



WP6 SYNTHESIS

Budapest

Plenary Meeting

WP6 OBJECTIVES (TA)

- **International comparison** (using case-studies reports) to define a typology of **GIs protection effects** crossed to **different legal and institutional systems**
- **Identification of "invariant" effects**
[issue to be questioned in conclusion]
- Definition of long-term scenarios *[assessed regarding sustainable development objectives]* without policies changes for each relevant situation, highlighted by the case studies (baseline scenarios)

Methodology based on case studies comparison

1. Case trajectories analysis

(Driving forces / Pressures / State / Responses Model)



2. Scenarios (according to three hypothesis regarding economic competition regime)



3. Impacts (economic, social, environmental)

Methodology based on case studies comparison

1. Case trajectories analysis



2. Scenarios (according to three hypothesis regarding economic competition regime)



3. Impacts (economic, social, environmental)

Methodology: how to build scenarios?

- **‘Scenarios’ have to be constructed for each case study (GI system) from the trajectories analysis (of the “system” and of “the protection scheme”)**
- **But all the GI systems are in the same competing economic system which is global and regulated by public and private rules and standard.**

Idea of “global market” refers to enlargement both of the size of the market (export issues) and of the marketing network (including media).

- **To build the scenarios we propose to refer to three hypothesis (or ideal-types) regarding international trade regime and the position of the ‘Geographical Indication’ as IPR :**
 - 1. - DIVERGENCE**
 - 2. - CONVERGENCE**
 - 3. - PLURALITY**

...

- According to the cases, the three scenarios correspond to different evolutions :
- of the configuration of the system of actors and
- of the power of each type of actors.

// SESSIONS:

Case by case, the forecast exercise will consist to identity the 3 scenarios corresponding with the three general baseline hypotheses

CONVERGENCE

- The **first hypothesis** corresponds to a growing role of the specific GI certification ("origin") benefiting from sui generis forms of protection and from policies promoting its use in the organisation of global markets
- It could be termed "**convergence**" in the measure of it supposes:
 - not only a global regulation which is still in debate
 - but also a convergence of the consumers' representations of the value attached with origin and of the policymakers visions
- A complete convergence of all the actors (stakeholders) on the substance of origin products is not a likely future. It is an integrative innovative logic we can express as a scenario
- *Main argument: durability of the protection*

CONVERGENCE: different scenarios

- According to national or regional situations the differences regard the stakes related :
 - to rural development,
 - to domestic market organisation,
 - to international trade from or to the area,
 - to the structures of food industries
 - To the value chain...
- And the supporting policies related to those domains
- National states (or EU) are in this scenario important players
- The capacity of GI stakeholders' organisations to influence or predominate on others quality schemes is also in play. That would signify that those organisations are able to go beyond a corporatist point of view and that the origin attribute is able to encompass a wide range of credence attributes

DIVERGENCE

- The **second hypothesis** corresponds to a weakening of the GI recognition in the concrete organisation of large markets and of the influence of the European model of sui generis protection.
- In this situation, diverse types of GI products and marketing tools can develop to preserve reputation of GI; this leading to muddled standards and “quality crisis”.
- This hypothesis (which can be related with the classic Akerlof's conjecture) will lead likely to a global weakening of the origin signs significance (an attached value) in front of the others specific quality identifiers as "organic", "fair trade", "biodiversity friendly" etc.
- The power relation between those identifiers is depending of the global support deserved by policies and Medias.

DIVERGENCE: different scenarios

- *Difference in the forecasts regarding this scenario are related to the stakes concerning rural development and supporting policies; to the mode of insertion of the region in the international trade trends; to the structures of food industries and retail; and to political capacities*
- Supermarket and private (sectoral) SSO are more powerful than many states... (ex coffee)
- Flexibility is at stake

PLURALITY

- The **third hypothesis** corresponds to the permanence of the diversity of GIs forums and quality forums in general.
- It is not a mix of the two former scenarios but it considers
 - the hybridization of the different types of system of protection
 - the fact that national systems of GI regulation are generally dualistic, because GI systems are diverse (what is changing within contexts is the support policy)
 - Some diversity in the values linked with origin according to national laws.
- **PLURALITY OF INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY FORUMS**
- Contrary to the first scenario, 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.
- Contrary to the second scenario based on the domination of private standards, the third one includes a role of orientation to the collective initiatives. It supposes that "the market" (helped by the media...) is able to make distinctions within a proliferation of quality labelling signs supporting a large variety of business models.
- What is clearing the market is the media system, including all forms of diffusion of the consumers' experiences. Relevant initiative groups are "hybrids" (Callon), they include diverse forms of knowledge.

Workshop session

- **For each regional configuration** (geopolitical context), we are supposed to assess:
 - - (1) how the developments we can observe thank to the case studies are sustaining one or one other of the three hypothesis, what are the corresponding changes in the actors power configuration?
 - - (2) in relation with those developments, what will be the evolution (trajectory of the system) of the concerned GI system (according to its type),
 - - (3) what are the impacts of that evolution on sustainable development objectives.

Contrasting the scenarios

	Convergence	Divergence	Plurality
Market	Globalization	Regionalization	Globalization with regional segmentations
Rules at international level	Establishment of public common rules for quality and origin	Some basic commons rules but weak	Basic rules but open for regional adaptations and mobilization
Institutions at national and local level	Able to implement international standards and rules in a convergent interpretation way	Not able to converge in understanding and implementation	Able to integrate and support different quality schemes in a coherent way toward different segments of consumers

System of protection

- Specific GI protection is part of it
- Other ways (complementary or substituting?):
 - Bilateral trade agreement (or importing country regulation) (UE/ India or Pakistan Basmati)
 - List of reserved geographical names (Dominican Republic)
 - Certified trademarks...

Compatibility public/private standards

Rationale	stake	Instrument
Heritage	Specific “origin” quality	Code of practice
Prevent quality heterogeneity jeopardizing reputation	Intrinsic quality attribute	Additional rules in the code of practice
New consumers’ concerns	process and other extrinsic quality attribute	Additional rules and skills

Types of Context

Protection Policy	Rural Development Policy	Market Strategic stake	
		Restructuring	Enlargement
P1 : C/D effective	public or NGO support for Rural Dev	Melton Mowbray pork Pie	Roquefort
	more sectoral support	<u>Tequila</u>	
P2: C/D non effective	public or NGO support for Rural Dev	Pico Duarte Coffee Kajmak	
	more sectoral support	<u>Paprika</u>	Jinhua Pampean Beef Bleuet du lac St Jean
P3: A/B efficient	public or NGO support for Rural Dev		
	more sectoral support		Florida
P4: A/B non efficient	public or NGO support for Rural Dev		Rooibos
	more sectoral support	Chontaleno cheese	Basmati

Diversity of the institutional and legal frameworks for GI: national/local dynamic

Driving forces (GI Scheme)

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Europeanization or WTO-requirements | Roquefort, Paprika, Kajmak, Jinhua |
| 2 | Importance of sanitary issues | Paprika, Kajmak, Chontaleno |
| 3 | Usurpation / frauds external to the SC | Paprika, Roiboos, Basmati, Tequila |
| 4 | Changes in the demand (diversity of the global or national demand) | Florida Oranges, Jinhua, Pampean Beef (Brazil), Pico Duarte Coffee |
| 5 | Reform of Agricultural policies | Roquefort, Paprika, Kajmak, Roiboos, Bleuets?, Jinhua, Chontaleno, Melton Mowbray Pies |
| 6 | Competition between different norms | Bleuets, Melton Mowbray Pies |

Diversity of the institutional and legal frameworks for GI: national/local dynamic

Pressures (GI scheme)

- 1 Establishment (or modification) of laws or procedures for GI (at national or local level)
Roquefort, Kajmak, Melton Mowbray Pies
- 2 Missing or contradictory policies
Paprika, Roiboos, Basmati?, Jinhua, Pico Duarte Coffee, Chontaleno
- 3 Enforcement problems
Roiboos, Basmati?, Jinhua, Tequila, Pampean Beef (Brazil) Chontaleno
- 4 Incoherence and/or inconsistency and/or conflicts in the frame of the GI scheme
Chontaleno?,
Kajmak, Bleuets, Florida Oranges, Tequila, Pampean Beef (Brazil), Pico Duarte Coffee, Chontaleno
- 5 US influence (and support)
Paprika, Kajmak, Pico Duarte Coffee, Melton Mowbray Pies
- 6 Europe influence (and support)

Diversity of the institutional and legal frameworks for GI: national/local dynamic

State (GI scheme)

S1	Lack of coordination between Intellectual property office and Ministry of agriculture (weakness of institutional coordination) or competition between administrations	Kajmak, Jinhua, Pampean Beef (Florida oranges) Paprika?, Roiboos,
S2	Commonplace GI product,	Tequila
S3	Heterogeneity of specific quality identifiers	Tequila, Basmati?
S4	Consumer interest in terroir products	Florida oranges, Bleuets
S5	Difficult appropriation of the GI concept at different levels	Roiboos, Bleuets, Florida Oranges, Pico Duarte Coffee, Chontaleno
S6	Failure of initiative groups	Paprika, Chontaleno
S7	Conflicts between branding and GI initiatives	Pico Duarte, Jinhua, Pampean Beef (Brazil)?
S8	Lack of service resource (no national certification body for example) or lack of enforcement	Pampean Beef, Pico Duarte, Kajmak
S9	Functioning implementation of GI scheme (efficiency of controls and producers involvement)	Roquefort, Melton Mowbray Pies

Diversity of the institutional and legal frameworks for GI: national/local dynamic

Response (GI scheme)

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| R1 | By actors mobilisation (coordination) :
Empowerment of the GI network and Formation of (new) initiative group (s) | Paprika, Kajmak, Florida oranges, Pampean beef, Roiboos, Basmati, Melton Mowbray Pies |
| R2 | By law modification (or enforcement) | Roquefort, Bleuets, Jinhua, (Pico Duarte, Kajmak) Paprika? Roiboos |
| R3 | By market initiatives (diversification) | Tequila |
| R4 | By external expertise and funds | Kajmak, Pico Duarte, Bleuets? Chontaleno? (stand by) |

System trajectories: Driving Forces

D1	Global competition / quality norms harmonisation
D2	Structural political change
D3	Rise of living standard / demand for diversity and tourism (shift from domestic demand to more international) / access to European market
D4	Liberalisation (removing of the tariff / building up quality scheme to regain competitiveness)
D5	Decentralisation / reinforcement of local authorities / more role of horizontal government

System trajectories: Pressures

P1	Rise of the prices of raw materials / productivity issues / competition costs
P2	Crisis in the valorisation of the product (loose in the premium) (crisis at the demand side)
P3	Increasing demand (crisis on the supply side)
P4	Demand Diversification / market Europeanization
P5	Importance of the sanitary norms