Navigating Ethical and Regulatory Frameworks in Genetic Engineering

A Research Paper submitted to the Department of Engineering and Society

Presented to the Faculty of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

University of Virginia • Charlottesville, Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Science, School of Engineering

Natalie Nieves

Spring 2024

On my honor as a University Student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment as defined by the Honor Guidelines for Thesis-Related Assignments

Advisor

Kent Wayland, Department of Engineering and Society

INTRODUCTION

Genetic engineering is a rapidly advancing field that uses technology to manipulate the genetic material of organisms. This powerful capability has the ability to transform industries such as medicine, agriculture, and environmental management. As genetic engineering evolves, it raises critical ethical and regulatory challenges that extend beyond the scientific community, impacting the lives of people globally.

This study examines the relationship between ethical principles and regulatory decisionmaking in the context of genetic engineering practices in the United States. It will explore how ethical considerations influence the development and implementation of regulatory frameworks, focusing on key issues like safety, privacy, and societal impacts. By analyzing the roles and interactions of academic researchers, private entities, and regulatory agencies such as the FDA, NIH, and USDA, the research seeks to demonstrate how ethical decision-making is incorporated into the regulatory environment, shedding light on the balance between the potential benefits of genetic engineering and the ethical and safety concerns.

Through a literature review of the existing regulatory frameworks, this study aims to provide a deeper understanding of the relationship between innovation, ethics, and policy in the field of genetic engineering. The findings will contribute to discussions on responsible practices and the development of regulatory frameworks that can effectively govern genetic engineering while upholding ethical principles and protecting the public interests.

BACKGROUND & CONTEXT

Many different groups of people are involved in making rules and decisions about genetic engineering in the United States. Academic researchers and universities play a pivotal role as key

stakeholders in genetic engineering. Commercial biotechnology companies, pharmaceutical firms, and other industry stakeholders are investing heavily in the development and commercialization of genetic engineering applications. These entities and their interests and priorities are important factors in the regulatory decision-making process. Government bodies such as the FDA, NIH, and USDA are responsible for establishing and enforcing regulations around genetic engineering research and products. The policies and enforcement of these regulatory agencies shape the ethical boundaries of this field.

Academic researchers are fundamental to pioneering research and development. The study by Blumenthal, Causino, and Campbell (1997) sheds light on the nature of academicindustry research relationships (AIRRs) in genetics. It reveals that companies in the genetics industry are more likely to finance research at universities compared to those outside the genetics field. As a result, university projects funded by genetics firms tend to be more extensive and enduring. This highlights the importance of academic institutions in genetic engineering research and suggests significant economic potential in the field. The study points out, "Genetics faculty with AIRRs were significantly more likely than non-genetics faculty to report that patents, licenses, new companies, and trade secrets had resulted from their university research" (Blumenthal et al., 1997). This indicates the clear role academic research plays in driving technological innovation and growth in genetic engineering. The support from genetics companies for university programs points to an investment in the future workforce, ensuring continuous progress in genetic engineering.

As academic institutions engage with both foundational research and commercial enterprises, the function of IRBs becomes increasingly significant. Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) are essential in maintaining ethical standards and regulatory compliance in academic

research, as emphasized by Jeremy Sugarman. He states, "Institutional review boards (IRBs) and the federal 'assurance' procedures play critical roles in the current research and regulatory environments for clinical research in academic medical centers and other institutions" (Sugarman, 2000, p. 687). Sugarman emphasizes their importance, advocating for an ethical environment to protect human subjects and maintain public trust. He highlights the obligation to protect the rights and interests of research participants, minimize risks, maximize benefits, and ensure fair treatment for all involved (Sugarman, 2000).

While Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) play a critical role in upholding ethical standards within academic and research institutions, government bodies have established broader frameworks to ensure genetic engineering practices meet societal, ethical, and safety standards. These frameworks include the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) , National Institutes of Health (NIH), and United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

The FDA plays a central role in regulating products derived from genetic engineering, particularly those used in human and animal health. The agency's jurisdiction covers human drugs, medical devices, biologics, and certain genetically engineered food products. Its interests are to evaluate and approve these products based on their intended use, rather than the technology used to create them. The agency follows rigorous testing and review processes to ensure the safety, efficacy, identity, purity, and potency of genetically engineered products. After approval, the FDA continues to oversee the production and distribution of these products to maintain ongoing compliance with safety standards. This ensures that genetically engineered products meet the same standard as traditional products and remain safe and effective over time. (Bonk, 1988).

The NIH plays a significant role in the oversight of genetic engineering through the Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee (RAC). Established in response to early concerns about the safety of recombinant DNA technology, the RAC is a key organization for reviewing various genetic experiments. It is particularly influential in human gene therapy, where it has provided oversight for 23 years. The NIH Guidelines, which the RAC helped develop, are noted for their flexibility, allowing them to be "amended much more easily than regulations." This adaptability has been crucial in impacting the development of genetic interventions that lead to actual human therapies, balancing innovation with safety and ethical considerations (Wivel, 2014).

The USDA has a role in the regulation, research, and promotion of agricultural biotechnology, aiming to enhance the quality and safety of U.S. agriculture. Through its various agencies, the USDA oversees the development and safe use of genetically engineered organisms, ensuring their environmental and economic viability. This includes regulating "field-testing, interstate movement, and importation of these organisms", conducting economic research on biotechnology adoption, ensuring food safety, and promoting global food security. Additionally, the USDA supports biotechnology research and education to influence innovation and sustainability in agriculture (United States Department of Agriculture).

Understanding the different roles, goals, and connections of these groups is key to minimizing the ethical and regulatory challenges in genetic engineering. As academic research, business efforts, and government oversight shape genetic engineering, it's important that they stay balanced, flexible, and adaptable as the field continues to evolve. Collaboration among all involved parties helps navigate genetic engineering while reducing risks.

EVOLUTION OF GENETIC ENGINEERING

Building on the understanding of the roles and interactions of important stakeholders in genetic engineering, it is important to explore the evolution of the techniques and the historical milestones that have shaped its development. This includes highlighting the scientific advancements as well as the ethical and regulatory challenges that accompany them. Techniques such as gene editing, gene therapy, and synthetic biology have expanded our capabilities because of significant contributions of pioneering figures in genetic research.

Gene editing, particularly through the development of CRISPR/Cas9, has revolutionized our ability to make precise alterations to DNA. This technology was advanced by the work of Jennifer Doudna and Emmanuelle Charpentier. CRISPR/Cas9 has enabled not only the correction of genetic defects but also the enhancement of agricultural crops and the development of cures for diseases.

Gene therapy is the use of genetic material to treat or prevent disease by replacing, modifying, or supplementing defective genes. Early experiments, such as those using the Shope papilloma virus for treating arginase deficiency, highlighted the technical and ethical challenges inherent in these approaches. These challenges led to the development of standards for clinical applications, as advocated by scientists like Friedman (Tamura & Toda, 2020). Also, the work of W. French Anderson in 1990 was catalytic, marking the first successful gene therapy treatment in humans. Anderson's treatment of a young girl with severe combined immunodeficiency demonstrated the potential of gene therapy to effectively treat genetic disorders, setting a precedent for future therapies (Scheller & Krebsbach, 2009).

Synthetic biology expands genetic engineering by making new biological parts and systems. It combines biology with engineering to create organisms with unique functions.

Innovations in synthetic biology have resulted in the development of microorganisms capable of manufacturing pharmaceuticals, biofuels, and biosensors for monitoring health and environmental conditions. Rosalind Franklin's elucidation of DNA's double helix structure, alongside the discoveries of other scientists like Watson and Crick, provided important insights into molecular genetics. Similarly, Kornberg's discovery regarding DNA polymerases' role in DNA replication has deepened our understanding of cellular processes and genetic mechanisms, further advancing the possibilities of synthetic biology (Snedeker et al., 2018).

As genetic engineering is evolving, the ethical and regulatory frameworks surrounding it have also continued to develop. The Asilomar Conference on Recombinant DNA in 1975 was a pivotal event, establishing early guidelines to mitigate potential biohazards and safety concerns. Subsequent guidelines from regulatory bodies like the NIH and FDA have built upon this foundation, focusing on ensuring the safety, efficacy, and ethical conduct of genetic engineering research.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Genetic engineering has progressed from understanding DNA to advanced technologies like CRISPR and gene therapy. These advancements have brought about scientific breakthroughs, but also complex ethical and societal challenges.

One of the key ethical concerns is safety risks. The potential for unintended consequences of gene editing, such as off-target effects or the creation of new genetic disorders, raises significant concerns that require careful evaluation and oversight. In addition to safety risks, the increasing availability of genetic information has also raised concerns about privacy. As more

individuals have access to genetic data, there are growing worries about how this information may be used, potentially impacting personal privacy and autonomy. Another ethical consideration is the issue of equitable access to genetic technologies. Ensuring that all populations have fair and equitable access to advancements such as gene therapies is crucial to prevent the increase of existing health disparities.

Genetic engineering's transformative potential raises concerns about societal impacts. The public holds diverse views, with some seeing it as promising and others expressing ethical reservations. Examining these perspectives is key as genetic engineering progresses.

CONTRASTING PERSPECTIVES ON GENETIC ENGINEERING

The debate over the level of regulation required in genetic engineering is not about scientific and ethical considerations, but also the public opinion and values. Researchers and the public hold contrasting viewpoints on this issue.

Researchers advocating for stricter gene editing regulations emphasize safety and ethics. They argue that tight regulations prevent unforeseen risks, unethical practices, and potential harm to individuals and ecosystems. Such oversight also protects vulnerable groups and ensures fair access to genetic technologies. Ultimately, they believe that stringent regulations build public trust, preserve human dignity, and uphold scientific principles.

Researchers that argue for more flexible approaches to promote innovation state that the fears held by individuals regarding biotechnology hinder its advancement. They also note that the public's apprehension about consuming genetically modified organisms stems from a lack of understanding about their nature and purpose (Babale & Atoi, 2021). By creating a supportive

regulatory environment and promoting public understanding of the technology's potential, researchers believe that human gene therapy can advance medical science while ensuring ethical and responsible practices. Moreover, researchers highlight that new technologies always come with challenges and ethical questions. They stress the need for open discussions involving different fields to address these challenges effectively (Benjamin & Familusi, 2020).

In addition to researchers' perspective, the public holds diverse perspectives on genetic engineering, with some expressing enthusiasm about its medical potential and others voicing ethical concerns. While many support using genetic engineering to treat diseases, there is more skepticism about using it for enhancement purposes like improving intelligence or physical characteristics. The public also exhibits fears about the societal impacts, such as the potential for a new form of eugenics and discrimination against those with "undesirable" genetic profiles. Additionally, a portion of the public admits to having limited understanding of genetic engineering, which can fuel misconceptions (Singer et al., 1998).

Understanding diverse perspectives on genetic engineering is crucial for analyzing regulatory responses. There is a critical role of public engagement and transparency in the regulatory decision-making process. Regulatory agencies like the FDA and NIH have historically valued public input and ethical considerations when evaluating applications for genetic engineering clinical trials. This shows how the public's concerns and ethical considerations are prioritized, reflecting a commitment to principles in the governance of biotechnology. Consequently, this study explores how regulatory bodies in the United States have developed and implemented frameworks to address these concerns.

METHODS

To thoroughly review the regulatory frameworks governing genetic engineering in the United States, I focused my research on the key regulatory bodies involved. I accessed the official websites of these agencies to gather comprehensive information on their regulatory guidelines, policies, and guidance documents related to genetic engineering and gene therapy products. This included reviewing materials from the FDA on their regulations and requirements for the safety, efficacy, and oversight of genetically engineered products under their jurisdiction. I also examined the NIH's role in genetic engineering oversight, including their guidelines for research involving recombinant or synthetic nucleic acid molecules and the work of the NIH Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee in providing guidance and review of genetic engineering experiments.

To understand the USDA's regulatory framework for agricultural biotechnology, I reviewed information from their website, focusing on the USDA APHIS regulations for the development and environmental release of genetically engineered organisms, as well as the USDA's role in evaluating the safety and environmental impacts of proposed GE organisms.

In addition to these primary sources, I conducted targeted searches on Google Scholar using keywords related to genetic engineering regulations, FDA gene therapy guidelines, NIH recombinant DNA oversight, and USDA biotechnology regulation. This allowed me to identify relevant scholarly articles, government reports, and other secondary sources that provided additional context and analysis of the regulatory approaches taken by these agencies.

The key criteria I used to select sources included their relevance to the regulatory frameworks and guidelines governing genetic engineering in the United States and their

emphasis on addressing safety, privacy, and ethical considerations in genetic engineering practices. By systematically reviewing the official policies, guidelines, and supporting literature from these three key regulatory bodies, I was able to develop a comprehensive understanding of the regulatory environment for genetic engineering in the United States.

RESULTS

In examining the regulatory frameworks of genetic engineering in the United States, it becomes evident that various regulatory bodies have adopted diverse approaches to ensure the safe and ethical advancement of this technology.

From a safety ethical view, the FDA requires "comprehensive safety studies for human gene editing research, including identifying editing events, assessing genomic integrity, evaluating biological consequences, and examining immunogenicity" (U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 2022). This ensures potential off-target effects and unintended consequences are thoroughly evaluated before clinical trials. The FDA also mandates long-term safety monitoring for gene therapy products (U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 2022).

Additionally, the NIH guidelines state that "experiments with recombinant or synthetic nucleic acid molecules are covered by the NIH Guidelines if they are conducted at or sponsored by an institution that receives any support for recombinant or synthetic nucleic acid research from the NIH" (Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, 1994). This allows the NIH to set consistent safety standards and minimize risks across genetic engineering research (Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, 1994).

The USDA APHIS regulations require developers of genetically engineered organisms to submit detailed information on the organism's characteristics, intended use, and potential environmental impacts. APHIS then conducts a thorough risk assessment to determine if the organism is as safe as its traditionally bred counterpart before granting non-regulated status (United States Department of Agriculture).

In regard to privacy concerns, the FDA's guidance states that "the informed consent document should include a description of the extent to which confidentiality of records identifying the subject will be maintained" for human gene therapy trials (U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 2022). This implies that for human gene therapy trials, the informed consent document must clearly explain to participants how their personal and identifying information will be kept confidential. The FDA emphasizes the importance of transparency around data privacy and protection for individuals participating in these trials. The NIH Genomic Data Sharing Policy requires researchers to obtain participant consent for sharing genomic and phenotypic data, with limited exceptions. It states that "the consent process should provide a clear explanation of the extent to which confidentiality will be maintained" (NIH, 2014). This policy mandates researchers to explicitly disclose to participants the degree to which their genomic and health data will be kept private and confidential. The policy aims to ensure participants are fully informed about data sharing practices before providing consent.

For societal and environmental concerns, the USDA supports the development of genetically engineered crops that can improve nutrition and food security in developing countries (United States Department of Agriculture). The USDA believes that genetically engineered crops have the capability to improve nutrition and increase food supplies in parts of the world

facing challenges with food insecurity. Additionally, the USDA evaluates the environmental and human health impacts of proposed GE organism releases (United States Department of Agriculture). The FDA, NIH, and USDA have each established regulatory frameworks to govern different aspects of genetic engineering research and products. These frameworks share some common strategies, but also have distinct approaches in addressing ethical concerns.

On the issue of safety risks, all three require comprehensive testing and risk assessment. In terms of privacy concerns, the FDA and NIH have implemented informed consent requirements to protect participant confidentiality in clinical trials and genomic data sharing. However, the regulations do not directly address broader societal impacts like the potential for genetic discrimination. The USDA stands out in its focus on promoting beneficial applications of genetic engineering, such as supporting the development of nutritionally enhanced crops to improve global food security. But the regulations do not provide guidance on managing the ethical challenges around using genetic technologies for human enhancement.

Overall, these frameworks demonstrate a strong emphasis on safety and privacy, with less explicit attention to the wider societal implications of genetic engineering. They could be improved by requiring more comprehensive assessments of societal impacts, establishing clearer guidelines for public engagement, and allocating more funding for research into the social and ethical dimensions of this field. Proactive steps in these key areas will be necessary as genetic engineering continues to advance globally.

CONCLUSION

In genetic engineering, balancing ethical considerations with regulatory frameworks is crucial for guiding safe and responsible progress. This research has dived into the history of

genetic engineering, key regulations, and different opinions on the right level of oversight. Genetic engineering has seen significant challenges in the past, which led to the creation of early guidelines like those from the Asilomar Conference and later guidelines like NIH, FDA, and USDA. With the introduction of new technologies like CRISPR/Cas9, regulations have had to evolve to ensure safety, effectiveness, and ethical use.

From the research, it's clear that there are varied opinions on how strict regulations should be. Some believe in tight controls to prevent risks and ethical issues, while others think more flexible rules can encourage innovation and scientific growth. This shows an ongoing debate and emphasizes the need for a balanced approach that both encourages innovation and maintains ethical standards. The regulatory bodies mentioned play important roles in making sure genetic engineering research is done ethically and safely. They emphasize public engagement, openness, and involving all stakeholders, which helps build trust and allows for scientific advancements.

As genetic engineering becomes more advanced and widespread, it's vital to create an environment that supports innovation while keeping high ethical standards. This study adds to the discussion by explaining the relationship between ethics and regulation in genetic engineering, providing insights that can help shape future policies and decisions. Overall, a balanced approach that combines rigorous safety checks, transparent regulations, and active involvement from the public is key to the responsible development of genetic engineering. By focusing on both ethics and technological progress, we can navigate the challenges of genetic engineering and ensure that it continues to offer hope for improving lives and other organisms.

References

Babale, Y., & Atoi, E. (2021). Ethical Concerns and Risk Perceptions Associated with the

    Application of Genetic Engineering. *KIU Journal Of Social Sciences, 7*(3), 231-238.

    https://www.ijhumas.com/ojs/index.php/kiujoss/article/view/1317

Benjamin, E., & Familusi, O. (2020). A Christian view of genetic engineering. *Global Journal of*

    Humanities and Social Sciences, 20(7), 1-10.

    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342961111_A_Christian_View_of_Genetic_En

    gineering

Blumenthal, D., Causino, N., & Campbell, E. G. (1997). Academic-industry research

    relationships in genetics: a field apart. *Nature genetics*, *16*(1), 104–108.

    https://doi.org/10.1038/ng0597-104

Bonk, D. T. (1988). FDA regulation of biotechnology. Food, Drug, Cosmetic Law Journal, 43(1),

    67-83. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26658479

Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health. (1994). Recombinant

    DNA Research: Actions under the Guidelines. *Federal Register*, 59(127)

    https://archives.federalregister.gov/issue_slice/1994/7/5/34464-34494.pdf#page=9

Institute of Medicine (US) Committee to Study Decision Making & Hanna, K. E. (1991).

    Asilomar and recombinant DNA: The end of the beginning. In K. E. Hanna (Ed.),

    Biomedical Politics: National Academies Press (US) (pp. 258-298). National Academies

    Press (US). https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK234217/ 258-298

Scheller, E., & Krebsbach, P. (2009). Gene therapy: design and prospects for craniofacial

    regeneration. *Journal of dental research*, *88*(7), 585–596.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034509337480

Singer, E., Corning, A., & Lamias, M. (1998). Trends: Genetic Testing, Engineering, and

    Therapy: Awareness and Attitudes. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, *62*(4), 633–664.

    http://www.jstor.org/stable/2749681

Snedeker, J., Wooten, M., & Chen, X. (2017). The inherent asymmetry of DNA replication.

    Annual Review of Cell and Developmental Biology, 33, 291-318.

    https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-cellbio-100616-060447

Sugarman, J. (2000). The role of institutional support in protecting human research subjects.

    Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges, *75*(7),

    687–692. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-200007000-00009

Tamura, R., & Toda, M. (2020). Historic Overview of Genetic Engineering Technologies for

    Human Gene Therapy. *Neurologia medico-chirurgica*, *60*(10), 483–491.

    https://doi.org/10.2176/nmc.ra.2020-0049.

U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2022). *Human Gene Therapy Products Incorporating*

    Human Genome Editing (FDA-2021-D-0398).

    https://www.fda.gov/media/156894/download#:~:text=FDA%20generally%20considers

    %20human%20gene,host%20(human)%20genetic%20sequences.

United States Department of Agriculture. (n.d.). Roles of USDA Agencies in Biotechnology.

    USDA. https://www.usda.gov/topics/biotechnology/roles-usda-agencies-biotechnology

Wivel, N. (2014). Historical Perspectives Pertaining to the NIH Recombinant DNA Advisory

Committee. *Human Gene Therapy, 25*(1), 19-24. https://doi.org/10.1089/hum.2013.2524