University patenting and licensing practices in the United Kingdom during the COVID-19 pandemic – implications for global equitable access to COVID-19 health technologies

Authors & Affiliations:

- Sarai Keestra, Department of Epidemiology and Data Science, Amsterdam UMC, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 0000-0002-6368-0977
- Rhiannon Osborne, School of Clinical Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK, 0000-0002-3301-2783
- Florence Rodgers, Imperial College London, School of Medicine, London, UK, 0000-0001-6627-1143
- Sabrina Wimmer, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands, 0000-0003-3040-7242

Corresponding author:

- Sarai Keestra, Amsterdam UMC, Meibergdreef 9, 1105 AZ Amsterdam, The Netherlands, or by email at s.m.keestra@amsterdamumc.nl.

Abstract

Universities play a vital role in developing health technologies to address the COVID-19 pandemic. We investigated the measures the top 35 UK universities receiving most Medical Research Council funding have taken to ensure global equitable access to health technologies in technology transfer. In October 2020 we sent Freedom Of Information requests and analysed universities' websites, to (i.) assess institutional strategies on the patenting and licensing of COVID-19-related health technologies,

(ii.) identify all COVID-19-related health technologies licensed or patented, and (iii.) record whether universities engaged with the Open-COVID pledge, COVID-19 Technology Access Pool (C-TAP), or Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM) COVID-19 licensing guidelines. Except for the Universities of Oxford and Edinburgh, UK universities have not updated their institutional strategies during the pandemic. Nine universities licensed 22 COVID-19 health technologies. Imperial College London disclosed 10 patents relevant to COVID-19. No UK universities participate in the Open-COVID Pledge or C-TAP, but discussions are ongoing. The University of Bristol signed up to the AUTM guidelines. Despite several COVID-19 health technologies being developed by UK universities, our findings suggest minimal engagement with measures that may promote equitable access. We suggest that universities review their technology transfer policies and implement global equitable access strategies for COVID-19 health technologies.

Key words

Patents; Universities; Technology Transfer; COVID-19 pandemic; SARS-CoV-2; Health technologies; Vaccines; Global Health equity

Introduction

March 11th 2021 marked a year since the unprecedented spread of SARS-CoV2 was declared a pandemic by the World Health Organisation (WHO) (Ghebreyesus, 2020). In the UK, universities have been at the forefront of health innovation to address COVID-19, as exemplified by the vaccines that have been developed by the University of Oxford and Imperial College London, the latter of which is still undergoing clinical trials (Garrison, 2020; UKRI, 2021). Additionally, COVID-19 vaccines are in pre-clinical development stages at the University of Nottingham and Nottingham Trent University (NTU, 2020; Zagnat, 2021) and the University of Cambridge (University of Cambridge, 2021). Universities in the UK have received significant funding for COVID-19 related research and development (R&D) for the innovation of vaccines, therapies, and diagnostics to address the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic from the UK government, charities, and public private partnerships, such as the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Initiative (CEPI) (UAEM, 2021; UK Research & Innovation, 2020). Estimates suggest that UK universities have received between USD $118 million and $USD 169 million from the UK government for the development of COVID-19 related health technologies (Policy Cures Research, 2020; UAEM, 2021). This includes £41 and £85.5 million from the Department of Business Energy and Industrial Strategy for the acceleration of COVID-19 vaccine development at Imperial College London and the University of Oxford respectively (Cross et al., 2021; Department for Business Energy & Industrial Strategy & Sharma, 2020; Scheuber & O'Hare, 2020). However, concerns remain regarding global equitable access to health technologies that have been developed at UK universities using significant public funding (Cross et al., 2021; Keestra, 2021; McDonagh, 2021; Pepperrell et al., 2021).

The approaches that universities take in managing the intellectual property (IP) of health technologies for SARS-CoV-2 have implications for the accessibility, affordability and availability for patients globally during the pandemic and beyond. Universities employ technology transfer offices (TTO), who are responsible for IP management and the technology transfer undertaken. In most instances, by

transferring a health technology to the private sector, the university relinquishes its influence over the subsequent development and marketization (Chokshi, 2006). A number of mechanisms are available to universities to promote global equitable access to COVID-19 health technologies. One such example is the Open-COVID pledge, a Creative Commons led project that calls on organisations to publish a standardised pledge promising the public free use of their IP in the fight against COVID-19 (Open Covid Pledge, 2020) . The WHO Covid Technology Access Pool (C-TAP) is another mechanism for sharing IP, know-how, and data related to COVID-19 health technologies (WHO, 2020). C-TAP is based upon the existing model of the Medicines Patent Pool (Medicines Patent Pool, 2021), which negotiates voluntary licenses to promote generic manufacturing and was originally founded to increase access to HIV antivirals (Burrone et al., 2019). Additionally, the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM) have published COVID-19 licensing guidelines aimed at universities specifically that recommend "*time limited, non-exclusive, royalty free licenses"* (AUTM, 2020). Finally, universities also have the possibility to develop their own policies or institutional strategies regarding the licensing and technology transfer of COVID-19 health technologies. Given the urgency of the COVID-19 pandemic, we aimed to identify the measures universities in the UK have taken during the pandemic to ensure global equitable access to COVID-19 health technologies. Such measures may include the adoption of new policies or mechanisms aimed at expediting access to COVID-19 IP through implementing specific conditions in technology transfer.

Methodology

Freedom of information (FOI) requests were filed to 35 UK universities in the period between 24th and 27th October 2020. Higher education institutions that received more than 1 million GBP in research grants from the Medical Research Council in 2017-2018 were included, this is the latest year that such funding information is available for (MRC, 2019, 2021). In the FOI, universities were asked to disclose information regarding (i.) a list of all COVID-19-related health technologies that had been licensed by the university, including whether the license was exclusive or non-exclusive and in what countries, as

well as a list of all COVID-19-related health technologies that had been patented by the university, (ii.) policy changes or institutional strategy on the patenting and licensing of COVID-19-related health technologies, (iii.) whether the university had plans to sign up to the Open-COVID pledge, and/or had been considering licensing particular COVID-19-related health technologies to the C-TAP initiative or the MPP. We additionally searched for policy changes on the universities' websites and looked at the signatories list of the AUTM COVID-19 guidelines. The full text of the FOI request and university responses are included as supplementary files (S1 & S2).

Results

Of the 35 universities contacted, 27 universities replied within the legal time frame as stipulated within the Freedom of Information Act (2008), another 8 universities responded with a delay of more than a working week (Newcastle University, University College London, University of Birmingham, University of Cambridge, University of Dundee, University of Edinburgh, University of Sheffield and University of Southampton) (Supplementary 2). We excluded three universities that were not able to disclose licenses and patents related to COVID-19 relevant health technologies in the format requested from this part of the analysis (Newcastle University, Swansea University, and University of Leeds). The University of Oxford only partially replied to this question. Additionally, the University of Oxford failed to respond to the question about engaging with mechanisms and/or pledges to expedite access to COVID-19 and was therefore excluded from the final part of the analysis.

Patent and licenses for COVID-19 health technologies

Of the 32 universities that responded to the this part of our inquiry, 28% [9/32] reported that they had licensed COVID-19 related health technologies (Imperial College London, University College London, University of Aberdeen, University of Birmingham, University of Bristol, University of Cambridge, University of Oxford, University of Southampton, and the University of Sussex). Together these universities have licensed 22 different health technologies since the start of the pandemic until

late October/early November 2020, listed in Table 1. They include 3 vaccines, 6 ventilator related technologies, and 7 licenses related to diagnostics for SARS-CoV2. Of the individual licenses 50% [11/22] were filed by the University of Oxford, which refused to disclose whether these were exclusive or non-exclusive licenses, citing commercial interests as an exemption permitted under FOI law. Of the licenses filed by the other universities 54.5% [6/11] were non-exclusive licenses, whereas 45.5% [5/11] were exclusive.

[Table 1: Licenses for COVID-19 technologies as disclosed by 32 UK universities autumn 2020.]

Only one university (Imperial College London) provided a list of patents relevant for COVID-19, which included a ventilator, a hand wash device, an antibody assay, a vaccine, and six method and apparatus patents, filed in the UK or the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT). Of the patents filed by Imperial College London, four were in priority stage. They noted however that "*unlike other Patent Offices, such as the United States Patent and Trademark Office, the UKIPO has yet to launch a formal scheme offering applicants prioritized examination of COVID-19 cases.*" Other universities said that they did not own patents on COVID-19 health technologies as of late October/early November 2020, or that their requests were still pending but that they were not yet able to disclose this information due to commercial interests.

Policy statements on technology transfer during the COVID-19 pandemic

Of the 35 Universities included in this analysis, one university, the University of Oxford, has released an institutional default approach regarding patenting and licensing of COVID-19 related health technologies in a statement titled "Expedited Access for COVID-19 IP" which was released in Spring 2020 (Oxford University Innovation, 2020). The other 34 universities (97%) did not have a COVID-19 specific patenting and licensing strategy. One university, the University of Edinburgh, updated their internal strategy on patenting and licensing in a university-wide revised essential medicines policy in September 2020 (The University of Edinburgh, 2020, 2021). This policy is not

limited to COVID-19 related health technologies alone but covers all health technologies developed through research at the university.

Use of the Open COVID Pledge, C-TAP, and the AUTM guidelines for COVID-19 technologies as mechanisms to expedite access

None of the 34 universities included in this part of the analysis (which excludes the University of Oxford, who failed to respond to this part of the FOI) have adopted the Open COVID Pledge or used C-TAP as a mechanism to expedite access to COVID-19 related health technologies. However, three universities (Birckbeck, King's College London, and Swansea University) said that review of the Open COVID Pledge is ongoing. Additionally, three universities (Queen's University Belfast, University of Birmingham, University of Bristol) mentioned that although they currently do not have COVID-19 related health technologies to license to the C-TAP initiative, they would consider licensing to the C-TAP if this was the most appropriate mechanism to ensure maximum impact for research. Finally, one university (University of Cambridge) disclosed that they have already had discussions directly with the WHO C-TAP/MPP initiative, but did not consider the mechanism appropriate for all health technologies. The University of Bristol is the only UK university that signed up to the AUTM guidelines for COVID-19 health technologies (AUTM, 2020).

Discussion

We conducted an assessment of 35 UK universities receiving the most MRC funding in the year 2017-2018, looking at their patenting and licensing practices regarding COVID-19 health technologies. Of the licenses for which exclusive status was known, 54.5% were non-exclusive, which is higher than the 30% recorded in a similar sample of UK universities before the COVID-19 pandemic started (Gotham et al., 2016). Prior to the pandemic, seven universities in the UK had implemented an essential medicines policy or committed to the principles of socially responsible licensing, including University College London, Imperial College London and the Universities of Oxford, Dundee, Bristol, and Edinburgh. These policies included measures such as refraining from prosecuting patent

applications in developing countries and using non-exclusive licenses in ways that promote access (Gotham et al., 2016). In this study we identified six non-exclusive licenses for COVID-19 health technologies developed by UK universities, three of which concerned ventilator designs. Health technologies that were licensed in LMICs specifically were all non-exclusive. In contrast, assays, vaccines, and potential therapeutic targets were mostly licensed exclusively, which includes the COVID-19 vaccines developed by the University of Cambridge, Imperial College London and the University of Oxford. Non-exclusive licenses allow for generic competition, which has shown to reduce prices of drugs (Wiggins & Maness, 2004). A notable example is the price decrease in HIV drugs after generic competition was allowed, which contributed to improved global access (MSF Access Campaign, 2013). Despite initial commitments by the University of Oxford to non-exclusive licensing (Oxford University Innovation, 2020), the University later entered into an exclusive licensing deal with the British-Swedish pharmaceutical company AstraZeneca to further the development of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-2 vaccine (U.S. House of Representatives, 2020). Still, the Oxford-AstraZeneca is one of the most affordable COVID-19 vaccines, suitable for deployment in LMICs. However, vaccine shortages, inequitable global access, and the vaccine price post-pandemic remain a concern (Keestra, 2021). Imperial College London exclusively licensed its COVID-19 vaccine IP to a newly established social enterprise, "VacEquity Global Health", which has committed to waiving all royalties in the UK and LMICs to promote equitable access in resource limited settings (Scheuber, 2020). As the vaccine is still undergoing development the implementation of these commitments remains to be seen. It is unknown till date through which modality the University of Cambridge will further commercialise its biological vaccine for COVID-19 (University of Cambridge, 2021).

We found that the majority of universities had not adapted their technology transfer strategies in response to the emergence of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. There were two notable exceptions of universities that had adopted novel technology transfer practices at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. In Spring 2020, Oxford University's technology transfer office, Oxford University Innovation (OUI) released a statement noting that *"the COVID-19 pandemic demands an urgent and*

unprecedented response" and that "*university research and expertise is critical to this effort*" (Oxford University Innovation, 2020). OUI subsequently specified that their default strategy for the technology transfer for COVID-19 related IP would be to "*offer non-exclusive, royalty-free licences to support free of charge, at-cost or cost + limited margin supply as appropriate, and only for the duration of the pandemic, as defined by the WHO".* Although commendable in principle, it remains unclear whether these commitments were adhered to in practice as the technology transfer agreements for COVID-19 related IP have not been made publicly available as of writing. In September 2020, the University of Edinburgh updated its Essential Medicines Position Statement applicable to the IP of all health technologies originating at the university (The University of Edinburgh, 2020). In this Position Statement they state that *"throughout the entire research and technology transfer processes the primary objective must be to ensure a return on public investment by maximising availability, accessibility, and affordability to the health technology"*. However, as the University of Edinburgh has not licensed any COVID-19 health technologies as of yet, it remains to be seen if these commitments to equitable technology transfer are actually put into practice. The lack of adoption of new technology transfer policies at other universities may be because universities felt that their existing patenting and licensing practices were adequate, and/or gave sufficient scope to make unique decisions for different health technologies depending on the circumstance. Analysis of how existing policies correlated with different decisions on COVID-19-related health technology patenting and licensing strategies would therefore be of interest for future research.

We found that none of the UK universities included in our cohort had adopted other mechanisms to expedite equitable access to COVID-19 health technologies, such as the Open Covid Pledge or the C-TAP initiative, although some universities indicated that discussions were ongoing. Signatories to the Open-COVID pledge are mostly technology, software, or social media companies, such as IBM, Amazon, Microsoft and Facebook (Open Covid Pledge, 2021). As of yet, no university in the UK has committed to or endorsed the pledge. This suggests that perhaps this mechanism is less suitable for universities and their practices regarding technology transfer. This might be due to concerns by

universities that such a universal pledge may affect licensing agreements for COVID-19 related IP that were signed prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. In contrast, the C-TAP, which was launched by the WHO's Access to COVID-19 Tools (ACT) Accelerator (ACT-A), has been specifically designed to accommodate for the voluntary sharing of IP and knowhow of COVID-19 health technologies. It is intended to particularly ease technology transfer to generic and biosimilar manufacturers in the Global South to increase manufacturing and global equitable access (Correa, 2021; WHO, 2021). However, no COVID-19 health technologies had been licensed to C-TAP at the time when we conducted our study in late October 2020. Therefore, UK universities and other research institutions should consider using the C-TAP as a mechanism to promote access to COVID-19 health technologies developed with public funding. On the 28th of May 2021 the Spanish National Research Council expressed its intention to share a COVID-19 diagnostic test under a non-exclusive license agreement with the C-TAP (Gutiérrez, 2021).This highlights the important role that public institutions can play in supporting global equitable access promoting initiatives during the COVID-19 pandemic. Indeed, the Medicines Patent Pool (MPP), which inspired the creation of C-TAP was granted its first voluntary license by a public research institution. In 2010, the US National Institutes of Health and co-patent owner the University of Illinois at Chicago granted the pool a license for a HIV-drug (Hillary Chen, 2010). Further, in 2017, Johns Hopkins licensed the first tuberculosis drug to the MPP (Medicines Patent Pool, 2017), which helped to get political will behind the mechanism. Finally, most current signatories of the AUTM guidelines are universities based in the United States, with the notable exception of the University of Bristol (AUTM, 2020). This is unsurprising as AUTM is a US-based organisation, which only receives limited engagement from UK universities. A UK-specific equivalent of AUTM does not currently exist.

Our study shows that utilising the Freedom Of Information Act is a useful methodology to gain insight into the role of universities in the R&D landscape that has emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, engaging with FOIs as a research method has limitations, as public institutions are allowed to refuse requests under section 43(2) of The Act if "*its disclosure under this Act would, or*

would be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of any person (including the public authority holding it)" (*Freedom of Information Act 2000*, 2000). This exemption based on commercial interests is sometimes employed by public research institutions to justify non-disclosure of information regarding the commercialisation of health technologies, as it is deemed commercially sensitive, but also in other cases such as the refusal to disclose clinical trial transparency policies (University of Liverpool, 2020). In the case of this particular study, the University of Oxford stated that disclosure would weaken the bargaining position of the OUI/University in the future (Supplementary 2). Oxford furthermore said that the university "*recognises that there is some public interest in disclosure of the information (…) However (...) in common with the rest of the Higher Education sector, the University is under financial pressure. It cannot rely solely on public funds to finance improvements to teaching and research, and related activities. There is therefore a strong public interest that the University should be able to supplement its public funding by entering into mutually beneficial partnerships with the private sector, which will further its charitable objectives. Any disclosure that jeopardised its ability to do this would not be in the public interest.*" However, concerns remain as engagement of public research institutions, such as universities, which receive large amounts of public funding, with the private sector should arguably be subjected to public scrutiny through mechanisms such as the Freedom Of Information Act (2000).

Limitations

Our analysis did not include discussion of whether licenses, both exclusive or non-exclusive, contained any further access maximising conditions or clauses such as pricing conditions, sub-licensing requirements, or step-in rights. Furthermore, our study did not explore which types of technology transfer are suitable for different health technologies, and what the outcomes of different types of technology transfer are. Biologics such as COVID-19 vaccines for example, will likely require different considerations in technology transfer to ventilator designs or small molecule drugs. A further challenge encountered in our study methodology was the lack of transparency regarding technology

transfer, as some universities did not disclose information in their response to our FOI request due to commercial interests.

Conclusion

Considering the unique position of universities in the biomedical innovation ecosystem, situated between upstream publicly funded R&D and often downstream private sector marketisation, universities have both the opportunity and responsibility to determine the conditions of technology transfer (Keestra, 2021). This has especially been important in the response to the COVID-19 pandemic, in which public research institutions and public funding played a prominent role. We therefore encourage universities to review their patenting and technology transfer policies and practices for COVID-19 technologies. To promote global equitable access, multiple mechanisms are available to universities to employ in technology transfer, including the Open-COVID pledge, C-TAP, and the AUTM COVID-19 licensing guidelines. Universities can further develop institutional COVID-19 specific policies regarding technology transfer as the University of Oxford did, or follow the example of the University of Edinburgh by implementing an equitable access policy for all health technologies. It is important that we continue to develop a health innovation landscape that is open to the adoption of novel strategies that encourage global equitable access to health technologies for all, everywhere, during this pandemic and beyond.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful for the participation of the attendees of the Polygeia 2020 conference. Particular thanks goes to the workshop participants who helped by filing some of the Freedom of Information requests. We also want to thank Toby Pepperrell and Moly Pugh-Jones for their comments on the final version of the manuscript. No funding was received for the conceptualisation or execution of this study.

Conflicts of interest

The authors of this paper are all members of Universities Allied for Essential Medicines Europe. S.W. is a member of the Executive Committee of Universities Allied for Essential Medicine Global and F.R. is the National Coordinator of Universities Allied for Essential Medicines U.K. S.K. and R.O. are members of the People's Health Movement and the WHO Watch initiative. R.O. is currently Policy Director for Students for Global Health U.K. However, views expressed in this paper are their own and are not necessarily shared with the organisations the authors are affiliated with.

Funding

No funding was received for the conceptualisation or execution of this study.

Availability of data and material

Universities' responses are available in Supplementary 2. The FOIs are also publicly accessible online via WhatDoTheyKnow.com.

Code availability

Not applicable.

Author Contributions

SK, RO, and FR conceptualized the research and methodology; SK and FR designed the FOI; SK curated the data; SK conducted the data analysis; SK wrote the methods and result section; All authors contributed to the writing process of the introduction and discussion equally. All authors reviewed and approved of the final manuscript.

Ethics approval

Not applicable.

Consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

References

AUTM. (2020). *COVID-19 Licensing Guidelines*. AUTM - About Tech Transfer. https://autm.net/about-tech-transfer/covid19/covid-19-licensing-guidelines

Burrone, E., Gotham, D., Gray, A., de Joncheere, K., Magrini, N., Martei, Y. M., Gore, C., & Kieny, M. P. (2019). Patent pooling to increase access to essential medicines. In *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* (Vol. 97, Issue 8, pp. 575–577). World Health Organization. https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.18.229179

Chokshi, D. A. (2006). Improving access to medicines in poor countries: The role of universities. In *PLoS Medicine* (Vol. 3, Issue 6, pp. 0723–0726). PLoS Med. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0030136

Correa, C. M. (2021). *Expanding the production of COVID-19 vaccines to reach developing countries Lift the barriers to fight the pandemic in the Global South** (No. 92; Policy Brief).

Cross, S., Rho, Y., Reddy, H., Pepperrell, T., Rodgers, F., Osborne, R., Eni-Olotu, A., Banerjee, R., Wimmer, S., & Keestra, S. (2021). Who funded the research behind the Oxford-AstraZeneca COVID-19 vaccine? Approximating the funding to the University of Oxford for the research and development of the ChAdOx vaccine technology. *MedRxiv*, 2021.04.08.21255103. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.08.21255103

Department for Business Energy & Industrial Strategy, & Sharma, H. A. (2020, May 17). *Funding and manufacturing boost for UK vaccine programme*. GOV.UK. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/funding-and-manufacturing-boost-for-uk-vaccine-programme

Freedom of Information Act 2000, (2000) (testimony of Freedom of Information Act). https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/36

Garrison, C. (2020, October 5). *How the 'Oxford' Covid-19 vaccine became the 'AstraZeneca' Covid-19 vaccine | Medicines Law & Policy*. Medicines Law & Policy. https://medicineslawandpolicy.org/2020/10/how-the-oxford-covid-19-vaccine-became-the-astrazeneca-covid-19-vaccine/

Ghebreyesus, T. A. (2020). *WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020*. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020

Gotham, D., Meldrum, J., Nageshwaran, V., Counts, C., Kumari, N., Martin, M., Beattie, B., & Post, N. (2016). Global health equity in United Kingdom university research: a landscape of current policies and practices. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-016-0148-6

Gutiérrez, I. (2021, May 28). *España estrena la plataforma de la OMS para compartir conocimiento con un test serológico de COVID-19*. El Diario. https://www.eldiario.es/internacional/espana-estrena-plataforma-oms-compartir-conocimiento-test-serologico-covid-19_1_7981406.html

Hillary Chen. (2010, September 30). *US Government First to Share Patents with Medicines Patent Pool* . The White House President Barack Obama. https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2010/09/30/us-government-first-share-patents-with-medicines-patent-pool

Keestra, S. (2021). Structural violence and the biomedical innovation system: what responsibility do universities have in ensuring access to health technologies? *BMJ Global Health*, *6*(5), e004916.

https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-004916

McDonagh. (2021, April 28). *Oxford University has a special responsibility to ensure jabs reach the Global South | LSE COVID-19*. LSE. https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/covid19/2021/04/28/oxford-university-has-a-special-responsibility-to-ensure-jabs-reach-the-global-south/

Medicines Patent Pool. (2017, January 24). *The Medicines Patent Pool Announces First Licence for Tuberculosis Treatment*. Cision PR Newswire. https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/the-medicines-patent-pool-announces-first-licence-for-tuberculosis-treatment-611702695.html

Medicines Patent Pool. (2021). *Who We Are - MPP*. Medicines Patent Pool. https://medicinespatentpool.org/who-we-are/

MRC. (2019). *MRC Research Expenditure 2017/18, by research organisation (in alphabetical order) and region, £k*. UKRI. https://mrc.ukri.org/research/funded-research/recipients-of-funding/recipients-of-funding-2017-18-excel/

MRC. (2021). *Recipients of funding - Research - Medical Research Council*. Medical Research Council. https://mrc.ukri.org/research/funded-research/recipients-of-funding/

MSF Access Campaign. (2013). *Untangling the Web of Antiretroviral Price Reductions* (Issue July).

NTU. (2020, August 27). *Funding will allow clinical trials for COVID-19 vaccine to begin in Nottingham | Nottingham Trent University*. Nottingham Trent University. https://www.ntu.ac.uk/about-us/news/news-articles/2020/08/funding-will-allow-clinical-trials-for-covid-19-vaccine-to-begin-in-nottingham

Open Covid Pledge. (2020). *About Us - Open Covid Pledge*. Open Covid Pledge. https://opencovidpledge.org/about/

Open Covid Pledge. (2021). *Partners - Open Covid Pledge*. https://opencovidpledge.org/partners/

Oxford University Innovation. (2020). *Expedited access for COVID-19 related IP - Oxford University Innovation*. University of Oxford. https://innovation.ox.ac.uk/technologies-available/technology-licensing/expedited-access-covid-19-related-ip/

Pepperrell, T., Rodgers, F., Tandon, P., Sarsfield, K., Pugh-Jones, M., Rashid, T., & Keestra, S. (2021). Making a COVID-19 vaccine that works for everyone: ensuring equity and inclusivity in clinical trials. *Global Health Action*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2021.1892309

Policy Cures Research. (2020, September 10). *COVID-19 R&D tracker* . https://www.policycuresresearch.org/covid-19-r-d-tracker/

Scheuber, A. (2020, June 7). *Imperial social enterprise to accelerate low-cost COVID-19 vaccine*. Imperial College London. https://www.imperial.ac.uk/news/198053/imperial-social-enterprise-accelerate-low-cost-covid-19/

Scheuber, A., & O'Hare, R. (2020, April 22). *Imperial COVID-19 vaccine team secures £22.5 million support*. Imperial News. https://www.imperial.ac.uk/news/197017/imperial-covid-19-vaccine-team-secures-225/

The University of Edinburgh. (2020, September). *Essential Medicines Position Statement*. https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/essential_medicines_sep2020.pdf

The University of Edinburgh. (2021). *Renewed pledge commits medicines to most needy | The University of Edinburgh*. https://www.ed.ac.uk/news/2021/renewed-pledge-commits-medicines-to-most-needy

U.S. House of Representatives. (2020). *Statement of Sir Menelas Pangalos, Ph.D. Executive Vice President Biopharmaceutical Research & Development AstraZeneca Before the Subcommittee*

on Oversight and Investigations Committee on Energy and Commerce U.S. House of Representatives Pathway to a Vaccine: Efforts to Develop a Safe, Effective and Accessible COVID-19 Vaccine.

UAEM. (2021, April 14). *Public Medicines for COVID-19*. COVID Mapping. https://publicmeds4covid.org/

UK Research & Innovation. (2020). *Find COVID-19 research and innovation supported by UKRI*. https://www.ukri.org/find-covid-19-research-and-innovation-supported-by-ukri/

UKRI. (2021, April 28). *The Imperial vaccine – UKRI*. https://www.ukri.org/our-work/tackling-the-impact-of-covid-19/vaccines-and-treatments/imperial-covid-19-vaccine-trial-expands-to-additional-sites/

University of Cambridge. (2021). *Cambridge-developed SARS-CoV-2 vaccine receives £1.9million from UK government for clinical trial | University of Cambridge*. https://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/cambridge-developed-sars-cov-2-vaccine-receives-ps19million-from-uk-government-for-clinical-trial

University of Liverpool. (2020, August 18). *Clinical Trial Transparency (for UAEM Global Health Ranking) Update Since 2018 - a Freedom of Information request to University of Liverpool - WhatDoTheyKnow*. What Do They Know. https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/clinical_trial_transparency_for_49#incoming-1623819

WHO. (2020, October 27). *C-TAP: A concept paper*. World Health Organisation. https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/c-tap-a-concept-paper

WHO. (2021, May 28). *Special press conference to mark the first anniversary of the COVID-19 Technology Access Pool*. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/news-

room/events/detail/2021/05/28/default-calendar/special-press-conference-to-mark-the-first-anniversary-of-the-covid-19-technology-access-pool

Wiggins, S. N., & Maness, R. (2004). Price competition in pharmaceuticals: The case of anti-infectives. *Economic Inquiry*, *42*(2), 247–263. https://doi.org/10.1093/ei/cbh058

Zagnat, O. (2021, February 23). *Coronavirus vaccine developed in Nottingham to be tested on humans "this year" - Nottinghamshire Live*. Nottingham Post. https://www.nottinghampost.com/news/nottingham-news/coronavirus-vaccine-developed-nottingham-tested-5036839

TABLE 1

University	Technology	Country of Licence	Number of Licences	Exclusive, Non-Exclusive
Imperial College London	Vaccine	World Wide (WW)	2	Exclusive
Imperial College London	Ventilator design	World Wide (WW)	341	Non-exclusive
University College London (UCL)	UCL-Ventura breathing aid (CPAP) – Design and manufacturing package	122 countries (see Supplementary for further detail)	1978	Non-exclusive
University of Aberdeen	ATMO-Vent (Atmospheric Mixture Optimisation Ventilator)	Rwanda	1	Non-exclusive
University of Birmingham	Anti-IgG/IgA/IgM SARS-CoV2 Spike Protein assay	World Wide (WW)	1	Exclusive
University of Bristol	Potential SARS-CoV2 target, screening assay and therapeutic strategy	World Wide (WW)	1	Exclusive
University of Cambridge	Biological vaccine	World Wide (WW)	1	Exclusive
University of Oxford	Novel coronavirus vaccine	Did not disclose citing section 43(2) of the Freedom Of Information Act (FOIA), which states that information is exempt where its disclosure would, or would be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of any person. The University of Oxford says in their FOI response: "*It is our view that disclosure would be likely to prejudice the commercial interests of Oxford University Innovation (OUI) and/or the University, because the information would weaken the bargaining position of the OUI/University in negotiating similar agreements with potential licensees in future.*" The complete reasoning for non-disclosure is attached in the Supplementary.		
University of Oxford	Coronavirus testing primer design			
University of Oxford	Rapid test method for coronavirus			
University of Oxford	Ventilator electronics design			
University of Oxford	Mechanical ventilator			
University of Oxford	Ventilator software control system			
University of Oxford	ChAdOx2 - simian adenovirus vector			
University of Oxford	ChAdOx1 A new adenoviral vector			
University of Oxford	Adenovirus long promoter			
University of Oxford	Rapid test method for Coronavirus			
University of Oxford	Coronavirus testing primer design			
University of Southampton	Interferon Beta technology	World Wide (WW)	1	Exclusive
University of Southampton	A Personal Respirator for Healthcare Professionals Treating COVID-19 (PeRSo)	World Wide (WW)	NS	Non-exclusive
University of Sussex	Alcohol-based hand rub	UK and Zambia	NS	Non-exclusive
University of Sussex	Diagnostic testing systems	UK	NS	Non-exclusive

Table 1: Licenses for COVID-19 technologies as disclosed by 32 UK universities autumn 2020.