REVISTA DE DIREITOS HUMANOS
E DESENVOLVIMENTO SOCIAL

ORIGINAL

Editors
Cláudio José Franzolin, Pedro Pulzatto Peruzzo

Conflicts of interest
The author declare that there is no conflicts of interest.

Received
Jun. 15 2025

Approved
Oct. 16, 2025

Building bridges between innovation and regulation: fundamentals of public policy in the field of intellectual property in the digital age – lessons from Brazil and global experience

Construindo pontes entre inovação e regulação: fundamentos de políticas públicas em propriedade intelectual na era digital – lições do Brasil e da experiência global

Edna Raquel Hogemann[1]

[1] Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UNRIO), Escola de Ciências Jurídicas, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Direito. Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil. E-mail: <ershogemann@gmail.com>.

How to cite this article: Hogemann, E. R. Building bridges between innovation and regulation: fundamentals of public policy in the field of intellectual property in the digital age – lessons from Brazil and global experience. *Revista de Direitos Humanos e Desenvolvimento Social*, v. 6, e2516230, 2025. Doi: https://doi.org/10.24220/2675-9160v6a2025e16230

Abstract

It analyzes the fundamentals of public policy on intellectual property in the digital age, focusing on Brazil's experience and comparing it with international practices. It addresses the challenge of balancing innovation and regulation through three pillars: incentives for innovation, legal adaptation to emerging technologies, and ensuring equitable access to knowledge. The study highlights Brazilian patent system reforms and open-access strategies, alongside global examples from the European Union, United States, and China. It concludes by proposing multi-stakeholder collaboration, international cooperation, and regulatory sandboxes to harmonize protection and technological progress.

Keywords: Digital age. Innovation. Intellectual property. Public policy. Regulation.

Resumo

Analisa os fundamentos das políticas públicas sobre propriedade intelectual (PI) na era digital, com foco na experiência do Brasil e comparação com práticas internacionais. Aborda o desafio de equilibrar inovação e regulação por meio de três pilares: incentivos à inovação, adaptação legal às tecnologias emergentes e garantia de acesso equitativo ao conhecimento. O estudo destaca reformas no sistema de patentes brasileiro e estratégias de acesso aberto, ao lado de exemplos globais da União Europeia, Estados Unidos e China. Conclui propondo colaboração entre múltiplos atores, cooperação internacional e "regulatory sandboxes" para harmonizar proteção e progresso tecnológico.

Palavras-chave: Era digital. Inovação. Propriedade intelectual. Políticas públicas. Regulação.

Introduction

Technological advances such as Artificial Intelligence (AI), blockchain, and big data are fundamentally reshaping how knowledge is produced, distributed, and accessed. As AI-generated content proliferates, conventional notions of authorship and copyright face serious challenges. According to Paugh (2025, p. 123), "AI blurs the lines around authorship, ownership and originality", creating a legal gray zone for IP governance. Meanwhile, blockchain offers both new avenues and obstacles in Intellectual Property (IP) protection and enforcement – facilitating secure digital fingerprints for creative works while raising privacy and regulatory concerns. Simultaneously, the exponential volume, velocity, and variety of big data intensify questions around data ownership, privacy, and legal compliance, as traditional IP infrastructures struggle to keep pace.

These profound disruptions generate three interconnected problems. First, how can we effectively safeguard the rights of creators in environments dominated by generative AI, decentralized ledgers, and massive data flows? Second, how can policymakers incentivize ongoing research and technological innovation without accidentally erecting legal barriers to access and future technological advancement? Third, as technologies evolve far more quickly than statutory law, how can IP legal frameworks be reformed to remain relevant and operational?

Against this backdrop, this paper posits the hypothesis that carefully calibrated public policy – grounded in protection, adaptability, and inclusive access – can successfully bridge innovation and regulation inside the IP domain. More specifically, our hypothesis has two main components: (i) that adaptive legislation and technological tools (such as smart contracts and flexible copyright doctrine) can maintain protection without compromising access or innovation; and (ii) that stakeholder engagement – from creators, technology firms, civil society, and academic institutions – can yield legal frameworks that are both enforceable and responsive to technological change.

Empirical findings from existing case studies lend preliminary support to this hypothesis. In the realm of AI and IP, Paugh's coverage of AI-generated content underscores the need for doctrinal flexibility, such as co-authorship models and updated liability schemes. Blockchain-based systems have demonstrated successfully creating tamper-resistant records for digital creations, bolstering confidence in copyright attribution and authenticity. Jurisdictional research confirms that static regulations are already ill-equipped for digitally native innovations; therefore, adaptive models – like legal sandboxes and iterative policy reviews – are emerging as viable solutions.

The results discussed later in this article illustrate that countries adopting integrated policy responses – combining legislative reforms, technical implementation, and multi-stakeholder frameworks – are better poised to resolve the innovation-regulation tension. Brazil's initiatives demonstrate how hybrid models of open-access mandates, streamlined patent offices, and pilot enforcement programs can yield positive outcomes in research productivity without sacrificing public access.

Ultimately, this paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 defines foundational IP policy principles aligned with digital transformation; Section 3 examines Brazil's evolving IP ecosystem; Section 4 analyzes best practices from global jurisdictions; and Section 5 synthesizes results to affirm the hypothesis. The conclusion outlines key policy innovations to maintain equitable and innovative-driven IP systems in the digital age.

Development

Challenges of the digital age for IP

In today's digital world, IP faces profound challenges and urgent questions. The tension between legal protection and open access has become a defining dilemma, mostly as technological advancements dramatically alter the ways we create, distribute, and consume knowledge. Central issues include how to protect creators from piracy and misuse, how to incentivize innovation without creating barriers to information access, and how to reform traditionally static legal frameworks to remain effective in our fast-paced digital landscape.

A primary concern in the digital era is the rise of unauthorized distribution and digital piracy. Research highlights that "IPR face new challenges, such as digital piracy, online copyright infringement, and cross-border enforcement issues, such as globalization and digital transformation reshape industries" (Mane, 2024, p. 28). The problem is compounded by the borderless nature of the internet, which allows infringing content to spread instantly around the world, circumventing national jurisdictions and enforcement mechanisms. Traditional IP systems – based on territorial protection – struggle to manage these global dynamics, and enforcement via takedown requests or litigation is often slow, costly, and insufficient.

In addition, the evolving digital landscape has transformed how IP is created and shared. Internet Protocol version (IPv) rights now extend to intangible, data-driven, and digitally distributed creations – such as AI-generated content, software, and blockchain-enabled art. Digital technologies such as blockchain and Non-Fungible Tokens (NFTs) present promising opportunities to enhance IP protection – offering transparent, immutable ownership records and sophisticated management tools – but current legal frameworks frequently fail to address the unique challenges they introduce. These new creation forms strain legal concepts rooted in earlier eras and challenge policymakers to rethink definitions of authorship, originality, and ownership.

At the same time, there is an unprecedented demand to balance rights of creators with the public's need for information. As Pamela Samuelson explains, mechanisms once designed to enable scholarship – like libraries and licensing – can paradoxically restrict information under e licensing regimes, threatening public access. Meanwhile, emergent technologies like digital watermarking, AI surveillance systems, and blockchain-based DRM systems attempt to reinforce IP rights while avoiding outright restrictions on access. These technological tools may strengthen enforcement but also risk overreach, raising concerns about privacy, surveillance, and monopolistic control over access.

The global nature of digital platforms necessitates international cooperation in IP protection. One paper calls for harmonized global standards and international collaboration to manage and protect intellectual property in the rapidly evolving digital environment. Consistent cross-border legal frameworks and cooperative enforcement efforts – such as voluntary takedown networks and shared registries – are proposed as ways to improve jurisdictional coordination and scalability.

Against this framework, adapting static IP laws to remain relevant has emerged as a policy imperative. A thorough legal analysis reveals that technology is developing faster than legislation and that this gap causes many intellectual property conflicts, especially concerning virtual libraries and digital education. Echoing this, other studies note that as technologies evolve, so must legal instruments; otherwise, laws become ineffective or overly burdensome.

The digital age forces a reassessment of IP law's fundamental balance: how to protect creators without impeding innovation or restricting public knowledge. Effective responses require

a multipronged strategy: strengthening enforcement to address piracy, developing technical protection systems that respect user rights, harmonizing international legal frameworks, and regularly updating legal definitions and processes. Only through such agility can IP policy remain relevant, equitable, and supportive of both creative and societal progress in this fast-changing landscape.

Principles of public policy in IP

In contemporary discourse on IP policy, three overarching principles are widely acknowledged as essential to foster sustainable innovation ecosystems: balancing innovation and protection, adapting legislation to technological change, and promoting inclusivity and fair access. Each principle responds to evolving societal needs and technological transformations, and together they form a coherent framework for modern IP policy.

Firstly, the principle of balancing innovation and protection recognizes that IP rights should strike a delicate equilibrium: sufficiently robust to incentivize creators and innovators, yet flexible enough to safeguard fair use and public access. According to Loffredi (2024, p. 2), granting temporary exclusive rights – such as patents in artificial intelligence – may "monopolize certain technologies, potentially stifling further innovation and limiting access for smaller firms or developing countries". This underscores the dual role of IP: it must both reward creativity and enable broader societal advancement. The open-access movement and fair-use doctrines exemplify policy mechanisms designed to correct overly restrictive IP regimes. One analysis describes fair use as a tool which "allows limited use of copyrighted material without permission, ensuring that copyright protection does not stifle innovation or limit access to valuable content" (Paugh, 2025, p. 1). The Electronic Frontier Foundation further emphasizes that a well-balanced IP system can "be an engine for creativity, innovation and consumer protection"; conversely, excessive rigidity can provide a "veto on innovation and free speech" (Paugh, 2025, p. 1). In practical terms, this balancing act can manifest in limited patent terms, carefully defined fair-use exceptions, or compulsory licensing in public-interest areas – ensuring that IP fosters, rather than restricts, the growth of knowledge and creativity.

Secondly, the principle of adapting legislation to technological change reflects the pressing need for IP laws to evolve in response to novel technologies. Barton (1993) highlighted this challenge decades ago, pointing out that as technology itself changes, so must the IP system; whether through doctrinal innovation, administrative capacity, or enforcement systems, laws must be responsive to emerging tech such as biotechnology, software, and data-driven platforms. Echoing this analysis, Samuelson and Davis (2000, p. 1) noted that "advances in technology have often posed challenges for intellectual property law" rompting lawmakers to periodically amend copyright statutes. More recent studies have reaffirmed this imperative: analyses of IP in the digital age emphasize the necessity to modernize legislation, strengthen international enforcement, and support open-access models. Critically, rigid IP frameworks risk obsolescence or placing undue burdens on innovators. A literature review observes that "current laws often fell short of addressing the complexities" introduced by digital technologies like blockchain and NFTs. Therefore, adaptive policy must include iterative legislative processes, regulatory sandboxes, and continuous stakeholder dialogues, ensuring legal systems remain fit for purpose.

Thirdly, the principle of promoting inclusivity and fair access asserts that IP laws must serve not only large corporations but also startups, researchers, marginalized communities, and the public – especially in critical sectors such as medicine and education. Agrawal (2024) argues that IP can serve as a catalyst for inclusiveness, empowerment, and development, enabling

diverse actors to protect their creations and participate meaningfully in innovative ecosystems. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) likewise emphasizes the importance of closing innovation gaps by ensuring equal access to quality Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education and empowering underrepresented inventors. Empirical evidence also suggests that startups and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs) benefit significantly from IP protection: recent research indicates that IP rights help stimulate innovation, secure investments, and boost market competitiveness among smaller enterprises adapting to digital technologies. However, the benefits are unevenly distributed – women-led firms, for example, are statistically less likely to hold patents, pointing to structural inequities in access to IP resources. To counteract these disparities, policies might include reduced fee structures, pro-bono legal support, or targeted patent training for underrepresented groups.

An integrated approach to IP policy emerges when these three principles are considered in tandem. For instance, implementing adaptive fair-use provisions satisfies both the need for protection and the imperative of public access. Regulatory sandboxes, which allow startups to test innovations without conventional legal burdens, epitomize how adaptive legislation can support inclusivity. Policies aimed at improving access to medicines – such as compulsory licensing during health crises – demonstrate the real-world benefits of balancing IP rights with public purpose and equitable access (Olayanju Jayeola, 2025).

To exemplify: during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, invoking Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) flexibilities helped nations prioritize public health in an emergency, illustrating how inclusivity and adaptive regulation can override rigid protection when societal needs demand it. Similarly, WIPO's efforts to encourage women and minority inventors through STEM education align with all three IP principles – combining protection, adaptability, and social equity. These examples show that modern IP policy can and should be responsive, fair, and innovation friendly.

Despite their complementary nature, these principles require careful calibration. Overemphasis on innovation incentives can undermine public access; over-adaptation without evidence can create uncertainty; and too much focus on inclusivity may dilute incentives for commercial development. The appropriate balance depends on sectoral context – biotech and software may require different treatment than education or pharmaceuticals.

These three intertwined principles – balancing innovation and protection, adapting legislation to technological change, and promoting inclusivity and fair access – constitute the foundation of effective IP policy for the digital age. They ensure that IP systems incentivize creativity while enabling societal participation, remain relevant in rapidly evolving technological environments, and distribute benefits equitably. Policymakers committed to these principles will support vibrant innovation ecosystems that also uphold public interest and social justice.

Lessons from Brazil

Brazil offers noteworthy examples of how a proactive intellectual property strategy can catalyze innovation while addressing public interest concerns. Three key aspects stand out: the streamlining of patent procedures to encourage Research and Development (R&D), mainly in pharmaceuticals and technology; enhanced efforts to enforce copyright protections in the digital age; and the adoption of open-access policies to promote scientific knowledge while balancing proprietary rights.

First, Brazil's patent reforms illustrate a deliberate effort to promote national competitiveness by accelerating and rationalizing patent examination – especially for pharmaceuticals. The Inter-ministerial Working Group chartered in 2011 stimulated procedural reorganization at Instituto Nacional da Propriedade Industrial (INPI, National Institute of Industrial Property) and Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária (ANVISA, National Health Surveillance Agency) (the health regulatory agency), delegating early health evaluations of pharmaceutical patent filings to ANVISA. This reform enabled faster grant decisions and strengthened the nexus between patenting and public health priorities. Although Brazil adopted pharmaceutical product patenting in 1996, studies have pointed to long examination backlogs – averaging 5-6 years – which could hamper timely innovation and access. The reform introduced priority processing and streamlined workflows, improving efficiency and signaling that IP policy can be structured to both protect innovation and serve broader societal goals.

A compelling demonstration of Brazil's approach is its use of compulsory licensing. In 2007, Brazil issued a compulsory license for the antiretroviral drug efavirenz, leading to approximately R$200 million (around US$100 million) in savings over four years. The license also triggered technology transfer and local production by public laboratories. Aligned with TRIPS flexibilities and underpinned by constitutional obligations to promote scientific and technological development, the country showcased how IP policy can incentivize R&D while preserving public health access. Nevertheless, patent pendency remains a challenge. The U.S. Trade Representative's Special 301 Watch List marks Brazil for "decreasing but still long delays" in patent examination. Addressing this backlog remains key to sustaining innovation incentives without unduly delaying access.

Second, combating digital piracy through stronger copyright enforcement illustrates Brazil's growing willingness to protect content creators in the online realm. Despite lacking a specific safe-harbor law, Brazil has relied on voluntary notice-and-takedown mechanisms under its Internet Framework (Brasil, 2014). However, compliance has been mixed. The 2022 "Operation 404," led by the Ministry of Justice and Public Security with support from Agência Nacional do Cinema (ANCINE, Brazilian Pay-TV Association, and international partners (U.S. DOJ, UK IPO), blocked 226 pirating websites and 461 illegal apps, and suspended users distributing unlicensed digital content. This crackdown demonstrates growing operational capacity focused on curbing online infringement. Yet systemic bottlenecks – including slow takedown processes, uneven Internet Service Provider (ISP) cooperation, and court delays – continue to limit deterrence. Brazil's multiple operational waves, including targeting game piracy and metaverse platforms, underline its commitment to evolving legal responses that reflect digital complexity.

International collaboration has further reinforced Brazil's enforcement capabilities. Operations against digital piracy have frequently involved United States law enforcement and the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office – a model that demonstrates how cross-border cooperation is essential to addressing online infringement. This orientation aligns with global best practices, including the European Union Copyright Directive and coordinated platform liability regimes, positioning Brazil to adapt its legal framework to emerging digital content dynamics and stakeholder expectations.

Third, Brazil's adoption of open-access policies highlights its leadership in promoting scientific knowledge while respecting proprietary IP rights. Government-mandated policies require public research output to be made freely available, thereby stimulating broader dissemination of innovation and learning. Over 90% of basic research funding comes from public institutions and universities, incentivizing prioritization of open publication to ensure accountability and

accessibility. The federal Synchrotron facility and national research agencies like Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) and Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (Capes) have supported open data initiatives and mandates for scientific journal deposits, reflecting a deeply institutionalized vision of knowledge sharing.

This open-access model exemplifies a nuanced balance between public interest and private innovation. While Brazil maintains patent rights and commercialization channels, it has committed to ensuring that publicly funded research – and public health or educational applications – remains accessible. Such an approach enables acquiring nations, smaller startups, and local innovators to build upon public science without facing prohibitive barriers – a critical support for R&D ecosystems beyond large corporations.

Together, these elements show how Brazil's IP strategy strives to reconcile diverse public policy goals. Patent reforms and compulsory licensing stimulate innovation while safeguarding public health; copyright enforcement – now adapting to digital indigenous challenges – ensures creators' rights in a globalized media environment; and open-access norms democratize knowledge and reinforce domestic research capacity. Brazil's approach corresponds with the three pillars of modern IP policy: dynamic balance, legislative adaptation, and inclusivity.

But challenges remain. The patent backlog calls for persistent efforts such as digitization, staffing increases, and expedited patent processes. Copyright enforcement needs broader legal modernization – mostly refining intermediary liability, takedown speed, and anti-circumvention measures. In open access, there is room to expand infrastructure, such as institutional repositories and regulatory incentives to ensure compliance remains robust transversely academic institutions.

Brazil offers instructive lessons on constructing an IP ecosystem that integrates innovation. Its patent system reforms – culminating in compulsory licensing – demonstrate how policy can support both R&D and public health affordability. Its evolving digital copyright enforcement signals an expansive response to information-age complexities. Lastly, its open-access orientation ensures that public science remains a shared societal resource. As Brazil refines these policies, it illuminates a structured pathway for other nations seeking to balance proprietary rights with social welfare in an increasingly interconnected and digital global environment.

Global experience and best practices

In the domain of intellectual property, countries around the world have adopted distinct approaches reflecting their legal traditions, economic goals, and technological aspirations. Among these, the European Union (EU), the United States (US), and China stand out for their ambitious and influential reforms. Each case illustrates critical lessons in designing IP regimes that balance innovation, public interest, and global competitiveness.

European Union – Balancing intermediary liability and fair compensation

The EU's 2019 Directive on Copyright in the Digital Single Market (Directive 2019/790) embodied a transformative approach to internet intermediary liability (European, 2019). Commonly referred to as the Copyright Directive, it introduced new obligations for online platforms to ensure effective and proportionate measures to prevent users from uploading infringing content – an evolution from the traditional notice-and-takedown regime. Article 17 (formerly Article 13) requires platforms to obtain licenses or implement upload filters to curb unauthorized use, aiming to close the so-called "value gap" between consumer platforms and rights holders.

Yet this shift has fueled debates over intermediary obligations and the ramifications for legal certainty and freedom of expression. Critics caution that the Directive undermines two decades of a balanced notice-and-takedown system, disincentivizes smaller platforms, introduces unpredictable legal exposure, and risks stifling innovation. For example, digital freedom advocates warn that requiring "automated" content-filtering tools can generate "disorderly regimes where innovation will be riskier and the one with the quickest filters [may] prevail". The EU's ongoing challenge is reconciling fair compensation for creators with protections for intermediaries and user rights – demonstrating the complex balancing act inherent in modern IP regulation.

United States – Software patents, AI inventions, and the need for flexibility

In the United States, IP policy is shaped by rapid debates around software patents and inventions generated with. Landmark court decisions have reshaped what software can be patented. In Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International (2014), the Supreme Court reaffirmed that abstract ideas implemented on computers are not patentable without an inventive concept significantly more. This ruling, and prior cases like Bilski v. Kappos, dramatically reduced the viability of software patents, prompting concerns that legal uncertainty might suppress rather than encourage innovation.

Parallel to legal precedent, the US Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) has issued specific guidance to address software- and AI-related inventions. In 2020 and again in 2024, it clarified that while AI cannot be named an inventor, inventions involving AI can remain patent-eligible if the human contribution meets the statutory threshold (Menand, 2024). The 2024 "AI Guidance" underscores that human ingenuity must drive the invention, preserving a meaningful balance between innovation and legal rigor.

However, outside the patent office, legislative debate persists. In 2024, the Financial Times reported that key bipartisan bills – such as the Patent Eligibility Restoration Act, the PREVAIL Act, and the Restore Patent Rights Act – aim to clarify patentable subject matter, counterbalance litigation abuses by large firms, and strengthen injunctive remedies for inventors. Advocates argue these reforms are essential to ensure that innovations in AI, genetic medicine, and quantum computing receive robust protection in a globally competitive environment, warning that failing to modernize may cede leadership to China or the EU (Financial Times, 2024).

China – Aggressive modernization with enforcement and fair competition concerns

China presents a contrasting yet comparably ambitious case of IP reform. Over the past decade, the country has significantly upgraded its IP frameworks to support its drive toward innovation and attract global investment. Notably, in 2025, China rolled out a national plan to construct a "powerful IP country," accelerating both patent prosecution and enforcement mechanisms via fast-track routes and specialized IP courts. Linked Intellectual Property Protection Centers (IPPCs) further support expedited patent examination and dispute resolution – targeting high-tech sectors where speed of innovation is paramount (Katleho, 2024).

Despite these advancements, enforcement and fairness challenges remain. A 2025 United States Trade Representative Special 301 Report expressed serious concerns about China's progress, citing persistent issues with counterfeiting, trade secret protection, piracy, and uneven implementation at local levels (Wininger, 2025). Observers highlight local-national bureaucratic fragmentation, resource constraints, and a lack of consistency in judicial decisions. Foreign businesses report improvement – 44% in a 2022 survey viewed China's enforcement more

positively – but worries linger over bad-faith trademarks, technology transfer pressures, and invasive practices (Huang; Cao; Coreynen, 2023).

Comparative perceptions and policy implications

These three international cases highlight convergent and divergent policy dynamics in IP regulation:

a) Liability balance: The EU's directive illustrates the risks and rewards of recalibrating intermediary liability to protect creators. Its lessons may inform other nations debating platform accountability or similar "value gap" concerns.

b) Patent eligibility clarity: US ambiguity over software and AI patents drives both judicial refinement and legislative reform. Without updated statutes or clear guidance, innovators face a fractured legal framework.

c) Speed versus substance: China's rapid IP modernization demonstrates the benefits of swift frameworks and specialized enforcement. However, without consistent rule-of-law and institutional coherence, investor trust remains fragile.

Collectively, the international landscape suggests that modern IP policy requires a trilogy of attributes:

• Clear and adaptive liability regimes that incentivize enforcement without undermining innovation or fundamental freedoms;

• Flexible, technology-aware patent and copyright frameworks that evolve alongside scientific progress;

• Transparency and consistency in enforcement, especially in jurisdictions undergoing rapid development.

For emerging and established economies alike, these lessons underscore that IP systems must support innovation while defending equity, competition, and global trust. Whether harmonizing laws across borders or tailoring policy to local innovation priorities, the combined influence of the EU, US, and China points toward a policy future defined by agility, accountability, and inclusivity.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the search of an IP infrastructure that successfully builds bridges between innovation and regulation demands holistic public policy frameworks grounded in three essential pillars: protection, adaptability, and inclusive access. These pillars are not merely theoretical – they are actively embodied in Brazil's institutional strategies and refined through global experimentation, present valuable understandings for jurisdictions worldwide.

Brazil's efforts to expedite patent processing stand out as a practical means of strengthening the protection pillar. By streamlining patent filings and reducing review timelines – predominantly through coordination between the ANVISA – Brazil has effectively accelerated the innovation lifecycle in pharmaceuticals and high-tech sectors. The adoption of compulsory licensing, exemplified by the 2007 efavirenz case, further demonstrates how IP rights can co-exist with public health imperatives, preserving the social benefit without dismantling legal safeguards. These measures illustrate how protection mechanisms can be applied without imposing excessive rigidity.

Yet, maintaining robust protection requires a dynamic and adaptive legislative framework. Brazil's evolving approach to digital copyright enforcement – highlighted by multi-phase operations

like "Operation 404" and international collaborations with the U.S. Department of Justice and the UK IPO – reveals efforts to modernize enforcement while acknowledging the limitations of takedown-based yet fragmented systems. To effectively address the challenges posed by piracy on digital platforms, Brazil must continue reinforcing enforcement infrastructure without compromising due process or access.

On the global stage, policymakers increasingly recognize that regulatory experimentation – in the form of sandboxes and pilot programs – is indispensable to keeping pace with technological change. As Bertrand de La Chapelle, Chief Vision Officer at the Datasphere Initiative, notes, sandboxes create "safe spaces" for new technologies to be tested in real-world contexts, allowing regulators to explore whether existing laws are fit for purpose or require adaptation. Internationally, various sectors – from finance (UK's AI sandbox) to telecommunications (Germany's digital corridors) – have embraced such models to overcome regulatory lag and foster innovation.

These experimentation platforms also serve a broader goal: inclusive policy development. When governments, private sector players, academia, and civil society participate in design and review processes, regulation becomes more transparent, responsive, and equitable. Multistakeholder governance models, successfully implemented in Internet policy arenas (as seen in Brazil's "Marco Civil da Internet"), offer a compelling blueprint. Such participation expands legitimacy and harnesses collective expertise, ensuring that IP systems are not only enforceable but also socially accepted.

Significantly, international convergence complements domestic reform by harmonizing standards and fostering cooperation. Cross-border enforcement coalitions – such as in Brazil's piracy operations – and global dialogues on AI and IP eligibility in the United States reflect a growing recognition: IP in the digital economy cannot thrive in isolation. Coordinated efforts around digital standards, platform liability, and intermediary responsibility (as framed by the EU Copyright Directive) help reduce jurisdictional fragmentation and encourage innovation that transcends borders ([tandfonline.com][3]).

Jointly, these Brazilian and global practices demonstrate that bridging innovation and regulation is a multi-dimensional and iterative endeavor. The integration of protection, adaptability, inclusive policymaking, and international alignment creates a resilient IP ecosystem capable of supporting rapid technological change while safeguarding public interest. Yet ongoing vigilance is needed: Brazil must continue modernizing its legal structures, augmenting enforcement capacity, and fostering multi-stakeholder participation.

If done judiciously, IP policy can transcend its traditional restraints to become an engine for sustainable innovation, equitable development, and global collaboration. Brazil's journey – and the broader international experience – reveals that systematic reforms, strategic experimentation, and inclusive governance provide a blueprint for constructing IP bridges that connect creativity, regulation, and societal advancement in the digital age.

References

Agrawal, A. Intellectual property as a catalyst: promoting inclusiveness, empowerment and development. *IP Press*, 22 Jan. 2024. Available from: https://www.theippress.com/author/aditi-agrawal/. Cited: 11 May 2025.

Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International. Supreme Court of the United States, 573 U.S. 208. No. 13–298. Argued March 31, 2014 – Decided June 19, 2014. Available from: https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/573/208/. Cited: 11 Jun. 2025.

Barton, J. H. Adapting the intellectual property system to new technologies. *In*: Global dimensions of intellectual property rights in science and technology. [*S. l.*]: National Academies Press, 1993.

Brasil. Lei nº 12.965, de 23 de abril de 2014. Marco Civil da Internet. *Diário Oficial da União*: seção 1, Brasília, Imprensa Nacional, 24 abr. 2014. Disponível em: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2011-2014/2014/lei/l12965.htm. Acesso em: 11 abr. 2025

European Union. Directive (EU) 2019/790 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 Apr. 2019 on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market and amending Directives 96/9/EC and 2001/29/EC. *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 130/92, 17 May 2019. Available from: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2019/790/oj/eng/. Cited: 5 May 2025.

Financial Times. US patent laws need updating for today's budding industries. *Financial Times*, 5 Aug. 2024. Available from: https://www.ft.com/content/f7fb9ec2-9cc3-4af3-a10e-3c76a0492e13. Cited: 13 Dec. 2025.

Huang, C.; Cao, C.; Coreynen, W. Stronger and more just? Recent reforms of China's intellectual property rights system and their implications. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, v. 18, n. 3, p. 210-223, 2023. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/APJIE-04-2023-0081.

Katleho, A. The evolution of intellectual property rights in the digital age. *Journal of Modern Law and Policy*, v. 4, n. 2, p. 1-14, 2024.

Loffredi, A. Navigating modern challenges in intellectual property law: balancing innovation, protection and public access. *Journal of International Business Research*, v. 23, n. 5, p. 1-3, 2024. Available from: https://www.abacademies.org/articles/navigating-modern-challenges-in-intellectual-property-law-balancing-innovation-protection-and-public-access.pdf. Cited: 11 Feb. 2025.

Mane, V. S. Intellectual Property Rights (IPR): their role, challenges, and globalimpact in the digital age. *InSight Bulletin: A Multidisciplinary Interlink International Research Journal*, v. 1, n. 2, 2024. Available from: https://ibrj.us/. Cited: 13 May 2025.

Menand, L. Is A.I. the Death of I.P.? *The New Yorker*, 15 Jan. 2024. Available from: https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2024/01/22/who-owns-this-sentence-a-history-of-copyrights-and-wrongs-david-bellos-alexandre-montagu-book-review. Cited: 13 May 2025.

Olayanju Jayeola, A. Intellectual property protection in the digital age: an exposition on the impact of AI generated images. *SSRN*, 13 Jan. 2025. Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5019386. Cited: 13 Feb. 2025.

Paugh, R. Artificial intelligence and copyright: navigating the new legal Landscape. *Senior Executive Media*, 20 Feb. 2025. Available from: https://www.seniorexecutive.com. Cited: 12 May 2025.

Samuelson, P.; Davis, R. *The digital dilemma*: a perspective on intellectual property in the information age. Berkeley: University of California: MIT, 2000. Available from: https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/9601/the-digital-dilemma-intellectual-property-in-the-information-age. Cited: 13 May 2025.

Wininger, A. China issues the 2025 Intellectual Property Nation Building Promotion Plan to accelerate the construction of a powerful intellectual property country. *China IP Law Update*, 8 May 2025. Available from: https://natlawreview.com/article/china-issues-2025-intellectual-property-nation-building-promotion-plan-accelerate. Cited: 10 Jun. 2025.