Proposal/Contract no.: **FP6-2003-SSP-3 - 006522**

Project acronym: **SINER-GI**

Project full title:
Strengthening International Research on Geographical Indications: from research foundation to consistent policy

SPECIFIC TARGETED RESEARCH OR INNOVATION PROJECT

PRIORITY 8.1. POLICY-ORIENTED RESEARCH (SSP)

FINAL ACTIVITY REPORT

Period covered: from 1st May 2005 to 31st July 2008	Date of preparation: 15th September 2008
Start date of project: 1st May 2005	Duration: 39 months
Project coordinator name: Gilles Allaire Project coordinator organisation name: INRA Toulouse	Revision: Draft 1

FP6-2003-SSP-3 - 006522

SINER-GI
Strengthening International Research on Geographical Indications: from research foundation to consistent policy

Instrument: SPECIFIC TARGETED RESEARCH OR INNOVATION PROJECT
Thematic Priority: PRIORITY 8.1. POLICY-ORIENTED RESEARCH (SSP)

Activity Report (2005-2008)

Policy recommendations for EU

By Gilles Allaire (INRA)
Project coordinator (2007-2008)

This note presents the Sinergi project results in stressing critical points which could be of interest to consider in debating Europe actions related to GIs development issues in the global context of food and rural development. It draws from the presentations made for the meeting with EU officials in April and for the final meeting in June, and it uses conclusion from the D9, D10 and D12 reports and in general from all the workpackages leaders contributions.

Disclaimer: The SINER-GI consortium gratefully acknowledges from the European Community financial contribution under the Sixth Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities, for the Specific Targeted Research Project SINER-GI SSPE-CT-2005- 006522.
The views expressed in this contribution by SINER-GI project coordinator and members are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the information.

CONTENTS

In a decade, two main changes, one related to the market and the other to agricultural and rural policies, have transformed the Geographical Indication (GI) political economy. On the market side, GIs are circulating in new circuits, and in market extended by the internationalisation of the agrofood system of provision, and differentiated by various private collective and public standards related with quality issues; thus confronting both established and new GI systems of production to scaling up and quality design issues. A new international competition regime is emerging, in which various types of standard setting organisations supply international conventions in differentiating and regulating food markets. On the other side, at the international level, the main factor is the implementation of the 1994 TRIPS agreement, which have extended the scope of countries implementing GI, in particular in the South. This geographical extension of GI related initiatives introduced new concerns for the implementation of that standard as a tool for global or regional public goods provision as rural development and biodiversity issues; and thus new aspects of the international debate on GI issues are developing. After having presented the main results of the Sinergi project, we will address questions related to the implications for the European Commission strategy in that domain of these two new developments.

1. Main results of Sinergi project

The inventory of GIs in a large set of countries and cases studies carried out in several geopolitical contexts have shown and documented the several dimensions of GI systems: the technology and product qualification procedure, the market structure, the supply chain organisation, the policies in support, the property regime and governance structure. Taking in account public goods such as cultural heritage, consumer trust in the food system and in some cases, biodiversity and sustainable agricultural practices and landscapes, GIs were found in the SINER-GI case studies to be considered with great interest in non-EU countries, and offering opportunities for local processes of social development. SINER-GI results after worldwide examination indicate that although the number of established GIs in third (non EU) countries remains relatively low, it is growing steadily and many additional processes of defining and establishing GIs are currently under way in Asia, the Americas and to some extent in Africa. Most policy initiatives have been take in line with the national strategies to ensure WTO TRIPS compliance. Other initiatives in Third countries stem from local initiatives or from the influence of extension, research or development projects. Although it remains unclear which proportion of these initiatives will actually lead to established recognition under a GI quality assurance scheme, it must be acknowledged that GIs represent nowadays a worldwide notion. It is increasingly being identified and targeted by states and economic actors when dealing with original local products with market potential. It is therefore no longer possible to say that GI is a Europeo-centric topic or Europe-restricted reality, and concerns firstly an old US/Europe dispute on Intellectual Property doctrine. While formal public legal provisions are not always in real use, there is a growing concern and involvement of public policies, with the aim of protecting, regulating, enhancing local initiatives on these products and of supporting external positive effects on the whole rural context. Clearly, a diversified set of policy tools is used for this purpose by governments and professional actors, at various levels (global, regional, national, and local), raising integrative issues.

Collective and trade initiatives which include names of origin as asset, are diversely supported in third countries as in Europe by private firms, local professional organisations, regional or national policies and aid programmes and NGO’s. These initiatives were generally found in combination with other strategies of quality assurance schemes promoted by trade actors in a developing regime of market differentiation. Their legitimating is supported by various

political values expressed through territorial and community governance. Therefore a debate exists among the experts and within the public regarding the best governance for GI systems, especially in relation with the valorisation of local specific resources. By itself the existence of market standards cannot valorise specificities (which are linked with the establishment of an identity…), and cannot activate collective dynamics based on local actors and on valorisation of local specific resources; but standards and protection can permit such dynamics. GI policies and GI products market dynamics relate to three types of political issues: GI as names or identifiers to which are tied intellectual property rights; GI products market qualification processes, which regard market functioning, and the reputation mechanisms which are at play in GI economy; the GI political economy, and the various public justifications for supporting GIs (trade laws, regional development, biodiversity, and global heritage).

One needs to distinguish between the infrastructure level of quality definitions (the signalling system), that is the legal framework established to define what is a PDO or a organic product for example, and the GI system level of internal regulation. The TRIPS agreement introduces a minimum legal international standard for Geographical indication, as a category of intellectual property right, while Fair trade or organic standard are based coordination within private actors. Depending of national contexts, the infrastructure of the quality certification systems and corresponding legal provisions can be more or less developed. It is possible to have a developed legal infrastructure level, with poor implementation in existing GI systems. In the reverse, it can be found private/collective initiatives which are very strong and well organized. It's the same for organic farming standards implementation.

Due to the diversity of geopolitical contexts and of the GI protection schemes and support policies worldwide, with different GI systems modes of governance and quality definition and market structures, a diversity of the impacts of GI systems implementation on rural development and sustainability is expected. To address this diversity issue, by a comparative analysis, general driving forces and pressures on both institutional framework and quality systems were put in evidence. These driving forces express the contemporaneous evolutions of the international trade regime, and result according to geopolitical contexts in pressures framing the global competition regime. Responses of the actors, local or national, producers or consumers, were analyzed in a same comparative way, thus putting light on the social movements implicated in rural development and collective interests nested in GI property right. The responses range from local actors coordination, formation of (new) initiative groups, local network capacities empowerment by social innovation and/or external expertise and funds; to regulation or enforcement devices setting (code of practice and control issues); and to marketing initiatives. This global framework allows considering several scenarios regarding the new international competition regime in consideration of position of origin and GI recognition as marketing tool, in a situation in which private and public standards play an important role in the dynamics of markets. Variability of the impacts can thus be analyzed according to the scenarios, the geopolitical contexts and GI systems types.

GI systems impacts have to be considered in relation with global sustainable development objectives. By diverse aspects, global objectives are concerned by the issue of the GI intellectual property right, e.g. fair trade (rural communities' poverty reduction), biodiversity and traditional knowledge protection, rural development, food security, etc. Global environmental objectives are also at stake along with the global trade objectives founding the WTO (as consumers' health protection, regulation of marks and IPRs as part of services liberalisation, etc…). All of those issues are controversial and conflicting, but more or less

orientating open coordination for an international regulation. General and specific characteristics of GI systems determine their impacts. Impacts assessment needs to include in the analysis, the role of legal, economic, organisational, and especially socio-cultural aspects, such as cultural resources, identity, traditions, local knowledge. What was produced by the comparative analysis of case studies was a comprehensive framework of the diversity of the impact factors and an understanding of the models of impact according to the diversity of the situations.
The following items have been identified as pertinent, comparable and assessable criterions:
Economic issue: Access to market stabilisation/increase, Price premium, Value added transmitted to local producers
Social: Local Employment, Empowerment of local people, Cultural value / heritage
Environment: Local breed/variety conservation, Extensive farming, Natural resources preservation
In addition, the sanitary / hygienic rules of production appear to be an important item, as a potential expected effect of the GI recognition process.

For established GI systems or protection schemes, effective impacts are always complex to identify due to the combination of factors. Many comparative studies show the great influence of general factors such as political support or other policy concerns. Furthermore, it is difficult to distinguish what is caused by the legal protection versus the GI system economic aspects. Concerning GI systems which are in progress and are not yet established, it is impossible to assess its effective impacts. It is only possible to identify and assess factors which could potentially be impacted by the GI system or protection scheme. But the recognition of impacts is part of the actors' positive involvement. In general, observed or expected impacts of geographical indication systems are mainly linked with economic or social issues. But, if the economic concerns are the only motives in the implementation of the GI initiative and protection schemes, there are some crucial risks. For example: a registered geographical indication may lead to more power in favour of the most powerful actor in the GI system, and have negative consequences for the small scale producers; the delimitation of the geographical area / technical constraints might also have negative effects by unfair exclusion of certain actors. Additional certification costs may exclude from the benefits of the protection, if not exclude totally, small scale farmers; premium prices can be captured by out-of-area actors. Inversely, an enlarged vision of the GI initiative considering social and environmental objectives may be an opportunity to stimulate collective management tools and joint strategy within the supply chain; the definition of geographical area and the coding of technical practices may give recognition to localized assets (such as agro-biodiversity, producers' and processors' know-how, etc.) while warranting consumer confidence; the recognition and certification processes may upscale and enlarge the market resulting in an obtaining and distribution of price premium. These different scenarios point out to the critical importance of the governance rules which are established nationally and along with the implementation of each GI initiative.

The conception of GI schemes is related to the conception of the rights entailed by the recognition of origin names as an Intellectual Property Right. A conception of the IPR strictly in term of economic asset is in opposition with a conception based on the notion of common heritage and including knowledge or cultural asset. This second conception is at stake in building specific rural development policies and programmes. To undertake a global perspective for strategic assessment, it is relevant to consider seriously sustainable agriculture and rural development concerns in analysing the roles of the institutions and the procedures involved in the geographical indications implementation schemes. First, not only the market

aspects have to be taken into account (to reach some niche in the market and to get a premium). Second, other correlated policies are crucial. The agricultural policy, the rural development policy, the food safety regulations and the anti-trust policies play important roles in order to optimise the positive effects on sustainability. Third, starting from the beginning of the registration procedure, such procedures as the publicity about the registration demands and the opening of an opposition procedure are important to reach a definition of the product that is well legitimated and negotiated by the economic actors themselves (delimitation of the area of origin and definition of conditions of production). Otherwise, there is a risk of serious loss of efficiency of the other related policies. Fourth: Beyond this normative result, the case studies show that there is a continuous process of differentiation inside a developing GI system along with brands or other types of signs that rely on the origin reputation and attributes. So there are several levels in the formation of the collective reputation and the governance of a given GI system.

Sinergi scientific objectives were:
- to gather an up-to-date systematic knowledge on GIs legal protection systems, socio-economic aspects, institutional arrangements and levels of protection of GIs for agricultural products currently used throughout the world, and to systematise and analyse their pros and cons
- to understand the effects of the different kinds and levels of protection of GIs on economic, social, environmental, cultural and ethical dimensions of GI production basins and value chains;
- to design a common analytical framework to analyse, assess and monitor the effectiveness of GIs, considering the different economic, environmental, and social effects of the most relevant types of institutional frameworks;
- to design and propose a common monitoring and assessment tool for analysing the conditions of success of GIs, supported by case-studies and practical examples; this perspective being implemented by a strategic guide (Criteria for transferability of GIs good practices);
- to provide relevant information and recommendations to policy-makers on whether and how to support GIs through the setting-up a network of researchers, through exchanges of information on research results and meetings.

The following steps have been taken:
- Analysis of existing work and building of a conceptual model for:
    - the analysis of GIs production systems and their markets
    - an analytical methodology to model and to measure the impact of GIs on the different dimensions of rural development and to assess the conditions for success, both from market, as well as from public good consideration aspects.
- Implementation of in-depth case studies on the basis of a common methodology. Reports distribution is restricted, but the results are being enhanced through several scientific articles and a book.
- Development of scenarios from a conceptualization of the GI role in international trade; development and implementation of a comparative analysis of the case studies.
- Elaboration of recommendations for public policies (from the meetings with experts)
-Communicate findings, disseminate information and build a global network of research on GI.

SINER-GI workpackages results:
Protection and legal aspect (WP1)
Economic aspects from the point of view of sustainable rural development (WP2)
Synthesis: GI systems typology (WP3)
Comparative analysis (WP4, WP5, WP6): driving forces and actors initiatives
Assessment taking in account scenarios (WP5, WP6)
Scenarios and policy recommendations (WP7)
Lessons for stakeholders (WP8)

The SINER-GI project was an effective support to strengthen and extend an international research network on GI, initiated under the Dolphins project (5th FP). The Project Advisory Board and a working network of over 40 associated researchers have reinforced the 11 partners. In-depth case studies have established contacts with stakeholders and international agencies working in the field of GI systems implementation.

SINER-GI outputs:
A website devoted to GI (www.origin-food.org)
Recent scientific information on key issues on geographical indications
Online of communications made at the seminars and conferences organized under the SINER-GI project
Online of scientific reports made in the SINER-GI project
Links to the main websites and institutions dealing with the geographical indications issue in the World
Database on scientific literature on geographical indications

A database on origin products
Freely viewable on the SINER-GI website, composed of more than 60 GI products around the world

Scientific papers
The dissemination strategy of research results has allowed the publication of numerous articles in various scientific journals in social sciences, making SINER-GI consortium a major contributor on GI law & economics.

2. Critical points to be considered and recommendations for European Union

GI systems develop through marketing initiatives within long or short value chains and with national, local, or international policy supports. There are several dimensions of GI products economy, and GI production systems are complex institutional combinations: the market structure, the supply chain organisation, local resources management system, the stakeholders' configuration and policies types of support, the regulation and control management system and the industry (global value chain) mode of governance, the technology and its generic vs. specific aspects, and product qualification procedures… Policy implications regard the general design of quality schemes, and also development policies (rural development, including water and biodiversity aspects). Policy setting is confronted with issue of combination or integration of several tools, due to the fact that protecting GI is not neutral on these development issues.

We develop here three synthetics points, drawing on global Sinergi work:
- GIs in a new innovation and trade regimes,
- International relations and negotiations on GIs,
- GIs policy in Europe, including external aspects.

2.1 - GIs in new innovation and trade regimes

In the contemporary globalisation of the economy, food markets are undergoing a shift towards services and products differentiation among quality attributes. Since the 1980s, many authors have emphasized a 'quality turn' corresponding to the increasing variety of food services[1]. The differentiation of food qualities concerns the whole system of food production and provision. The industrialization of food chains has been renewed by biotechnological innovations and at the same time consumption patterns have undergone substantial transformations with the development of services at the end of the food chains and worldwide domination of the supermarkets in the urban diet provision. The new standards emerging in food provision systems put in relation mode of production codifications with emergent global norms related to sustainability inspired programmes, promoted both by states, and social movements and NGOs. Food quality standards and environmental standards are perfect examples of the double dynamics of decentralization (private and voluntary standards) and globalization (WTO and other international agreements) of the market regulation. This new standardization (or innovation) regime is characterized by multi-actor initiatives to set up global norms, products by products (e.g. sustainable forest norms); it tends to renew marketing strategies at the various stages of agrofood chains, and to institute entry conditions for certain markets. Although quality standards concern the large industrial food systems, a new paradigm of innovation is developing through the extension or the mainstreaming of 'alternative foods' and marketing (farmer's market, local contracts…). Organic or ethnic products may be mentioned in this category along with products qualified by their origin, whether they bear a recognized geographical indication or not. In this movement big retailers at the world level play a key role. Alongside public health, social or environmental standards, private standards emerge in coalitions of firms. This corresponds to a new way of competing: excluding competitors from the market, improving competencies, specifying production conditions, establishing new management systems. This development of private standardization associated with public standardization may have potentially varied and contradictory effects: positive effects (complementarities with public policies, assistance in bringing firms up to standard, head-starts for some leading businesses) and negative effects (capturing of public good by private interests, lobbying effect dragging quality down). This prompts the debates about the linkages between the different aspects of qualification of agricultural goods and food: safety, environment, fair trade, etc., including GIs, and about their complementarities or substitutability, in terms of production, impacts, marketing or consumption.

Quality regulation doctrine restricted to the basic competition laws and trademarks system relies on the assumption of a perfect capacity of the consumers to clearly identify market marks and of the sharing of a coherent quality attributes nomenclature within all the market chain, which can be organized by the law. But, the building of market qualifications result from complex processes which entail several types of intermediaries, from which outcomes provisory, evolving, and heterogeneous quality; what we call private and public standards. In a complex universe of qualification, due to market networks enlargement and food acculturation, private standard-setting organizations are developing as an institutionalized solution to global problems when international conventions are absent in the relevant domain as it is the case for standards pertaining to sustainability as well as it is for the very nature of origin property. They can be also a way around WTO rules limiting states' ability to enforce production requirements over the products they import and in this case can be supported by governmental bilateral agreements.

[1] Bibliographic references concerning the issues addressed in this point can be founded in the D9 and D12 reports (see also the final meeting presentations on the website).

The change in the governance of markets and in the competition regime among actors in food chains institutes several types of fora where products specifications and mode of production standards are debated and negotiated among various types of actors, private or governmental, scientific experts and NGO representatives, whether specialized or not. Producers, processors and retail firms, have strategic resources in play within quality fora, and engage in strategic behaviour known as forum shopping, and formalized by economists as a strategic trade-off between the cost of participation in a particular quality forum and the benefit (collective quality reputation) it provides. In the context of the global competition, a strategic challenge for firms and for GI systems collectively is to position themselves in the relevant quality forum or fora (or media universes) for claiming quality attributes. In other words, to position a firm or a product in the quality universes which drive marketing standards is to participate in quality forum(s) and to relate to standard-setting-organisation(s) (SSO), at different level of participation or membership. The present situation resulting from the TRIPs agreement offers potentiality for a multiplication of national or regional GI recognition and protection systems, contributing to the differentiation of the quality fora.

Sinergi has presented three alternative economic scenarios (see D9 and D12 reports) specifying the new international trade and competition regime, in regard of the position of GI identifiers as marketing tools for differentiate final products (how are organized the markets, what are the objectives of actors in organizing markets, how GI rules and juridical tools are used or not?). We called these scenarios: CONVERGENCE, DIVERGENCE, and PLURALITY. All of them borrow elements of the present situation. We have observed a diversity of GI products qualification processes on the global market and several contrasting GI based strategies. To define the third economic scenario (plurality), we hypothesise some consistency of that situation as equilibrium, while in the real world this plurality fuels no negligible tensions. We confront this hypothesis with: (1) the hypothesis of unification of the GI concept in the stakeholders representations and strategies, needing some convergence in the national competition laws, trademarks systems and GI protection doctrines; and (2) the hypothesis where consumers are changing their preferences, but do not recognize significant value to GI's as quality sign. The driving forces which influence the probability of occurrence of each of the three scenarios are not limited to the demand tendencies but are notably depending on the forms of the processes of standard setting, by private or public initiatives. Each scenario concerns both the future of GI (different conceptions of GIs) and the future of GI relation vis-à-vis other quality standards.

The first scenario is based on the idea that the process of acquiring value for origin is related to a particular convention of quality, which can translate as a whole in different contexts; it is why we call it "convergence". Convergence is on the vision of GI nature, it concerns policy makers but yet all actors of the value chain. In this vision, protected GIs are supposed to get a market premium in covering specific geographical quality and in addition they are supposed to absorb other high quality specifications, in significant extent. Diffusion of this quality paradigm is generally thought by its proponents in favour of the emergence and the development of new GI markets, if the products are able to benefit from the global demand and if they gather the conditions to access to large markets. In this perspective, the challenge for a convergent GI doctrine is to achieve in term of social value a shift from an inscription in the “aristocratic” cuisine to the new concerns for healthy, local, natural food, biodiversity, and social heritage preservation. Very likely, the convergence scenario needs an international organization of the GI producers’ interests. Convergence between GIs and other quality schemes linked with origin depends of the role of culture and power given to the producers (culture of products versus culture of enterprise).

Considering the functioning of GI systems, the development of private/collective assurance quality schemes is not incompatible with this scenario; depending on the degree of cooperation in the governance of the global value chains; even in the absence of a prescriptive administrative burden and facilities, these schemes can include collective deliberation of the producers to define the specificity of the product by code of practice (collective marks) and a public control when certification marks belong to a state agency. As ideal-type, this scenario does not oppose to open entry for producers reaching the conditions. But there is an efficiency trade-off between generality and specificity in quality system of certification.

While we can observe a certain convergence within GI policies justifications, we also observe that, in order to adapt to developing marketing strategies of differentiation, GI sui-generic legal systems tend to diversify the significance of the GI signs, as it is the case in the dualistic European system (PDO/PGI). As the marketed products on GI signs are heterogeneous, there is a trend to complicate GI classification systems, by classification marks within a type of GI (PGI *vs* PDO) and by distinguishing within GI according to the level of specificity (see typical product and local food). The second economic scenario considered corresponds to the hypothesis of a weakening of the prescriptive systems of GI protection, if they are unable to guaranty a coherent (readable) system of quality differentiation. Empirical studies show various situations regarding the success of GI systems to attract premium and to support durable local development according to the clarity of GI standards (and of the classification of individual marks inside a GI standard). In some cases, the collective aspects of the specific quality regulation can suffer from the scaling up of GI systems and markets, whether this stems from the GI system incapability to keep for collective quality control or from unreadable quality signalling system. Thus, in this scenario, private standards and competition laws are the factors dominating the market organisation. Others signs having some link with the consumers' representations of the notion of origin (ideas of local, tradition, nature…) can challenge the PDO/PGI system or other GI signalling systems. In the same way of confusing the standard for origin products, collective initiatives revalorising places of production and the link between consumption and places and seasons can contributes to weaken GI signs. They are in general coming from outside GIs communities, as for example the initiatives of the organic agriculture communities in the USA, even in Europe the action of Slowfood. So, there are several rationales to support or not the logic of this second scenario. It can be termed "divergence" in several senses: persistent discrepancy in the TRIPs negotiation, divergence of actors' conceptions of GI significance (including consumers, policy makers and media), divergence within quality qualification and certification/control systems; all of this weakening the origin as specific quality identifier. There are two issues to be distinguished: the GI standard itself (GI system level) and the GI type of sign amongst quality standards and labels.
Divergence scenario is based on a classic economic argument: proliferation of quality schemes will weaken the quality definition, because of the heterogeneity of the products and of the signs. May be, consumers will prefer for example organic to GI, or won't be able to differentiate products. So, it will make loose premium for producers. In contrast, in the plurality scenario, we suppose that several quality schemes can coexist, and that consumers are able to differentiate quality schemes. Divergence is when plurality is not a success, when exist too much heterogeneity of the GI products and competition within quality standards, and no visibility. It is possible to find, at the GI systems or specific markets level, elements of convergence (within quality representations) or of divergence. In the real world, there are a lot of different situations. For example, in coffee we have a lot of fair trade initiatives, and organic, for fresh products. It's too easy to say that diversity of quality standards weaken quality premium, because for consumers' expectations, region, products and initiatives are different. For each product, in each region, we don't really have a competition because very

often the industry or the retailers decide of the way they will use the coexisting quality schemes regarding consumers' expectations.

The third economic scenario is built considering how the diversity of the GI systems is presently developing and corresponds to the permanence of the diversity of GIs fora. Contrary to the first and second scenarios, here the diversity of the GIs products and signs is not an obstacle for the market recognition (at different premium levels) because that diversity is integrated in a diversified but functioning signalling *pluralistic* system. The third scenario is based on the hypothesis of the establishment of a functioning pluralistic system of market quality identifiers by public/private initiatives at different governance levels. Contrary to the second scenario based on the domination of private standards, the third one includes an important role to the collective initiatives. It assumes that GI, in the broad sense of the TRIPs agreement, keeps for its ability to structure markets. It supposes that "the market" (helped by the media…) is able to make distinctions within a proliferation of quality labelling signs, thus supporting a large variety of business models and thus of local development models. What is clearing the market is the media system, including all forms of diffusion of the consumers' experiences. Contrary to the first scenario the third one is not supposing a convergence of GI fora, but it suppose a workable diversity of GI visions which are distributed on a value scale resulting from the diversity of fora reputation and credibility. There is a circulation of different visions on GIs through media. Hybrid forums confront different types of local initiatives on quality based on origin. Including in UE, there are different consumer confidence models and perceptions of the quality schemes. And it is not easy to say if EU should keep GI scheme clear or integrate (convergence) aspects of other quality schemes, organic or fair trade for example. Part of that issue is how important is tradition for GI recognition. Supposing the plurality of quality schemes being market effective, effective development of GIs need some basic convergence; at least within fora supporting GI. With convergence, it comes an opening of the UE system to third countries, and thus the issue of the selection process and of the definition of convergent criteria. But, from this opening it necessarily results some plurality, because exist a lot of private initiatives at international level.
Even EU does not have so many rules to implement the code of practices (agreement on specifications) and to control the way producers and traders use the agreed code of practice. To have GIs becoming more organic or fair trade friendly, a model of the implementation of the code of practice is needed. There are several ways to introduce linkages between these sorts of standards: in the scheme (for all the GIs under that sign, e.g. the European logo), in the code of practice, regarding each product, or by using complementary marketing tools and private or public complementary standard. Organizing such combinations is forum specific. Complementarity with environmental norms is the same type of issue: one can consider that the introduction of environmental requirements in the code of practice guaranty positive impact on sustainable developpement, and so introduce convergence within quality schemes, while the others could say that environmental norms can better diffuse for themselves and for all products (not only for GIs), and this has nothing to do in the code of practice related with GI products specificity. One can say that the interest and originality of the GI standard is that each code of practice is unique. Thus the question is how to give general rules to pay attention to rural development or environmental issues when implementing a GI standard.

2.2 - International stakes on GIs, with an European perspective

A- Main issues

General stakes at the international level can be identified from Sinergi results[2].

- At the information system and research levels: questions about the kind of data or analysis that could be useful for the EU Commission in the international negotiations. While European action is oriented through the extension of art.23 to all products, UE is suspected of protectionism, and because GI products can be considered not so important in terms of overall trade, there is a need to focus on the impact of GI on international trade, and spillover for local areas.
    - Problems:
        - heterogeneity of GIs in Europe and lack of coherent complete database,
        - methodological difficulties to define economic results in terms of costs, prices and territorial impact.

- Support for the implementation of GIs in new countries (in the context of bilateral agreements and cooperation mechanisms):
    - no data on GIs in developing countries due to the novelty of the system and the incomplete implementation (but several international regional meetings with the main involved international agencies, WIPO and FAO),
    - Siner-gi has elaborated a strategic guide jointly with FAO

- Economic stakes
    - the economic weight of GI products in international trade should be evaluated more precisely
        - Problem: how to assess the weight of GI products not benefiting from a formalised scheme and the benefice of a plurality of signs?
    - improving legal protection (including definition, control, etc.) is linked to an evaluation of the damages caused to legitimate producers by misuses at the national and international scales (see the issue of extension and the "claw-back" claim for the European geographical indications).

- Relations between GIs and other qualification schemes
    - Organic, fair trade, biodiversity labels: integration in GIs, or addition to GIs? (See upper).

- Issues on GIs for EU:
    - internal issues:
        - improvement and unification of the national GI schemes (which is un way with the third party certification, but a very common implementation doctrine does not exist),
        - efficiency assessment as a tool to reach the objectives mentioned in the EC Regulation or in associated policies,
        - support for the implementation of the GI scheme in new Members

[2] See Erik Thevenot-Mottet in Brussels steering committee minutes (April 2008).

- external issues:
  - getting a better protection for European GIs in third countries,
  - convincing third countries to adopt a similar system and supporting them to implement it (allies for international negotiations),
  - promoting the concept of GIs as such as a quality sign, for the benefit of European GI products on export markets,
  - consensus on the GI concept and on the relative legal protection or coexistence between different concepts of GIs worldwide,
  - links between GI policies and other policies: on biodiversity, traditional knowledge, etc.,
  - national and international processes of registration, cross-registration, etc. Management of the EU register as a de facto international register if the WTO does not succeed in establishing soon a multilateral register open to all products.

B- International relations, and negotiation on GIs

The Doha round negotiation is continuing after the July 08 meeting fail. One group of countries (including EU) had asked for three intellectual property issues (TRIPS issues) to be part of the agenda, and to link them with Agriculture and NAMA modalities. Another group has opposed both the linking and the assertion that the subjects are ready for negotiations based on draft texts. Only one of these subjects was officially part of the Doha round of negotiations and accepted as part of the "single undertaking" in which all Doha round subjects form part of a single package, with "nothing agreed until everything is agreed": (i) the negotiation to create a multilateral register for geographical indications for wines and spirits. The other two subjects are officially "implementation" issues. Members differ over whether these are subjects for negotiation or not: (ii) "GI extension": a proposal to extend to other products the higher level of geographical indications protection now given to wines and spirits; (iii) "disclosure": requiring that patent applicants disclose the origin of genetic material and traditional knowledge used in their inventions, or alternative proposals[3].
Those advocating extension include Bulgaria, the EU[4], Guinea, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Morocco, Pakistan, Romania, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia and Turkey. Those opposing extension include Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Chinese Taipei and the United States. They

[3] The TRIPS Agreement requires a review of Article 27.3(b) which deals with patentability or non-patentability of plant and animal inventions, and the protection of plant varieties. Paragraph 19 of the 2001 Doha Declaration has broadened the discussion. It says the TRIPS Council should also look at the relationship between the TRIPS Agreement and the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, the protection of traditional knowledge and folklore. It adds that the TRIPS Council's work on these topics is to be guided by the TRIPS Agreement's objectives (Article 7) and principles (Article 8), and must take development issues fully into account. Proponents of a CBD-related amendment have traditionally included Brazil, India and Peru. Proponents of the protection extension and of the CBD issues linked their efforts explicitly in a "non-paper" dated 26 May 2008.

[4] The latest proposal from the EU is document TN/IP/W/11, circulated in June 2005. This calls for the TRIPS Agreement to be amended so that all products would be eligible for the higher level of protection in Article 23, and the exceptions in Article 24, together with the multilateral registration system currently being negotiated for wines and spirits.

argue that the existing (Article 22) level of protection is adequate[5]. They also reject the "usurping" accusation, arising from the extension proposal and the "claw back" list set up by the EU.
The attempt to reach a global agreement on the way to concluding the Doha Round by the end of July 2008 failed. But the three issues related to intellectual property were not discussed during the ministerial Conference. The fail is not a result of the disagreement on those issues, which was discussed during the conference under the coordination of the Norwegian Minister of foreign affairs (M. Gahr Støre). If some progress can be noticed on the first issue (the register), USA and other members (Argentina, Canada) refused to discus the issue of extension. Negotiations will resume in September and the TRIPS "modality" text proposed by more than 100 members[6] is on the table. In parallel, the WIPO is preparing Lisbon arrangement reform related to the register organisation. So are the current issues on the negotiation table.

In the last period, since the beginning of the Doha round (in 2001), bilateral agreements between EU (or USA or Canada) and various (developing) countries are also providing recognized GI products lists[7]. In this type of agreement, EU is looking to protect some products "phares" as Champagne, Cognac, Parmigiano-Regiano…, but also these agreements orient cooperation funds for development (rural development notably), domain in which NGOs on one side and States on the other side are in competition. While bilateral agreements can be efficient in term of protection, political issues on GI integrated policies are not in the debate.

In considering convergence issue, there are three categories of countries: (i) countries supporting the interest of GI, but with likely different motivations, (ii) few sceptic countries on the interest of GI (for ideological reasons or to maintain a bargaining power), (iii) virgin countries, for which the TRIPS agreement in the WTO framework is a new opportunities. Cooperation and the opening of the European GI register are in this last situation at stake. We observe a rapidly growing number of GI applications in the world, with heterogeneity in terms of requirements and control procedures[8].

[5] The draft text for extension proposes that members "shall provide" that their national authorities will consult the register, and that any product listed in the register will be assumed a legitimate GI "absent evidence to the contrary." Traditional opponents such as Argentina, Australia and the United States in the past have urged that the register be voluntary and have raised concerns about it applying to them automatically. Also in the GI register proposal, exceptions of certain product names from GI registration due to their 'generic' nature, as allowed by Article 24 of TRIPS, would be allowed "only if substantiated." The GI extension would apply to all products and would retain the exceptions found under TRIPS Article 24.

[6] Albania, Brazil, China, Colombia, Ecuador, EC, Island, India, Indonesia, Kirghizstan, Liechtenstein, Macedonia, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Suisse, Thailand, Turkey, ACP and African Groups.

[7] Ongoing applications: bilateral agreement on mutual recognition with third countries: 10 products with China; 2 with India; 46 others (1 from Switzerland).

[8] For example, the protection of Geographical Indications for Goods is an emerging topic in India with 116 applications received in January, 2008, out of which 40 geographical indications have been registered; this shows a wide implementation of the recent legal framework built especially for the protection of geographical indications. The Geographical Indications of Goods Act (1999) entered into force in September 2003; 15 applications were filed in 2004, 26 in 2005, 31 in 2006 and 37 for the first half of 2007. Around 30 applications are in agricultural/horticulture goods; 35 in textile and embroidery; and around 35 in other handicraft, whether of wood, stone, leather, painting and few in other products like oil, soap, and incense stick…There is one foreign GI application on Pisco wine.

C- Conclusions

Three main issues[9] can be considered for European strategy.

1. GI political economy has changed due to the trend to differentiate services within food market and the emergence of new development policies focused on biodiversity and local resources; and on the rural areas. These two changes raise issues on policies integration around GI standard as rural development and biodiversity and traditional knowledge protection tools. How to regulate GI standards, in which extend and at which level of the qualification process, taking in account rural development or biodiversity issues? The first finality is to be linked, en general, with the millennium goals and notably poverty mitigation; and in particular in the EU, it is in relation with the Rural Development Reglement framework. The second finality concerns the interaction between TRIPS and CDB (disclosure issue). But it concerns also the relation between the IG standard specifications and the way it is implemented in relation with private/collective standards as related to organics, fair trade and environmental collective and public concerns. The issue of policies integration is to be contrasted at the different levels, international, national (or European) GI scheme, and local GI systems. The first levels are concerned by setting regulative provisions for scheme design, while at GI production and marketing system level rules (codes of practices and operational rules) integrative issues concern the management of territorial resources.

2. In the new competition regime, forum shopping within quality fora leads to a strategic impact of the national (European) regulation (provision for developing quality schemes). This has implications for doctrines on Intellectual property and also on implementation tools conception. Generally observers oppose two doctrines: binding registration schemes and certification marks with the persistence of a cross Atlantic debate around GI doctrine. But, while public action was limited in the past to the legal protection of GI, new rural development policies and collective initiatives, both in the North and in the South are using differently the opportunity to linked GI with rural development objectives. New justifications for GI support policies have developed with the recognition of positive impact of GI on territorial public goods, including biodiversity.

3. The positioning of Europe as one of the leading actor in the building of the GI international framework, and the change in the GIs economy introduces new issues to be considered as GI for non food products. Internal implementation of the GI regulation, both for European and non European products, and the international cooperation with developing countries thus appear as linked issues.

2.3 - GIs policy, with an European perspective

Why GI policy and why integrated GIs policies?

Which scope for the public intervention?

Public policies are in response of the so-called market failures (which are defaults in markets organisation or, in other words, institutional failures), and they are legitimated (or justified) by the finality to obtain some public good effect within some relevant scale. Thus the policies design is related to social finalities and to the social distribution of the capacities to

[9] See the conclusions presented in the final meeting by Gilles Allaire and the D12 report under the direction of Giovanni Belletti and Andrea Marescotti.

implement it. The role of public institutions (at different level) is much wider than making a (good) law, translating the finalities in coherent ways, and linking public expenditure with public good return. It implies implementation issues, and the support to collective actors' capacities to undertake corresponding collective/public initiatives (actions). This perspective implies to take in account different aspects of the value chains or of the local economies and not only internal aspects of the setting up of GI schemes. It also implies to take in account the different dimensions of the origin products valorisation processes.
The first finality for GI regulation as intellectual collective property right is in terms of competition (protecting mode of production as collective creations (and heritages) and avoid consumers misleading), in relation with what can be termed signalling failures. While in the contrary to organics or fair trade standards GI is an international statutory standard, this international GI standard provided by the TRIPs agreement does not include specifications related with other finalities. But it has to be consistent with other international objectives included or not in the OMC framework. Others finalities, as to sustainable development, rural capabilities development, traditional knowledge and biodiversity preservation, health and food security, can be put in relation with GI products codification regulation (not only the protecting GI scheme per se), for which several legal system exist worldwide; and to specific territorial returns which accounts as territorial public good. Different scales are concerned. At the local level, GI systems production in the measure they impact the local population resources and economy, can enhance collective capabilities and welfare and provide environmental public services. At the European level, for example, successful and positive sustainable territorial origin products systems of production can be seen contributing to social cohesion, and to the global European competitiveness. For success in that dimensions integrative policy is needed not only related to failure in competition regime, but also to failure regarding sustainable development aspects. That introduces subsidiary aspects and the identification of such types of failures. Interest for GI protection is that the market is providing premium price for the specific reputation conveyed by the origin quality signal, and that this premium entails pecuniary spill over effects. But GI protection scheme by itself is not enough to guaranty the existence of a premium, the collective reputation of the product have to be constituted in itself on the market and maintaining through the behaviours of the various actors of the system, in a context where conflicts of interest exist. Failures at this level are controlled by rules at the GI system level, but which need various types of public support. That raises two issues: (i) how to integrate different policy actors around a GI product strategy? (ii) How to get the right mix of public and private initiative?

From these general remarks it follows some observations and general recommendations:
• Not always the protection by a GI scheme (standard) is the best way of reaching certain collective (territorial) and public aims; GI protection benefit can be captured by the more powerful actors and to the detriment of territorial public good provision.
• Necessity for subsidiary, within a common implementation doctrine,
• Importance of participatory issue. More the particular standard specifications for a given GI products are generic and not linked with specific resource, more the agricultural raw material producers can be found as excluded of the setting of the system (some PGI examples can be founded in Europe, where producers are not always aware of the existence of this procedure).
• Assessment of GI public policies: need for evaluation

Legal framework concerning GI registration and protection is only a part of a policy set; all the GI product valorisation process is in some extent supported by public interventions, in order to maximise positive effects, and avoid pitfalls. Thus, we should put attention to a comprehensive "integrated GI policy" aiming at supporting positive influences of GI

valorisation on local sustainable dynamics (economic, social and environmental) and fronting possible negative effects. Such policy is multi-scaled and needs to involve regional/local authorities. But it would avoid to charging GI with too many roles or functions, and must also consider negative effects.
Setting up a good framework for GI products development is a complex and multidimensional matter. There are different levels of intervention (European, national, regional, local), including external levels (e.g. technical cooperation, International organisations); and different ways of intervention (direct by public administration or indirect (supporting intermediate institutions, as collective, professional or private organisations). The point is to know to what extent and to what conditions GI systems may produce valuable positive externalities, and what is the role of public policies to get GI systems providing such positive externalities or public services at the right level. The issue is not only the existence but the effectiveness of comprehensive policy.

Identified Critical areas in the light of GI systems sustainability[10]*:*

- GI POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK: existence and effectiveness of a GI (public) comprehensive policy and clear and accessible legal protection regulation and control system. Issue of control, certification and trust of consumers (problems of costs). To ensure that legal framework can be relevant even for small products (flexibility of the system).
- RULES-SETTING PROCESS: Clear definition of rules. Actors' active participation (not only supply chain actors), product *proudness*, information, capacities, empowerment. Inclusion of the different stakeholders' categories involved. Conflicts regulation procedures.
- SETTING OF THE AREA DELIMITATION: big versus small, which criteria?
- ROLE OF LOCAL RESOURCES: taking into account the need of protecting local (human and material) resources in the Code of Practices.
- ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE: network building, collective organisation with democratic participation rules, allowing regulating the evolution of the GI system (innovation and technology, market changes, new firms in the system). Cultural initiatives to allow producers confident in cooperation. Considering the participatory issue, they are obstacles for the cooperation between producers, depending from social contexts; it's important that they know the profit they will obtain by participating.
- HORIZONTAL-VERTICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE GI BENEFITS: access to GI by firms, bargaining power inside the GI system.
- ENTRY BARRIERS and EXCLUSION ISSUES: the GI standard can be too much costly or non adapted for local markets or for traditional products.
- MARKET: product's reputation, « real » link to territory, relevant markets. Retail sector concentration. Fair competition. Market unbalances.
- CONTROL and CERTIFICATION SYSTEM. It is important to see all aspects of the protection, control and certification system to trust in the GI legal system. The question of certification and control costs is also important for the credibility of the protection system regarding financial capacities of small producers, namely if you

[10] See D12 report.

introduce requirements on sustainability on the code of practice, or as success factors. The credibility is a combination of the general setting and the situation for each product.

- CONSUMERS AND CITIZENS: information and solidarity between producers and consumers (local consumers, distant consumers). Specific information campaigns to consumers.
- COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY: GI legal (« formal ») protection to be seen as one of a set of tools to valorise Origin Products. Integration of different tools to attain the objective. Rural development extended strategies and spillover effects at local level.

2.4 - The European quality forum: which implication for GI implementation doctrine

By some aspects, European products, marks, quality standards, included PDO/PGI, benefit of a collective quality reputation, which is sustained by the cultural dimensions (European heritage), and in which public quality regulation and doctrine play a significant role. In this sense we can speak of a European quality forum. The strengthening and the extension of the European quality forum, and even the maintaining in a top position of that forum, are resulting of a large mix of public and private actions. The (private) investment in reputation and the worldwide extension of the protection of some products with a very high reputation and European gastronomic culture play a role in building the collective reputation. The performance of the European regulation and of the national systems of implementation are also at stake in maintaining the reputation of European quality signals, and we seen here a trade-off in terms of transaction costs between generic and specific IG standards. But, a complementary main stake is in how Europe considers Third countries IG products in implementing the EU510/2006 Regulation, and here also trade-off can be stressed. Within this emerging international GI framework, the EU regulation is assuming a growing role. In spite of - or rather because of -, the absence of a multilateral register, EU 510 constitutes a goal for many producers in many countries. The European register is an important reference, even for producers in those countries which oppose EU positions on GIs in international negotiations[11].

Although third country registration was already possible under former EU regulation 2081/92, an important modification was included in the EU regulation 510/2006, as third countries applicants may apply at the level of EU Commission directly, not necessarily through their governments. The modalities required are the same as intra-EU applications, plus the proof that the GI is protected in its country of origin. Sui generis protection is not a requisite, but it must be TRIPS compliant. Certifying bodies are submitted to the same norms as for European GIs. The new regulation is stimulating third country applications. On September 27, 2007, “café de Colombia” became the first non EU product to be granted the EU recognition as a PGI. The SINER-GI set of national and case studies have identified the access to EU market as one of the main driving forces in the national dynamics regarding GIs. EU regulation will therefore not be a model, but rather one of the main references, in a GI world with several and probably diverse quality forums. What kind of GI model is and will be promoted through the EU regulation?

[11] On this point see Denis Sautier intervention in Brussels meeting (April 2008) and D12 report.

In this context, several possibilities exist as to the future relation of EU510 with third countries applications. How will the EU handle the probable increase in number of applications?

- EU can set requirements such as a strong control plan. The new regulation (art.10 and 11) foresees that for third countries, the control of the code of practices can be done through competent authorities which can be either official institutions or a certifying body as defined by regulation n°882/2004. It also states that these controls must take place before the marketing of the product. Still a question may be raised as to where the control will apply: at the entry point into the EU market or in the places of production and processing. Concerning the guarantees of objectivity and impartiality of the controls, the EN 45 001 norm is now required from all certifying bodies, either European or from third countries (art 11).
- Will the in depth examination of the applications be conducted in the long run, by EC commission services or through the EU Food quality agency?
- Will the applications be received and treated independently from other international policies, or will it be linked to some initiatives on Policy dialogue and deliberation with the third countries concerned (which co-ordination with DG Trade or Europaid?)[12].

On aspect of the building of GI new doctrine regard the development of expertise. In this regard, SINER-GI project has built a large network of scholars and associated researchers worldwide, involved and interested in discussing and searching the matter further. This network has a strong potential to bring inputs into several follow-up activities such as:

- Observatory of GIs worldwide,
- Harnessing a policy dialogue on GI with participation of economic and civil society actors,
- Implementation tools building (in the sequence of the SINER-GI strategic guide on GIs in collaboration with FAO),
- Assessment tools and strengthening assessment capacity (for in-country monitoring of GI effects)[13].

Finally, there is also a need to seek more coordination between member states and EC levels, in order to enhance the consistency of EU-driven GI related international policies and initiatives.

The role of the EU regulation as quality forum raises new issues in regard of that regulation: the specifications regarding processed products, in particular traditional products, and regarding non food products, as handcraft… The question is about the way to control the supply chain. The question is in relation with GIs product evaluation, which is raised at national but also at international level. Some similar products in some countries are PDO and in other a PGI depending on cases, while it's difficult to justify in particular at WTO level, but even at European level. High requirements can be a sort of entry barriers, if the only few products are accepted within the European register. In the reverse, large registration within the PDO system present the risk to weaken the European quality scheme.

[12] For example, the Santiago FAO-SINERGI joint meeting on Geographical indications in Latin America (Santiago, Dec. 11-14, 2007) with officials from 10 countries, showed a strong demand and potential for a policy forum on management of GI and linking GIs to rural and local development.

[13] On the assessment of the Sinergi cases studies, see Dominique Barjolle interventions in the Brussels meeting (April 2008) and final meeting (June 2008), and D9 report.

3. Project assessment and elements to prepare further research programmes and the future of SINER-GI network

While the SINER-GI project has achieved a number of results, both scientific and "practical", some limits and needs for future research have to be considered. As the previous EU-FP6 Dolphins project, the SINER-GI project relied on monographic work studies to compare national protection schemes, and studies on products and value chains to compare production systems and collective strategies. This work was engaged both to understand the specific mechanisms regulating GI systems (in particular by elaborating typologies), and to develop indicators of "success" for these systems and impact indicators with respect of sustainable development principles.

On the first aspect, analysis of protection devices and development initiatives on geographical indications in the non-EU countries was of great interest to a renewal of scientific knowledge on this issue. Several aspects can be particularly highlighted:
- A better understanding of the diversity of institutional situations,
- A finding of a dynamic increase of initiatives for the promotion of GIs in most countries,
- A finding of important potential for GIs development because of the richness and diversity of quality products linked to geographical origin (diversity of breeds, vegetal species, and local know-how),
- A renewal of questions on the European protection devices in terms of issues related to the demand for recognition by third countries, and diffusion of various protection systems in the world,
- Recognition of the opportunities that origin products offer to local process of development.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding the good results obtained, not all the research issues on GIs have been sufficiently explored, in socio-economic as well in cultural and environmental issues. The size of the field to analyse, the diversity of situations and the rapid evolution of the diffusion and settlement of protection schemes and emergence of initiatives ask for pursuing and deepening the study on potential GIs role as a tool to improve valorisation of local specific food systems (as local culture, biodiversity, landscapes, preservation of traditional productions models, etc.). A continuation of the vein of the SINER-GI project could provide useful results, including comparison with other "quality assurance schemes". But other perspectives, comparing rural areas more than a specific type of initiative, and including the analysis of the diffusion of various type of initiatives could provide another type of results necessary to the evaluation of rural development.

On the second aspect, SINER-GI contributed to an analysis of GI impact factors which must precede the construction of indicators. However, modelling of GI impact (or of other quality schemes) is still difficult, because it not only depends on their dissemination over an area, but also on the efficiency of economic channels (or value chains) and the interest of consumers for quality questions (willingness to pay). Moreover, the perspective of sustainable development can not be understood without being specifically linked to legitimate and recognized objectives from which impact indicators might be proposed. While the comparison allowed building a general framework, the data collected by the programme are not sufficient if quantitative assessment is an objective. There is a clear need for further researches to get the impacts assessment for a quantitative representative sample of geographical indications systems. This could be derived from the data base collected by SINER-GI or from case studies done recently by FAO (or others projects). But additional data is needed in relation to the diffusion of the various food quality assurance schemes. This prospect also requires

incorporating extensive data on rural areas economies. The assessment of rural development policies is now of great concern at a time when assessment procedures of public policies are needed and while Europe is setting a strategy for the evaluation of rural development. To carry out a comprehensive study on the comparative contribution of GIs and of other quality schemes to sustainable agriculture and rural development, more comprehensive data is required on the diffusion of the corresponding systems (and this type of data is not collected by statistical systems (UE asked EUROSTAT to get this information; but it depends on member states).

There is also clearly a need to elaborate best practices to set up, implement and achieve a GI initiative for a given product, as well as GI protection scheme at institutional level. In developing countries especially, the weaknesses of public support and institutions are very high and in some cases, there is a risk to have more negative than positive effects, only caused by wrong decisions at the moment of the registration procedure. While a GI product is not a novelty, establishment of a code of practices lead to some innovation, and the collective organisation and the building-up of the rules are innovation. That introduces need for focused research about the role of various actors playing possibly an active role during the registration procedure. The other statement is to put forward deliberative democracy argument as approach to governance in a highly competitive and differentiated market where different quality schemes and producers strategies compete. There is a need for policies (and research on policies) that balances market stakes and quality of life/RD objectives through type of policies and regulations based on discussion.

Mixing socio-economic perspective with agronomy, zootechnical sciences and technology (which were not within the competence of Siner-gi) should also allow the opportunity to develop a specific research on GIs code of practices which need undoubtedly to be led.. Indeed, in the current context, a study on the conditions of development and impacts of "quality assurance schemes" generally seemed relevant. The emergence of standards combining private (volunteers) and public dimensions is raised by many authors as a major feature of the transformation of international trade regimes (organic, GI, fair trade, quality standards of European distribution networks…). *A measurement of the diffusion of such approaches in European trade, and an analysis of induced changes in markets regulation is undoubtedly a stake for future research programs.*

Following Siner-gi results, three research tracks and topics can be considered:
- New research specifically devoted to the management of GI.
- The dissemination of the various assurance schemes (including national and European quality signs) within various food industries and rural spaces and the impact of their implementation on rural development indicators.
- The role and share of the various assurance quality schemes in the international food trade, and more precisely in European import, export, and local trade.

Dissemination activities

Dissemination activities include publication of scientific papers, training and expertise. Researchers involved in the Sinergi case studies are free to publish the results in scientific papers; yet some papers are published and communications were presented in relevant scientific meetings (agricultural economics, rural sociology, regional sciences and anthropology), see annex; a scientific panel will be submitted for the next IAAE congress (Bejing, 2009). A scientific workshop gathering PhD students was organized by the consortium members and associated researchers (June 2007), a second meeting will be

organized in the end of this year, in the aim to enhance the scientific valorisation of the cases studies. A book is in preparation to present the comparative analysis of the case studies and the scenarios, drawing from the workpackages reports (D9, D12).
During the time of the project, in addition of the planned activities, some Sinergi consortium members (AGRIDEA and CIRAD) set up international training programmes (2007, 2008) directed towards people implementing IG standards in new countries. Training activities in which are engaged several of the Sinergi teams are an important aspect of the dissemination; training models and tools can be diffused via the website (if maintained). In the scope of the Sinergi project (WP8, D11), was designed a strategic guide, in collaboration with the FAO[14] ("LINKING PEOPLE, PLACES AND PRODUCTS, a guide for sustainable agrofood systems based on Geographical Indications.") to address the main questions faced by development actors who seek to identify, define, and protect products with a quality linked to geographical origin, as well as to establish the complex set of elements for their sustainable development; this guide is directed to rural development specialists, from the public or private sectors, as well as to policy makers, rural leaders and trainers.
To further dissemination activities and utilisation of research results from SINERGI project, the consortium members have decided at the Steering Committee of June 24, 2008, a joint agreement for a period of three years. This notably implies the maintaining of the website and of the electronic database on GI products created in the scope of the project. The maintaining of the website is not only and issue of money and human resources (the consortium is expecting to find), but also the issue of its utility behind the access of the results of ancient research projects (Dolphins and now Sinergi). An electronic version of the guide could be a persistent interest of that website, which could be completed by training tools (from training programmes in which Sinergi members are involved). An electronic newsletter should be the mean to maintain active the website. The maintaining of the database is another issue, because actualisation or extension of this database entails important costs, the ambition in this domain has to be limited. This database (which will age rapidly) will be a minimum alive if used, this could be either by the commission services (this perspective should be assessed) and by the experts network which de facto arises from the Sinergi consortium, but certainly this perspective need some organisation, which will be discussed in the framework of the agreement between the Sinergi consortium members covering the new period.

[14] Programme on Quality Linked to Geographical Origin (Website: www.foodquality-origin.org**).** A two days joint meeting (Sinergi & FAO) was organized in Roma in January 2008, with the participation of the Sinergi PAB members and of many of international organisations concerned by GIs, for extended exchanges on the role in rural sustainable development dynamics of on initiatives valorising quality based on origin, started from the presentation of cases studies conducted in scope of Sinergi or the FAO programmes. Analysis in depth of the cases studies results was carry out with the participation of stakeholders in regional meeting, in Budapest (October 2007) and Santiago of Chile (December 2007), the last one being mixed with a regional FAO meeting. See the proceedings on Sinergi or FAO websites. A book will is to be published in Spanish (FAO/CEDAL) including Latina America Sinergi cases studies.

Final activity report ANNEXES

Research Teams

INRA, Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, France

CIRAD, Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement, France

DSE – UNIFI, Università degli Studi di Firenze – Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Italy

AGRIDEA, Association Suisse pour le Conseil en Agriculture - Service Romand de Vulgarisation Agricole, Switzerland

UNEW, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, United Kingdom

WU, Wageningen University, Netherlands

LU, University of Latvia, Latvia

UNIPR – DSE, Università degli Studi di Parma – Dipartimento di Studi Economici e Quantitativi, Italy

ENITAC, École Nationale d'Ingénieurs des Travaux Agricoles de Clermont-Ferrand, France

ORIGIN, Organisation for an International Geographical Indications Network, Belgium - Switzerland

UNED, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Project co-ordination
Bertil Sylvander, INRA (2005-2007)
Gilles Allaire, INRA (2007-2008)

SINER-GI scientific productions

SINER-GI scientific reports

D1 – GI legal and institutional issues
Editor: Erik Thévenod-Mottet (AGRIDEA)

D2 – GI Social and Economic Issues
Editors: Andrea Marescotti and Giovanni Belletti (DSE-UNIFI)

D3 – Conceptual synthesis
Editors: Bertil Sylvander and Gilles Allaire (INRA Toulouse)

D4 – Proceedings of the International Meeting on GIs diversity and impacts
Editor: Talis Tisenkopfs (University of Latvia)

D5 – Electronic database on GI products
Editors: Erik Thévenod-Mottet (AGRIDEA), Bertil Sylvander (INRA Toulouse), Frederic Wallet (INRA Toulouse)

D6 – Report on case study methodology
Editor: Hielke van der Meulen (University of Wageningen)

D7 – Critical check-list for impacts assessment
Editor: Hielke van der Meulen (University of Wageningen)

D8 – In depth case studies

- Pico Duarte Coffee from Dominican Republic
  Giovanni Belletti (DSE-UNIFI), Andrea Marescotti (DSE-UNIFI), Franck Galtier (CIRAD)
- Basmati Rice from India and Pakistan
  Delphine Marie-Vivien (CIRAD), Georges Giraud (ENITAC)
- Rooibos Tea from South Africa
  Estelle Bienabe (CIRAD), Dirk Troskie (Western Cape Department of Agriculture)
- Jin Hua Ham from China
  Frederic Wallet (INRA Toulouse), Bertil Sylvander (INRA Toulouse), Guihong Wang (University of Toulouse / INRA), Yafan Sun (Yangzhou University)
- Pampa beef from Argentina
  Marcelo Champredonde (INTA Bordenave), François Casabianca (INRA Corte)
- Gaúcho Pampa da Campanha Meridional Meat from Brazil
  Claire Cerdan (CIRAD, UMR Innovation, Montpellier / UFSC Florianópolis), Delphine Vitrolles (University of Lyon 2 / CIRAD Montpellier), John Wilkinson (UFRRJ -Universidade Rural Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro), Luis

Otavio Pimentel (UFSC - Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis)

- Kajmak cheese from Serbia
  Marguerite Paus (ETH Zurich), Magali Estève (AGRIDEA)
- Florida Oranges from United States
  Elizabeth Barham (University of Missouri-Columbia), Sarah Bowen (University of Missouri-Columbia), Anna Perret (AGRIDEA), Erik Thévenod-Mottet (AGRIDEA)
- Blueberry Bleuet from Canada
  Anna Perret (AGRIDEA), Erik Thévenod-Mottet (AGRIDEA)
- Chontaleno cheese from Nicaragua
  Filippo Arfini (University of Parma), Sabrina Cernicchiaro (University of Parma), Maria Cecilia Mancini (University of Parma), Stefano Magagnoli (University of Parma), Anna Chiara Matteo (University of Parma), Emilio J. Lopez (University of Juigalpa)
- Tequila from Mexico
  Hielke S. van der Meulen (Wageningen University), Sarah Bowen (University of Missouri-Columbia)
- Paprika Kolocsa from Hungary
  Talis Tisenkopfs (Latvia University), Gilles Allaire (INRA Toulouse), Barna Kovacs (Corvinus University of Budapest), Mathieu Ansaloni (INRA Toulouse)

D9 – Synthesis and scenarios. Analysis built on Case Study reports
Editors: Gilles Allaire (INRA Toulouse), Dominique Barjolle, Talis Tisenkopfs

D10 – Proceedings of the Meeting on policy recommendations
Editors: Angela Tregear (UNED), Frederic Wallet (INRA Toulouse)

D11 – Material for GI implementation & assessment strategic guide
Editor: Filippo Arfini (University of Parma)

D12 – GI Strategies and policy recommendations
Editors: Angela Tregear (UNED), Andrea Marescotti (UNIFI), Giovanni Belletti (UNIFI)

SINER-GI, Final meeting Scientific papers

- John WILKINSON (UFRRJ), Claire CERDAN (CIRAD UMR Innovation – USFC) "A Brazilian perspective on GIs"
- Estelle BIENABE (CIRAD-UMR Innovation), Cerkia BRAMLEY (University of Pretoria), Delphine MARIE-VIVIEN (CIRAD-UMR Innovation), Dirk TROSKIE (University of Pretoria) "Assessing the merits of protecting well known origin-based products with increasing export demand through GIs: discussion based on the Basmati and the Rooibos cases"
- Anna PERRET, Erik THEVENOD-MOTTET (AGRIDEA) "A New World for GIs: the stakes on major origin products in North America"
- Franck GALTIER (CIRAD-UMR Innovation), Giovanni BELLETTI (University of Florence), Andrea MARESCOTTI (University of Florence) "Are Geographical Indications a way to "decommodify" markets of raw materials? Some insights from the example of a coffee GI"

- Thierry LINCK (INRA-LRDE), Magali ESTEVE (AGRIDEA), Dominique BARJOLLE (AGRIDEA), Rémy BOUCHE (INRA-LRDE) "Advantages, potentials and limits of GI protection for farm-cheese production in mountainous area, examples from Cotija cheese (Mexico) and Livno cheese (Bosnia-Herzegovina)"
- Estelle BIENABE (CIRAD-UMR Innovation), Cerkia BRAMLEY, Dirk TROSKIE, Johann KIRSTEN (University of Pretoria) "The move towards geographical indication protection within the Rooibos industry: a case in point for harnessing the geographical indication potential in South Africa"
- Marguerite PAUS (IED – ETH Zurich) "Geographical Indications in Transition countries: governance, vertical integration and territorial impacts. Illustration with case studies from Serbia"
- Marcelo CHAMPREDONDE (Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria), François CASABIANCA (INRA-LRDE) "Opposite interests and Institutional blockades as factors that impede the construction of a GI. Analysis from the case of the Argentinean Pampean beef"
- Hélène ILBERT (UMR Moisa, Montpellier), Michel PETIT (IAMM) "Geographical indications: International Conflicts and Challenges"
- Denis SAUTIER (CIRAD-UMR Innovation), Pascale MOITY-MAIZI (Montpellier Sup'Agro-UMR Innovation) "Relevance and challenges of geographical indication protection for emblematic origin based products in Western and Central Africa"
- Laurence BERARD, Philippe MARCHENAY (CNRS, ''Terroir Resources – Cultures, Customs, and Societies'') "Local products and Geographical Indications: taking into account the local knowledge and biodiversity"
- Dwijen RANGNEKAR (Warwick University) "Protecting Geographical Indications: Club Goods and the Dilemmas of Collective Action"

Plan for using and disseminating the knowledge

Section 1 - Exploitable knowledge and its Use

Exploitable Knowledge (description)	**Exploitable product(s) or measure(s)**	**Sector(s)**of application	Timetable for commercial use	Patents or other IPR protection	**Owner&** Other Partner(s) involved

Not relevant in the short term.

Section 2 – Dissemination of knowledge

Planned /actual Dates	Type	Type of audience	Countries addressed	Size of audience	Partner responsible /involved
Early 2009	GI strategic guide with FAO	GI stakeholders	Several countries (in particular developing countries)	Unknown (more than 100)	UNIPR (P8)
January 2009	PhD seminar	PhD students and researchers	Students from about 10 countries	40 persons	CIRAD (P2)
Spring 2009	Teaching session	GI stakeholders	Stakeholders from European and developing countries	20 persons	CIRAD (P2) / AGRIDEA (P4)
August 2009	Organization of a scientific session on GIs at the IAAE conference, in Beijing	Researchers in Agriculture Economics	Researchers from many countries	1000 persons	ENITAC (P9)
From the end of the project	Newsletters and legal and technical assistance	Global network of GI producers	Several countries in the world	Several hundreds of producers	ORIGIN (P10)

Section 3 - Publishable results

Result description (product(s) envisaged, functional description, main advantages, innovations)	1/ WP5 Case-study Report: Pico Duarte Coffee (Dominican Republic) 2/ WP6 D9 Report 3/ WP8 D11 Report
Possible market applications (sectors, type of use ..) or how they might be used in further research (including expected timings)	No market applications
Stage of development (laboratory prototype, demonstrator, industrial product...)	Draft
Collaboration sought or offered (manufacturing agreement, financial support or investment, information exchange, training, consultancy, other)	None

Collaborator details (type of partner sought and task to be performed)	
Intellectual property rights granted or published	None
Contact details	1/ Prof. Andrea Marescotti - DSE-UNIFI (Italy). E-mail: andrea.marescotti@unifi.it 2/ Gilles Allaire – INRA Toulouse (France) E-mail: allaire@toulouse.inra.fr 3/ Prof. Filippo Arfini – DES – UNIPR (Italy). E-mail: filippo.arfini@unipr.it

Published papers and contributions to scientific meetings until August 2008

- Allaire G., 2007. Les figures patrimoniales du marché. *Économie appliquée,* Tome LX, n°3, pp121-156.
- Chikazunga D., Biénabe E., Louw A. "Determinants of small scale farmers' participation in restructured food markets in South Africa: the case of the tomato sector" *XIIth Congress of the European Association of Agricultural Economists, EAAE 2008 Congress*, Ghent, Belgium, August 26-29, 2008
- Galtier F., Belletti G., Marescotti A., (2008) "Are Geographical Indications a way to "decommodify" the coffee market?", *XIIth Congress of the European Association of Agricultural Economists, EAAE 2008 Congress*, Ghent, Belgium, August 26-29, 2008
- Giraud G. (2008) Range and Limit of Geographical Indication Scheme: the Case of Basmati Rice from Punjab, Pakistan, *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, vol. 11, Issue 1, February, pp 51-76.
- Marie-Vivien D., 2008. From Plant Variety Definition to Geographical Indication Protection: A Search for the Link Between Basmati Rice and India/Pakistan. The Journal of World Intellectual Property, 1747-1796.
- Paus M. (2008) "Geographical Indications in transition countries: Governance, Vertical Integration and Territorial Impact. Illustration with case studies from Serbia". *IAMO forum 2008 "Agri-food Business: Global Challenges – Innovative solutions"*. Halle, Germany, June 25-27 2008.
- Sylvander B, Allaire G., Belletti G., Marescotti A., Thevenod-Mottet E., Barjolle D., Tregear A., 2006. Les dispositifs français et européens de protection de la qualité et de l'origine dans le contexte de l'OMC : justifications générales et contextes nationaux, *Revue canadienne des sciences régionales*, Vol.29, N°1
- Tisenkopfs, T. (2007) "Saldie pipari". *Rīgas Laiks*, 2007., Nr. 10., 24-30. lpp. (*Sweet pepper: Research experiences of Hungarian paprika case study*, in Latvian)

- Reviron S., Tseelei E-A. "Which collective organizational pattern for geographical indications dominated by a leading processor? Similarities between case-studies from Mongolia and Switzerland" *XIIth Congress of the European Association of Agricultural Economists, EAAE 2008 Congress*, Ghent, Belgium, August 26-29, 2008

- Vermeulen H., Biénabe E. "What about the food 'quality turn' in South Africa? Focus on the organic movement development" *105th EAAE Seminar 'International Marketing and International Trade of Quality Food Products'*, Bologna, Italy, March 8-10, 2007

Strategic Guide (FAO, Sinergi)

LINKING PEOPLE, PLACES AND PRODUCTS

CONTENTS

Workpackage list

WP No	WP title	Lead contractor No	Start month	End month	Deliverable No
1	Legal and institutional issues	AGRIDEA	1	12	D1
2	Social and economic issues	DSE-UNIFI	1	12	D2
3	Conceptual synthesis	INRA	13	18	D3, D4
4	Methodology and selection procedure	WU	14	26	D6, D7
5	Case study analysis	CIRAD	20	31	$D8_{(1...8)}$
6	Synthesis and scenarios	INRA	27	33	D9
7	Strategies and policy recommendations	UNED	31	38	D10, D12
8	Communication and dissemination	INRA	1	38	D5, D11

Deliverables List

Delive-rable No	Deliverable title	WP n°	Lead participant	Assistants
D1	Report on legal and institutional issues	1	AGRIDEA	INRA, CIRAD, ORIGIN
D2	Report on social and economic issues	2	DSE-UNIFI	AGRIDEA, LU, UNIPR, ENITAC
D3	Report on conceptual synthesis	3	INRA	UNEW, UNED, CIRAD
D4	Proceedings of the meeting on GIs development	3	LU	DES-UNIFI, CIRAD
D5	GI World wide database on-line	8	AGRIDEA	INRA
D6	Report on case study methodology	4	WU	UNEW, UNED, CIRAD
D7	Critical check-list for impacts assessment	4	WU	UNEW, CIRAD
D8	Case study reports	5	CIRAD	All partners
D9	Report on synthesis and scenarios	6	INRA	AGIRDEA, LU
D10	Proceedings of the meeting on policy recommendations	7	UNED	INRA, DES-UNIFI, UNEW, ORIGIN
D11	GI implementation & assessment strategic guide	8	UNIPR	INRA, CIRAD, AGRIDEA, ORIGIN
D12	Report on strategies and policy recommendations	7	UNED	INRA, DSE-UNIFI, UNEW, ORIGIN

Meetings List

Meetings and Conferences

Meetings	Place	Audience (approx.)	Date
First Year			
Start up Meeting	Parma	60	21-22 June 2005
Plenary Meeting	Toulouse	50	12-13 Jan. 2006
Second Year			
International Meeting	Montpellier	90	6-7 Sept. 2006
Third Year			
PhD Meeting	Geneva	30	04 June 2007
Regional Meeting 1	Budapest	45	24 Oct. 2007
Regional Meeting 2	Santiago	25	10-11 Dec. 2007
FAO/SINERGI Meeting	Rome	60	31 Jan. – 01 Feb. 2008
Final Conference	Geneva	70	23-24.06.2008

PAB Meetings

Meetings	Place	Date
First Year		
PAB Meeting 1	Parma	21 June 2005
Second Year		
PAB Meeting 2	Montpellier	7 Sept. 2006
Third Year		
PAB Meeting 3	Rome	30 Jan. 2008

Working Groups meetings

Meetings	Place	Date
Second Year		
WP4 meeting	Paris	23 June 2006
Database Meeting	Lausanne	7-8 Nov. 2006
Third Year		
WP6 Workshop	Lausanne	11-13 Oct. 2007
WP7-WP8 Workshop	Edinburgh	10-11 Jan. 2008