

WP 2:

GI social and economic issues

**Comments and questions
for the discussion**

Priv.-Doz. Dr. Richard Balling
Montpellier, 2006 September 6-7

WP 2-report „GI economic and social issues“ ...

- starts with basic definitions: OP, GIP, Recognised GIP (incl. EC-Reg. 510/06-Protected GIP: PDO/PGI)
- raises 100 questions and aspects underlining the broad impact of this field of research
- is based on 24 country-/project-/special interest-reports with contributions of 63 researchers
- is well founded and interesting also for GI-experts (exemples and case studies from Non-EU countries)
- gives an **evaluation grid** structured into four dimensions:
The contribution of OP and GI schemes to
 1. Supply Chain
 2. Rural Development
 3. Environment
 4. Consumers
- proposes an OP/GI **typology** with 12 criteria to differentiate

1. The contribution of OP and GI schemes to Supply Chain

- What is the rare factor in the marketing system of OP/GI? Who benefits and why?
- The influence on supply chain is mainly determined by the integration of raw materials?
- How to integrate traditional small scale producers (butcheries, bakeries...)? How to avoid a downgrading after GI registration of the non certified short channel and local consumer oriented producers?
- Setting the standard is ambivalent, showing a tradeoff: high specificity: higher quality, better/easier acknowledged; more (small/traditional) producers are excluded, less biodiversity, less innovative ability; less opportunities for brand/company positioning within the OP.
My conclusion: only as high/specific as necessary (not as possible).

2. The contribution of OP and GI schemes to Rural Development

- Not only OP/GI themselves but the links and effects to other fields (tourism, gastronomy, cultural events ...) are responsible for the OP effectiveness on rural development.
- How to create and grow these links with other endogenous potentials?
- The impact of OP/GI on regional food culture:
 - To develop consciousness for regional food quality and specificity – with longterm influence on cuisine, on the culinary attractiveness of a tourist destination and a basis for the (food) image of a region/country.
 - To improve the position of the agrifood sector in public discussions and decisions.

3. The contribution of OP and GI schemes to Environment

- Short channel marketing and local use: Economies of scale and the bundling of logistics for the mass market cause for other products (perhaps) a lower use of resources than OP?
- Are the expectations in this field generally right/justified?

4. The contribution of OP and GI schemes to Consumers/Citizens

- More critical and demanding consumers expect generally the integration of raw materials for „real origin products“ ?
(especially for sensitive products like meat/sausages).

Is an obligatory use of regional raw materials important/essential?

- Is an obligatory labelling effective for the OP positioning in the market?

A legal/EC-Logo has also a standardising effect, but for the necessary price-premium we need basically a perception as **original**.

An affective/emotional positioning is a key factor for OP.

OP and GI Typology

- The 12 proposed criteria are a good starting point
- Ranking by importance?

Other criteria:

- Including raw materials from regional origin or not
- Offensive/Defensive