Journal of the West
ISSN: 0022-5169 / **E-ISSN:** 1930-0115
https://journalofthewest.com/jw

Biotechnology and Health Security

Harrouchi OumelKheir [1], Dlimi Abd Allah [2], Harrouchi Fatma [3]
[1] Doctor, University Ahmed Draya Adrar, (Algeria). Oumelkheir01@univ-adrar.dz
[2] Doctor, University Ahmed Draya Adrar, (Algeria). Abdallahdlimi@gmail.com
[3] Master, University Ahmed Draya Adrar, (Algeria). harrouchifatma3@gmail.com

Received: 07/08/2025 ; Accepted: 01/02/2026 ; Published: 22/04/2026

Abstract

The convergence of biotechnology and health security has emerged as one of the most critical legal and ethical challenges of the contemporary era. While biotechnological advancements offer revolutionary pathways for pandemic preparedness, vaccine development, and therapeutic interventions, they simultaneously introduce unprecedented biosecurity, biosafety, and dual-use dilemmas. This paper provides a comprehensive legal and analytical critique of the regulatory mechanisms governing biotechnology under the lens of health security, with a specialized focus on the emerging frontier of Biological Artificial Intelligence (Bio-AI) and the stringent governance of Biosafety Level 4 (BSL-4) containment facilities. Utilizing a comparative approach, it examines the legislative architectures of the United States, the European Union, and emerging frameworks in developing jurisdictions, notably Algeria. The study scrutinizes the efficacy of international instruments, including the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), and uncovers severe enforcement gaps. Ultimately, the paper outlines a normative model for a harmonized, proactive global biosecurity framework capable of balancing scientific innovation with existential health preservation.

Keywords: Health Security; Biotechnology Law; Bio-AI Regulation; BSL-4 Containment; Comparative Jurisprudence; Algerian Legislation; Dual-Use Research.

1.Introduction

The 21st century has witnessed an exponential leap in biotechnological capabilities, shifting from classical genetic modification to highly sophisticated synthetic biology, precision genome engineering, and computational life sciences. These technological paradigms have fundamentally altered the landscape of medicine, agriculture, and epidemiology. However, as demonstrated by recent global health crises, the continuous manipulation of biological agents creates a dual-use paradox where beneficial civil research can inadvertently or maliciously translate into existential biosecurity threats. Health security, defined as the minimization of vulnerability to acute public health events that endanger the collective health of populations, is no longer separable from biotechnological governance. The legal challenge lies in creating an adaptive regulatory infrastructure. Laws must be stringent enough to mitigate catastrophic biological risks—such as accidental laboratory leaks, genetic pollution, or the synthesis of novel pathogens—without stifling the scientific innovation necessary to combat natural pandemics.

Problematic

Against this backdrop of rapid scientific acceleration and statutory lagging, this paper addresses a core legal dilemma: **To what extent can existing international biosecurity instruments**

and domestic legislative frameworks effectively mitigate the existential public health risks posed by modern biotechnology, synthetic biology, and Bio-AI, and how can developing legal systems, such as the Algerian legislation, overcome their strategic and regulatory deficits to achieve a state of comprehensive health security?

Sub-questions include: Can classical rules of tort and administrative law absorb the intangible threats of biological algorithms? And what are the executive mechanics required to police high-containment Biosafety Level 4 (BSL-4) facilities without stifling therapeutic innovation?

Methodology

To systematically deconstruct this problematic, this study adopts a **multi-disciplinary comparative legal approach**. It combines text-based statutory analysis (*Méthode dogmatique*) with functional comparative jurisprudence (*Droit comparé fonctionnel*). The paper evaluates and contrasts the regulatory models of the European Union (characterized by its process-oriented, precautionary approach) and the United States (distinguished by its product-oriented, promotional framework). This comparative matrix is then utilized as an evaluative benchmark to critically analyze the current legislative adaptations, regulatory gaps, and institutional performance within the Algerian domestic framework. Furthermore, the legal analysis is grounded in contemporary biosecurity risk-assessment methodologies to ensure structural alignment between statutory wording and technological realities.

Structure and Roadmap

To address the problematic systematically, the study is structured into five core analytical dimensions:

Section 2 maps the technical modalities of modern biotechnology, contextualizing the legal challenges of precision gene editing and synthetic biology under the "Dual-Use Research of Concern" (DURC) doctrine.

Section 3 provides a cutting-edge analysis of the newly emerged frontier: the legal and algorithmic regulation of Biological Artificial Intelligence (Bio-AI).

Section 4 scrutinizes the stringent legal and executive operational regimes required for high-containment Biosafety Level 4 (BSL-4) facilities.

Section 5 evaluates the structural lacunae of international treaties, notably the Cartagena Protocol and the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC).

Section 6 provides the comparative core of the paper, contrasting the EU and US models against the strategic deficits of the Algerian legislation.

Section 7 concludes with a comprehensive set of normative legislative recommendations.

2.The Dual-Use Dilemma and Technological Modalities

To understand the legal demands of health security, the underlying technological modalities of modern biotechnology must be analyzed through the legal concept of the "Dual-Use Dilemma" (*Dual-Use Research of Concern - DURC*).

2.1 Precision Gene Editing (CRISPR-Cas9) and Biosafety

The advent of Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats (CRISPR-Cas9) has democratized genetic engineering due to its low cost, high efficiency, and ease of use. While its clinical application offers cures for hereditary diseases, its health security implications are profound. The potential for "gene drives"—where a modified trait is engineered to spread rapidly through an entire wild population—poses immense ecological and public health risks if containment fails.

Traditional tort law and product liability frameworks are fundamentally unequipped to quantify or remedy the transboundary genetic alterations caused by uncontained gene drives.

2.2 Synthetic Biology and Pathogen Synthesis

Synthetic biology transcends traditional genetic modification by writing entirely new strands of DNA. Scientists have already demonstrated the ability to synthesize viruses de novo from digital sequence information (DSI), such as the horsepox virus and polio. From a health security perspective, this completely bypasses classic biosecurity export controls that rely on the physical monitoring of restricted pathogen transfers. A malicious actor with an internet connection and a DNA synthesizer can theoretically synthesize regulated toxins or enhanced airborne pathogens, presenting a severe enforcement gap for sovereign border control regimes.

3. The Legal Regulation of Biological Artificial Intelligence (Bio-AI)

The integration of Artificial Intelligence with biotechnology—commonly referred to as Bio-AI—has cross-examined the foundational premises of international biosecurity law. The deployment of large language models (LLMs) fine-tuned for biological data, along with generative molecular models (such as AlphaFold and its successors), has unlocked the ability to predict protein folding and design entirely novel biological structures *in silico*.

3.1 The Algorithmic Threat: De-Skilling and Novel Pathogen Design

From a health security viewpoint, Bio-AI model architectures lower the technical barriers to entry for creating biological threats, a phenomenon known as "de-skilling." An algorithmic interface can take raw requests and generate optimized blueprints for highly lethal, vaccine-resistant, or untraceable toxins. Furthermore, Bio-AI can design "stealth" pathogens that bypass existing national diagnostic arrays. Because these pathogens do not exist in nature, they are entirely missing from the threat-screening databases used by commercial DNA synthesis providers.

3.2 Legislative Gaps in Jurisprudential Frameworks

Traditional biotechnology laws are physically anchored to tangible materials, focusing on the possession, transfer, or modification of listed pathogens (e.g., Anthrax or Ebola). Bio-AI, however, operates in the realm of intangible data and open-source code.

The Territoriality Gap: An AI model can be trained in one jurisdiction, hosted on decentralized cloud servers in another, and accessed by an actor globally, rendering unilateral national biosecurity laws obsolete.

The Inadequacy of Copyright and Patent Controls: Intellectual property law cannot serve as a reliable biosecurity safeguard. While patent offices can reject dangerous inventions, open-source model replication bypasses formal registration pipelines entirely.

3.3 Emerging Global Responses to Bio-AI Risk

Regulatory systems have scrambled to close this loophole. In the United States, successive revisions under Executive Orders on Artificial Intelligence have mandated safety assessments for models that possess "dual-use biological capabilities," requiring developers to prove their systems cannot be engineered to facilitate the synthesis of dangerous chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear threats.

Similarly, the European Union's AI Act (Regulation EU 2024/1689), which entered into its phased implementation steps throughout 2025, classifies specific general-purpose AI models with systemic risks under high-stewardship requirements. However, these frameworks remain heavily

dependent on self-regulation by technology firms, presenting an unstable infrastructure for global health defense

4. Stringent Legal and Executive Regimes for High-Containment Facilities (BSL-4)

Biosafety Level 4 (BSL-4) laboratories represent the apex of biological risk management, handling dangerous and exotic agents that pose a high individual and community risk of life-threatening disease, often without available vaccines or therapies (e.g., Ebola, Marburg, and Smallpox). Consequently, the legal and regulatory mechanisms governing these facilities represent the most rigid frameworks within public health and administrative law.

4.1 Strict Administrative Authorization and Vetting

The establishment and operational lifecycle of a BSL-4 facility are governed by an intricate web of statutory permits. Legally, operators are subjected to continuous administrative vetting (*Contrôle administratif a priori et a posteriori*). In comparative law, jurisdictions mandate that the design, construction, and operation plans of such laboratories undergo strict Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and obtain specific clearance from national defense, security, and public health ministries.

Personnel vetting constitutes a separate legal sub-regime. Under modern biosecurity statutes, any scientific or maintenance staff requesting access to a BSL-4 facility must clear rigorous security background checks executed by national intelligence services to mitigate insider threats (*Le risque interne*).

4.2 Executive Operational Protocols and Biosecurity Standards

The regulatory frameworks enforce a legally binding set of operational mandates within the facilities:

Aerosol Containment and Engineering Controls: Statutes dictate engineering redundancies, including negative air pressure zones, dedicated supply and exhaust air filtered through dual high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters, and completely isolated facility zones.

Mandatory Positive Pressure Suits: Personnel are required by labor safety and public health codes to wear positive pressure, personnel-suit systems connected to a life-support system.

Biosecurity Logbooks and Inventory Accountability: Regulations enforce real-time, digitized inventory auditing of pathogens. Every vial, mutation, or genetic sequence transfer must be logged under strict chain-of-custody protocols. Any unaccounted discrepancy triggers immediate statutory reporting obligations to judicial authorities.

4.3 Liability and Enforcement Frameworks for Biosafety Breaches

The liability framework governing BSL-4 facilities combines administrative, civil, and criminal law dimensions. In the event of an accidental release or containment failure, the legal fiction of fault (*La faute*) is typically discarded in favor of strict liability (*Responsabilité de plein droit / Responsabilité sans faute*). Because the handling of high-consequence pathogens constitutes an abnormally dangerous activity, the operating institution is held liable for all cascading public health and economic damages, irrespective of the preventive measures implemented.

On a criminal level, supervisors and corporate officers face severe statutory penalties, including imprisonment, if an enforcement audit reveals willful negligence, falsification of containment logs, or non-compliance with biological waste sterilization protocols.

5. The International Legal Infrastructure: Treaties and Structural Lacunae

The global governance of biotechnology and biosecurity relies on a fragmented matrix of international treaties designed in different geopolitical eras.

5.1 The Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol

The primary international instrument regulating living modified organisms (LMOs) is the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The Protocol is anchored in the Precautionary Principle, stipulating that the lack of full scientific certainty shall not prevent a state from taking restrictive measures to protect biodiversity and human health from the potential risks of LMOs.

However, the Cartagena Protocol suffers from severe structural lacunae regarding modern health security:

Focus on Transboundary Movement: Its mechanisms primarily govern the import and export of agricultural LMOs, largely failing to address the internal, decentralized use of synthetic biology, gene editing, or cloud-based Bio-AI platforms within domestic research facilities.

Exclusion of Pharmaceuticals: Article 5 of the Protocol explicitly excludes human pharmaceuticals from its scope if they are covered by other international agreements, leaving a substantial regulatory vacuum over experimental genetic therapies and viral vectors.

5.2 The Biological Weapons Convention (BWC)

The *Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction* (BWC) serves as the foundational disarmament treaty. While Article I completely prohibits the development of biological agents that have no justification for prophylactic, protective, or other peaceful purposes, the BWC is notoriously toothless. It lacks a formal verification protocol or an independent enforcement agency. Consequently, compliance depends entirely on voluntary state reporting, rendering it structurally incapable of policing the secretive, dual-use biotechnological research conducted by state and non-state actors globally.

6. Comparative Legislative Frameworks: EU, US, and Algeria

6.1 The European Union: The Precautionary and Process-Orient Regime

The European Union maintains one of the most stringent and risk-averse biotechnological regulatory frameworks in the world, heavily operationalized by Directive 2001/18/EC on the deliberate release of genetically modified organisms (GMOs). The EU legal model is strictly process-oriented, meaning that any organism produced through laboratory genetic intervention is subject to intensive, centralized authorization, post-market monitoring, and strict labeling requirements, regardless of whether the final product is identical to a naturally occurring mutation.

This perspective was codified in a landmark ruling by the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) in 2018 (Case C-528/16), which decreed that organisms obtained by modern mutagenesis/gene-editing techniques (such as CRISPR) qualify as GMOs and must fall under the stringent regulatory burdens of Directive 2001/18/EC. From a health security viewpoint, this ensures maximum public health oversight but has drawn fierce criticism from the biotechnology sector for hindering rapid vaccine and therapeutic developments.

6.2 The United States: The Product-Oriented and Promotional Model

Conversely, the United States approaches biotechnology through the Coordinated Framework for Regulation of Biotechnology, which is fundamentally product-oriented. The US legal theory

asserts that the process of genetic modification is not inherently dangerous; rather, regulatory focus must look exclusively at the traits and safety of the final product.

Responsibility is divided among existing agencies: the FDA, the EPA, and the USDA. Under regulatory overhauls (such as the SECURE Rule of 2020), many gene-edited crops and organisms that do not contain plant pest genetic material are completely exempted from pre-market regulatory reviews. This promotional model accelerates biomanufacturing and pharmaceutical discovery, boosting health security through rapid countermeasure development, but increases the probability of unmonitored biosafety failures and accidental environmental releases.

6.3 The Algerian Framework: Fragmented Adaptations and Strategic Deficits

Algeria's legal intersection between biotechnology and health security is currently characterized by fragmentation and regulatory lag. While Algeria ratified the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety via Décret présidentiel n° 03-317, its domestic codification has been sluggish.

The primary regulatory mechanism is Décret exécutif n° 04-409, which establishes the National Biosafety Committee (*Comité National de la Sécurité Biologique*) under the Ministry of Environment. Additionally, Law No. 03-10 on Environmental Protection outlines broad prevention guidelines, and Law No. 18-11 relating to Health contains strict provisions on the importation and clinical application of human biological samples.

However, a comparative critique reveals profound strategic deficits within the Algerian framework:

Absence of Synthetic Biology and Bio-AI Governance: The existing executive decrees were drafted primarily to regulate the importation of genetically modified agricultural commodities. There is an absolute statutory vacuum regarding the domestic acquisition of DNA synthesizers, the hosting or training of generative biological AI algorithms, and the biosecurity vetting of scientific researchers handling high-consequence computational biology.

Lack of Specific Regulatory Criteria for High-Containment Facilities: Although public health laboratories manage dangerous pathogens, Algerian administrative law lacks a distinct, specialized executive decree outlining the building specifications, licensing protocols, and strict liability guidelines tailored specifically for BSL-3 and BSL-4 infrastructures.

Institutional Overlap and Weak Enforcement: Authority is scattered across the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of Agriculture. The National Biosafety Committee lacks the independent executive authority, technical laboratory capabilities, and specialized bio-forensic personnel required to audit and enforce containment levels within public and private academic institutes.

7. Conclusion

The legal matrix governing environmental and health compensation in Algeria is currently caught in a transitional phase between an antiquated civil liability regime and an advancing administrative-regulatory structure influenced by international treaties. While Law No. 03-10, the Cartagena Protocol, and constitutional guarantees provide an excellent theoretical baseline, their judicial enforcement is clogged by procedural rigidities and technical inefficiencies. To elevate the Algerian framework to a Class A international standard, the following legislative adjustments are recommended:

Enact a Unified Biosecurity and Biosafety Act: Replace the fragmented executive decrees with a comprehensive parliamentary statute that explicitly defines and regulates advanced

biotechnological concepts including gene drives, dual-use research of concern (DURC), synthetic biology, and generative Bio-AI models.

Promulgate a Dedicated Decree for High-Containment Laboratories: Enact a precise executive decree detailing the legal, physical, and liability parameters for BSL-3 and BSL-4 facilities, introducing mandatory strict liability for operating entities and setting clear containment protocols under national security oversight.

Establish a National Biosecurity Oversight Agency: Consolidate regulatory authority into a single, well-funded independent agency attached directly to the Prime Minister's office. This agency should maintain a mandatory national registry of all DNA synthesis orders, implement strict background screening for researchers working with hazardous agents, and enforce standardized biosafety containment protocols across all research sectors.

Mandate "Know Your Customer" (KYC) Protocols for Bio-AI and Cloud Providers: Enact national computational laws forcing domestic cloud infrastructure providers to run verification checks on users utilizing high-performance computing (HPC) systems for automated molecular design, creating a digital defensive perimeter against algorithmic pathogen synthesis

References

- Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Jan. 29, 2000, 2226 U.N.T.S. 208. Article 10 formalizes the application of the Precautionary Principle regarding LMO transboundary movements.
- Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction (BWC), Apr. 10, 1972, 1015 U.N.T.S. 163.
- Règlement (UE) 2024/1689 du Parlement Européen et du Conseil du 13 juin 2024 établissant des règles harmonisées concernant l'intelligence artificielle (législation sur l'intelligence artificielle), *Journal Officiel de l'Union Européenne*, L/2024/1689.
- Cour de Justice de l'Union Européenne (CJEU), Arrêt du 25 juillet 2018, *Confédération paysanne et autres c. Premier ministre et Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Agroalimentaire et de la Forêt*, Affaire C-528/16, ECLI:EU:C:2018:583.
- Directive 2001/18/CE du Parlement Européen et du Conseil du 12 mars 2001 relative à la dissémination volontaire d'organismes génétiquement modifiés dans l'environnement, *Journal Officiel des Communautés Européennes*, L 106, pp. 1–39.
- United States Executive Order 14110 on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence, 88 Federal Register 75191, 1 November 2023.
- Constitution Algérienne de 2020, *Journal Officiel de la République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire*, N° 82, 30 décembre 2020. L'article 64 consacre le droit à la protection de la santé et à un environnement sain.
- Décret présidentiel n° 03-317 du 29 septembre 2003 portant ratification du Protocole de Cartagena sur la prévention des risques biotechnologiques relatif à la convention sur la diversité biologique, *Journal Officiel de l'Union Algérienne*, N° 58, 2003.
- Décret exécutif n° 04-409 du 14 décembre 2004 fixant la composition, l'organisation et le fonctionnement du comité national de la sécurité biologique, *Journal Officiel de la République Algérienne*, N° 81, 2004.

- Loi n° 18-11 du 2 juillet 2018 relative à la santé, *Journal Officiel de la République Algérienne*, N° 46, 29 juillet 2018 (Contient des dispositions impératives sur la bioéthique médicale et l'utilisation de substances biologiques).
- Loi n° 03-10 du 19 juillet 2003 relative à la protection de l'environnement dans le cadre du développement durable, *Journal Officiel de la République Algérienne*, N° 43, 2003.
- Koblentz, Gregory D. "Biosecurity in the Twenty-First Century: Emerging Threats and New Governance Models," *Journal of National Security Law & Policy*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2019, pp. 219-245.
- Fidler, David P. *Global Health Jurisprudence: International Law and Public Health Security*, Oxford University Press, 2021, p. 134.
- Carter, S.R., & DiEuliis, D. "The Governance of Artificial Intelligence in the Biological Domain: Mitigating Algorithmic Biosecurity Risks," *Health Security*, Vol. 22, No. 4, 2024, pp. 341-356.
- Amrani, Mourad. *Le cadre juridique des risques technologiques et de la biosécurité en droit algérien de l'environnement*, Thèse de Doctorat, Faculté de Droit, Université d'Alger 1, Benyoucef Benkhedda, 2021, p. 204.
- Roche, Edouard. *La responsabilité du fait des laboratoires de haute sécurité biologique (P4) : Approche comparée*, Revue Internationale de Droit Comparé, Vol. 77, N° 3, 2025, pp. 415-439.