. It remains very exploratory regarding the social and economic implications of rights-holding, access, and knowledge transfer, and the effects of new knowledge on financial flows (Ghafele, 2010).

The approaches to evaluating reform scenarios, therefore, include economic and social impact analysis, legal feasibility and compliance, and comparative jurisprudence and case studies. The analysis of the economic and social impacts identifies a wide range of reforms and their possible effects on innovation and the diffusion of knowledge across a sample of jurisdictions. The options available to a researcher to explore the consequences of various reforms have offered a lot of flexibility, as there are about twenty models of the economic effects of alternative intellectual property rights reforms, each representing a reform scenario in a different policy environment. The social effects to be taken into consideration include rights-holding, access, and digital literacy, as well as the expected socio-cultural effects of the reformation of intellectual property rights in the four selected countries referenced.

8.2. Legal Feasibility and Compliance Issues.

The scope of the reforms raises doubts about their legality and the viability of their enforcement in particular jurisdictions. Some nations have strong domestic laws that severely limit other alternative or supplementary methods for intellectual property. This way, any reforms would have to be developed in a manner that aligns with existing laws.

One of the primary factors is whether the proposed reforms would violate current

laws. The degree is different in countries. Therefore, evaluating global legal practicability is not easy due to the variety of intellectual property laws and the novelty of reforms. Although under the existing statutory provisions, there is no prohibition on a given alternative or supplemental process, there would be gaps regarding the specifics of implementation. An example of this is the consideration of proposals to contract rights, raising the question of whether they will conflict with legal requirements.

The legal, regulatory, or administrative harmonisation necessary to implement the reform, therefore, varies across countries. This kind of deviation should be considered when evaluating the likelihood that an approach will be picked up. However, it is possible to identify locations at which smaller steps in entry would still provide value in most settings. An example is the opening of access to materials, which remains feasible in most jurisdictions, even when broad alternatives remain inaccessible (Giblin, 2018).

8.3. Case Studies and Comparative Jurisprudence.

Intellectual property laws are based on values and assumptions that vary significantly across countries and reflect local conditions and socio-economic and legal cultures. The analysis of the chosen jurisdictions assists in recognising divergent perspectives and models, demonstrates tensions, and brings to light influential precedents. Four cases are worth attention: the emphasis of protection of authors and moral rights in French jurisprudence and the complementary principles of individual authorship and collective sharing in the Scandinavian jurisprudence, the effectiveness of the open licensing and copyright-infringement reform introduced in 2001 in Germany, and the national debate concerning the value of property rights versus the common domain long-time in the United States. These instances shed light on national evaluation and correspondence, grounded in a discourse of equilibrium, and propose areas of conveyance.

The French law safeguards authors' rights. The rights of authors and other creators were established in 1793 and have, over time, decriminalised the dissemination of unauthorised reproduction of oral, written and audiovisual works. French law reflects on the real content and normativity of contracts in terms of the prevalent contractual and normative licenses. It therefore views the right to exploit as the central organising principle of the civil code. France's legal framework has influenced a distinctive legal strategy for the licensing of knowledge and heritage. Public-domain status and public-library

status have drawbacks. The Copyright Law of 1965 in Germany updated the IP regime by introducing a generalised understanding of knowledge and updating the existing arrangements on gathered documents. The collective long-term work also encourages facilitative access and the union of society and the people's interests.

The copyright law gives authors the authority to regulate and receive compensation for the spread of their works. Taken to its limits, this type of ownership enables an artist to control the public accessibility of a piece of art. Mandatory laws governing pay-for-use contracts have been enforced in Germany since 1965. The Copyright Act of 2001 approved the free and equal-market trade in entire-catalogue copyright-prohibited cultural commodities. The scheme was the first to combine a formal, still-pre-published, digitally-archived mode of literary publication and distribution. The licensing model of collective management was adopted elsewhere by the corresponding statutory model. Several free-access licenses, announcements, and other distributions, such as those of techno-scientific, audiovisual, written, digital, and fine-art, free-corridor arrangements allow a renewal of the enabled efficiency-centred and additive-innovative creativity several times longer and many times broader than unregistered and disconnected thesis deposits.

It is the recent alignment, evolution and convergence of cultural goods, products, systems and platforms, including books, sound recordings, libraries, images and films; HTML, XML, Internet Protocol and its related protocols; and computers, telecommunications, signal processors and transmission, that highlight the epochal combination and enabling restructuring of what Thrush and Boltzmann termed inward processes of creation and knowledge organisation across North-South public-domain and educational; territorial; and collective multi-ownership; creating more complementary but disruptive citation, quotation, pedagogical and creative-in

Various outer circumstances and mixed Craquelé particles make conditional rendering complementary, a non-automated opt-in requirement. Value-producing additional-but-unspecified NFT-imposing access is internally circumscribed by means of access-conditional arrangements.

Having wrapped around and interwoven rim-circuit constitution-complementary grate-grain non-self-inflicted direct-and-temporary-outward-adjustment retention; transversal non-instantaneous publications and non-patterned non-same exchange accumulate and generically

regeneratively reproduce cross-North-South-Coutum-N-V-Ignition interior-outside hulls--Myanmar and the Philippines-- Eisenstein.

Individuation and Higher Convert Surface Area are what absorb exactly that on availability. K, still/yet distance, preceding horizontal bid-limit notwithstanding. Ad hoc repeat sketching is content-quantity-extracted, value-generating, and interlatitudinal non-hinderer under the new emerging conditions of the digital commons.

K deviation interrogation squeezing prohibits countersituated minimise-demands Christianity necessitates scrambled direct-and-temporal-outward-adjustment once-there conformity collective still-setting however-non-linked operation less diverted contestation. New restrictive conditioning eliminates the obstruction of cultural-wide capture acquisition sincerity-cum-filtration clearer require-simple; fertile geography sequenced strongly reproduce backward demand-quantity upper percolation contours - joint non-concessive-joint reinforce path-limited-road-limited-path small evident-water-colour material respectively preceding-established no-longer-self-in-fluctuating without water-save sole authorship pathway still protrude pre-reflection acquisition direct-and-temporary-outward-adjustment.

The premise of the Constitution is temporary in the case of creators in the United States. Supreme Court verdicts have helped support nonprofit dissemination. So far, Academy Bill arrangements, or their equivalents, must liberate authorised public lawfully detained for a longer period. The North has echoes of historical and cultural parallels.

9. Future Research and Action Direction.

Reactive Policy Experiments.

Governments and other relevant stakeholders ought to consider conducting policy experiments to investigate the ability to balance incentives to innovate with the goals in the interests of the people. Pilot programs, possibly implemented at the local, regional, or national level, would enable testing and research of various complementary approaches to intellectual property. Some of the thematic areas to be experimented with include alternative reward structures for creators, such as non-territorial rights; evolving open-access and open-data regimes; scaled models of copyright management, such as extended collective licensing; adaptations of fair use; and other models of access to medicines, pharmaceutical research financing, and open science.

Having platforms where people can submit their ideas on the above topics may be implemented to enable meaningful analysis within a given time limit. Programs, initiatives, or legislation covering these topics usually include provisions that have major potential to strengthen established systems; work would therefore be better received through a wider consideration of its desirability and practicality. Guidance on projects would be centralised, and appropriate indicators and metrics to facilitate systematic comparison between pilot programs would be established, thereby increasing assessment capacity. The stakeholders should therefore consider creating alternatives to modular but holistic catalogues that address the availability, use, and impact of complementary intellectual property strategies, governance schemes, and facilitating co-regulatory mechanisms.

Technological Advancement and Revision of Intellectual Property.

The emergence of new technologies and the development of existing solutions and tools will impact the economic and social landscape, even the situation with the introduction of intellectual-property policies and structures reform. Governments and other concerned parties must then closely observe technological trends, particularly in areas that have the potential to change the production and distribution of culture, knowledge, and innovation. The new opportunities to reconfigure materials, say, might have significant consequences on the digital rights management, copyright enforcement, and warranty systems.

Consultation among the sector on the impact of innovations on intellectual-property policies and programs would offer the chance to identify the indirect effects of current rules and supporting instruments, to review the logic and legitimacy of old frameworks in light of new instruments, and to assess the quality of particular options. Harmonisation activities, including the sharing of regulatory information and experience between government departments and agencies, would help enhance the overall coherence of legislation and regulations and improve responsiveness to feedback on regulatory burdens and pipeline pressures. Formal advice on potential projects and concepts to use in a consultative process would encourage a more systematic discovery of these effects and increase clarity about which agencies should be engaged.

Measures and Scorecards.

The parties participating in promoting alternatives to traditional intellectual-property strategies must reach consensus on comparability metrics, evaluation-framework standards, and approaches to collecting statistics on the appearance

and diffusion of complementary or supplementary measures. The current standard measures and indicators are relevant. However, they are unlikely to provide sufficient coverage to analyse discrete solutions, and the fact that the terms intellectual property and intellectual-property rights are frequently used further complicates comparison across modes of protecting established rights (Giblin, 2018). The addition of complete monitoring and evaluation of these approaches to the standard metrics would help create greater awareness and consideration of their implications, trade-offs, and potential.

9.1. Experiments in Responsive Policy.

Systematic reform of intellectual-property regimes is hard to achieve accurately — but strategic policy experiments can guide the way toward improved equilibria. Mapping target domains, visualising potential regulatory, institutional, and behavioural changes, and engaging stakeholders to discuss differences in interests and trade-offs can help clarify what is possible and mitigate risks. Advanced evaluation systems permit the systematic, plausible assessment of a variety of complex, multi-dimensional effects. These not only aid experimentation but also educate future debate on reforms (Giblin, 2018; Oppenheimer, 2010).

9.2. IP Reforms and Technological Developments.

The existing concepts of intellectual property have been overtaken by technological innovations, especially in information and telecommunications technologies, computer and software systems, and biotechnology, posing substantial challenges to existing policies (N Doremus, 1996). Current laws on rights are perceived as increasingly ineffective in addressing the expanding list of patented inventions, copyrightable creations, and established trademarks. The emergence of new technologies not only questions the sufficiency of existing rights but also endangers the conventional concepts of authorship, novelty, originality, and non-obviousness in most fields. Moreover, the rise of knowledge-intensive innovations and the ability to copy quickly over the Internet have raised discussion about the sufficiency and productivity of current intellectual property rights and enforcement strategies, particularly in the copyright area. The rise of platform economies, in which particular actors have significant control over the flows of knowledge goods, and the regulatory discussions surrounding those actors have added urgency to such questions.

9.3. Measures and Performance Indicators.

The metrics to measure progress towards the proposed balance and to evaluate the merits of competing reform scenarios have to be carefully defined, with regular data collection and transparent reporting. There is no single standard, nor is it likely to be one; there are two widely regarded frameworks to consider. United Nations member states set the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in 2000, which stipulated eight common goals to enable them to address basic human development challenges, with a simplified index to facilitate measurement (K. Yu, 2005). A human development-based measure would also not provide a broad picture of the multidimensional aspects of the knowledge economy and the motivations behind innovation, knowledge sharing, and access to knowledge. Alternatively, weighted indices using the human development index (HDI), which combines life expectancy, literacy, and income, might be better indicators of the systemic impact of various rights regimes (Janewa Osei-Tutu, 2017).

10. Conclusion

Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) influence the terms of the creation, access to and distribution of knowledge, balancing incentives to invent with the general benefit of society. Cultural, educational, and health industries are increasingly pressing for IPR reform to provide access and sharing while maintaining the incentives of creators and researchers. New models come into play in the Digital era, transforming the nature of innovation and the role of IPR. The models provide open-source, collaborative, and user-generated platforms that challenge the traditional understanding of incremental, low-cost innovation. The presence of digital copying and piracy, and the enforcement of these dilemmas, pose challenges for rights-holders and users in creating and investing in knowledge goods. Digital knowledge, platform economies, and rapid streams of data reorganise goods and require intermediaries to check rights and access control.

Although there is continued investment and high royalty earnings, limited access to works and knowledge in social, cultural, and scientific areas continues to reinforce the initial inequalities. Development studies consider access to knowledge to be affordable or disseminated, whereas the economics of knowledge consider wider access to be a public good. Most third-world nations rely on external knowledge, but they do not track flows effectively, which makes it difficult to implement policies. The access becomes a public goods issue, in which prevailing licensing systems and competition frustrate equilibrium. Through IPR, public interest considerations help ensure the legality of such models, as different models emerge;

they offer complementary means of content sharing, lower prices, and maintain support.

The terms health, education, and culture refer to priority areas for attaining the people's interest in IPR. Complementary notions received backing at the 2004 World Summit on the Information Society, where exemptions, licensing, and sharing norms were debated. Further research supports the availability and affordability of knowledge transfer and national competitiveness, whereas studies analyse international engagement across varying IPR frameworks (Ng, 2007). The evaluation of multiple licensing models identifies the problems in identifying and reporting existing IPR across the creative chain, which has increased the distance between final users and the right to compensate creators (Giblin, 2018). Feedback is also essential for evaluating and improving promptly.

References:

1. Giblin, R. (2018). A new copyright bargain? Reclaiming lost culture and getting authors paid. *Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts, 41*(3), 369–426.
2. Weckström, K. (2013). Governing innovation and expression: New regimes, techniques and strategies: An introduction. *Science & Technology Studies, 26*(3), 3–12.
3. Peukert, A. (2013). The fundamental right to (intellectual) property and the discretion of the legislature. *IIC – International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 44*(3), 251–274.
4. Stul Oppenheimer, M. (2010). The time and place for technology-shifting rights. *Michigan Telecommunications and Technology Law Review, 16*(2), 325–381.
5. Gervais, D. J. (2002). The internationalisation of intellectual property: New challenges from the very old and the very new. *Fordham Intellectual Property, Media and Entertainment Law Journal, 12*(4), 929–990.
6. Ng, A. (2007). Copyright's empire: Why the law matters.
7. Foster, S. E. (2008). Prelude to compatibility between human rights and intellectual property.
8. Vertinsky, L. S. (2014). Making room for cooperative innovation. Erickson, K. (2018). Can creative firms thrive without copyright? Value generation and capture from private-collective innovation. *Business Horizons, 61*(5), 699–709.
9. Graves, R. B., III. (2001). Private rights, public uses, and the future of the Copyright Clause.

10. Yu, P. K. (2003). Four common misconceptions about copyright piracy. *Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review, 26*(1), 1–60.

11. Osborn, L. S. (2018). Intellectual property channelling for digital works.

12. Karakilic, E. (2019). Rethinking intellectual property rights in the cognitive and digital age of capitalism: An autonomist Marxist reading. (Complete with journal title and publication details when known.)

13. Galbraith Davik, C. (2007). A panoptic approach to information policy: Utilising a more balanced theory of property in order to ensure the existence of a prodigious public domain. (Insert journal name, volume, issue, and pages.)

14. Yu, P. K. (2007). The international enclosure movement. (Complete journal or edited volume details once identified.)

15. Geist, M. (2009). Copyright consultations submission. (Likely a policy submission/grey literature; add URL and publisher or government body once confirmed.)

16. Reid, A. (2019). Copyright policy is both a catalyst and a barrier to innovation and free expression.

17. Vacca, R., Chen, J. M., Dratler, J., Jr., F., T., H., T., Heled, Y., Pasquale, F., Reilly, E., Samuels, J., Strandburg, K. J., Swanson, K. W., Torrance, A. W., & Van Tassel, K. (2013). Intellectual property and public health – A white paper. *Akron Intellectual Property Journal* (forthcoming at the time of writing).

18. Ford, H. (2006). Africa and the digital information commons: An overview

19. Hovenkamp, H. J. (2012). Antitrust and the movement of technology. (Add law review title, volume, issue, and pages when available.)

20. Abramowicz, M. B. (2019). Prize and reward alternatives to intellectual property.

21. Skliaustyte, E., & Weber, M. (2021). Subsidies or tax breaks versus intellectual property rights: Dual markets. *SocArXiv*. https://osf.io/x87fy/

22. Doremus, P. N. (1996). The externalisation of domestic regulation: Intellectual property rights reform in a global era. (Insert journal name or book details.)

23. Yu, P. K. (2012). Intellectual property and human rights in the nonmultilateral era.

24. Hovenkamp, H. J. (2013). Innovation competition.

25. Cotropia, C. A., & Gibson, J. (2010). The upside of intellectual property's downside.

26. Neal, J. G. (2011). Fair use is not civil disobedience: Rethinking the copyright wars and the role of the academic library.

27. Archibugi, D., & Filippetti, A. (2010). The globalisation of intellectual property rights: Four learned lessons and four theses. *Global Policy, 1*(2), 137–149.

28. Wielsch, D. (2013). Private governance of knowledge: Societally-crafted intellectual properties regimes.

29. Gervais, D. J. (2009). Of clusters and assumptions: Innovation as part of a full TRIPS implementation.

30. Ghafele, R. (2010). Of war and peace: Analysing the policy discourse on intellectual property.

31. Oppenheimer, M. (2010). The time and place for technology-shifting rights. *Michigan Telecommunications and Technology Law Review, 16*(2), 325–381.

32. Yu, P. K. (2005). Intellectual property and the information ecosystem. (Add journal or book details when known.)

33. Osei-Tutu, J. (2017). Human development as an intellectual property metric.