

**Geographic indications (GI): linking history and tradition with competitive business****Indicações geográficas (GI): conectando história e tradição com negócios competitivos**

DOI:10.34117/bjdv6n5-059

Recebimento dos originais: 09/04/2020

Aceitação para publicação: 05/05/2020

**Alcido Elenor Wander**

Doutor em Ciências Agrárias (Concentração: Economia Agrícola)

Instituição: Centro Universitário Alves Faria (UNIALFA) &amp; Embrapa Arroz e Feijão.

Address: Rua R-12, 554, Ap. 402, Setor Oeste, 74125-140 Goiania-GO, Brazil.

E-mail: alcido.wander@unialfa.com.br.

**Cintia Neves Godoi**

Doutora em Geografia

Instituição: Centro Universitário Alves Faria (UNIALFA).

Endereço: Rua do Comércio, Qd 08, Lt 31, Casa 09, Jardim Vitória, Goiania-GO, Brazil

E-mail: cintia.godoi@unialfa.com.br

**Bento Alves da Costa Filho**

Doutor em Administração

Instituição: Centro Universitário Alves Faria (UNIALFA).

Endereço: QRSW 2, Bloco B 4 apto 103, Brasília, DF, Brazil.

E-mail: costaf@uol.com.br.

**Marcelo Ladvocat**

Doutor em Economia de Empresas

Instituição: Centro Universitário Alves Faria (UNIALFA).

Endereço: Al. Sibipirunas Qd. 56-C, Lt. 03. Residencial Aldeia do Vale, Goiânia, GO, Brazil.

E-mail: marceloladvocat@gmail.com.

**ABSTRACT**

Geographic Indications (GI) represent a collective trademark created to protect producers and promote the trade of products that have become notorious due to its region of production. Therefore, the main objective of this paper is to provide an overview on the concepts of GI and provide the main relevant facts and figures of GI worldwide and in Brazil. As of July 2019, more than 130 thousand of GIs were registered at the World Intellectual Property Organization, mainly in Europe, Asia and the Americas. In Brazil, as an emerging economy, GI is becoming an increasingly important, both in terms of protecting Brazilian typical products as well as the GI from other countries trading with Brazil. Consumption trends towards originality, typical products, expressing certain quality attributes may further develop businesses in different parts of the world. Consumers with higher income may prefer certain quality attributes for the products and services they consume. In this context, GI represent a strong and sustainable strategy to provide those goods and services to those demanding consumers.

**Key words:** Collective trademarks, Intellectual Property, Typical Products, Trade.

**RESUMO**

As indicações geográficas (IG) representam uma marca comercial coletiva criada para proteger os produtores e promover o comércio de produtos que se tornaram notórios devido à sua região de produção. Portanto, o principal objetivo deste artigo é fornecer uma visão geral dos conceitos de IG e fornecer os principais fatos e números relevantes de IG em todo o mundo e no Brasil. Em julho de 2019, mais de 130 mil IGs estavam registradas na Organização Mundial da Propriedade Intelectual, principalmente na Europa, Ásia e Américas. No Brasil, como uma economia emergente, o IG está se tornando cada vez mais importante, tanto em termos de proteção dos produtos típicos brasileiros quanto do IG de outros países que negociam com o Brasil. Tendências de consumo em relação à originalidade, produtos típicos, expressando certos atributos de qualidade, podem desenvolver ainda mais negócios em diferentes partes do mundo. Consumidores com renda mais alta podem preferir certos atributos de qualidade para os produtos e serviços que consomem. Nesse contexto, as IG representam uma estratégia forte e sustentável para fornecer esses bens e serviços aos consumidores exigentes.

**Palavras-chave:** Marcas coletivas, Propriedade intelectual, Produtos típicos, Comércio.

**1 INTRODUCTION**

Calling the product by its region of origin is an old practice. The first denominations are present in the Bible, Greece and Rome, e.g. the Corinthian Bronze, Carrara Marble, Emperor Cesar in Rome received wine amphorae with indication of the region of provenance etc.

Producers and consumers recognized peculiar flavors or qualities of certain products that came from certain locations.

However, the recognition of the product according to the location led to the practice of imitation by producers from other regions, creating unfair competition conditions. Within this context, comes the to protect producers and consumers from unfair practices by means of appropriate regulations.

With the intensification of global trade, geographic indications (GI) to be accomplished increasingly require national and international regulations to guarantee their protection.

To name the product by its region of origin represents an old practice today updated in the context of changes in the agri-food systems:

- a) globalization of markets (movement of goods between countries) (need to establish international rules / standards, e.g. *Codex alimentarius* - public nature, GlobalGAP<sup>1</sup> - private nature);
- b) market segmentation and the emergence of market niches; and
- c) behavior of consumers in relation to traditional products.

GI also gives rise to new market opportunities for traditional products of small-scale agriculture (Coneely & Mahon, 2015; Rahmah, 2017):

---

<sup>1</sup> GAP refers to Good Agricultural Practices.

- Specialties: market based on the valuation of a particular quality, association product / locality / tradition (e.g. GI, Slow Food movement, products with guarantee of origin etc.);
- Organics: food / products produced without the use of chemical inputs, respecting the environment and nature;
- Handcrafted: products done with artisan practices; and
- Solidarity: products of solidarity economy and fair trade, which are more concerned with the living and working conditions of the people involved in production.

In the economic globalization and associated commoditization, consumers seek authentic products, products from their region of origin. In this context, we observe the emergence of active consumers, who claims, through their way of consuming certain products an identity, a culture, a political or religious vision. The consumer is no longer a passive agent, but a subject capable of reacting and promoting certain models of development.

Geographical Indications are place names (in some countries also words associated with a place) used to identify the origin and quality, reputation or other characteristics of products (e.g. “Champagne”, “Tequila” or “Roquefort”) (WTO, 2019).

A GI is a sign used on products that have a specific geographical origin and possess qualities or a reputation that are due to that origin. It provides not only a way for businesses to leverage the value of their geographically unique products, but also to inform and attract consumers (Bonanno et al., 2019).

The impacts of GI are numerous and of several dimensions:

- **economic:** access to new domestic markets and external export markets;
- **social and cultural rights:** inclusion of producers or disadvantaged regions;
- **environmental:** conservation of biodiversity, local genetic resources and the environment.

Those three dimensions of impacts represent the triple bottom line of sustainable development<sup>2</sup>.

According to Cerdan et al. (2010, p.42), the main advantages of Geographic Indications include:

---

<sup>2</sup> Sustainable development was defined by the Brundtland Commission of the United Nations in 1987. Triple bottom line (TBL) accounting expands the traditional reporting framework to consider social and environmental performance in addition to financial performance. In 1981, Freer Spreckley first articulated the triple bottom line in a publication called ‘Social Audit - A Management Tool for Co-operative Working’. In this work, he argued that enterprises should measure and report on financial performance, social wealth creation, and environmental responsibility. The phrase ‘triple bottom line’ was articulated more fully by John Elkington in his 1997 book ‘Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business’.

- It generates satisfaction to the producer, who sees his products commercialized in the market with the GI, valuing the territory and the local knowledge (Donner et al.,2017);
- It facilitates the presence of typical products on the market, which will feel less competition with other producers of lower prices and quality;
- It contributes to preserve the diversification of agricultural production, the particularities and the personality of the products, which constitute a patrimony of each region and country;
- The added value of the products increases, and the transformation cycle takes place in the production area itself;
- It stimulates the qualitative improvement of the products, since they are submitted to production and elaboration controls;
- It increases the participation in the commercialization cycle of the products and stimulates the elevation of its technical level;
- It allows the consumer to perfectly identify the product in the methods of production, manufacture and elaboration of the product, in terms of identity and typical of the "terroir" region;
- It improves and makes the demand for the product more stable, as it creates a consumer confidence that, under the GI label, expects to find a quality product with specific characteristics;
- Stimulates investments in the production area: new plantations, technological improvements in the field and processing;
- Improves the commercialization of products, facilitating access to the market through a special identification; this is particularly true of cooperatives or associations of small producers which, as a rule, have less experience and reputation in the market;
- It generates confidence gains with the consumer regarding the authenticity of the products, the actions of the regulatory councils that are created and the self-discipline they require;
- Facilitates marketing through IG, which is a collective intellectual property, with advantages over brand-based promotion;
- Promotes typical products;
- It facilitates the fight against fraud, smuggling, counterfeiting and usurpation; and
- It favors exports and protects products against unfair external competition.

Premium price for GI products varies. According to Cerdan et al. (2010), in Europe, the premium price for GI usually are 10 to 15% above conventional products (without GI). But there

are cases where prices tripled with GI protection (e.g. the Vietnamese sauce of GI “Nuoc Mam de Phu Quoc” had its price increased from 0.50 Euros per Liter to 1.50 Euros per Liter after getting its GI in 2001).

According to Cerdan et al. (2010), GI often originates from disadvantaged agricultural regions where producers are unable to reduce the cost of production. In this way, they are led to invest in the valuation of quality and local knowledge (savoir-faire).

An emblematic example is the Champagne region in France:

- It was a poor region, located on the northern edge of the climatic zone producing grapes, with generally acidic soils;
- The champenoise winemaking method, well adapted to the difficulties of this raw material, allowed the economic success recognized worldwide today;

Most cheese denominations of origin in France are in mountain regions or classified as difficult areas. One of the key elements of the GI was to promote, create and implement new forms of local governance and regulation among the different agents of the production chain. The emergence of interprofessional committees and the search for a better harmonization of interests between the different agents allowed the strengthening of the region and the producers.

Key factors for a successful GI are (Cerdan et al., 2010, p.49-50):

- A producer organization and territorial agents, sensitized and prepared (training) to promote and protect their product;
- Product (s) with reputation and / or characteristics valued on the markets - consumers will be able to recognize this difference;
- Potential of coordination in the value chain (including, if possible, the different links in the chain);
- Financial and technical support in the initial phases of recognition and implementation of the initiative and in the management of GIs;
- A national promotion of the GI concept;
- An organization of national and regional level laws, as well as studies to preserve typical products;
- Public policies aimed at the recognition and maintenance of GIs.

Therefore, the main objective of this case is to provide an overview on the concepts of geographic indications and provide the main relevant facts and figures of GI worldwide and in Brazil.

## **2 GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATION, LOCAL IMAGE FORMATION AND VALUE TO CONSUMER**

In addition to all the benefits already mentioned (Cerdan et al., 2010) for involved stakeholders like producers, consumers, entities, government, and the potential development for the region considered, the adoption of a geographical indication is strongly connected to the image formation of a locality. The report from the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO, 2017), highlights GI as a differentiation tool in marketing strategies useful to the creation of brand equity which may generate premium brand prices for the protected products. The protection provided by GI, usually operationalized through certification like “Protection of Designated Origins” (PDO) or “Protected Geographical Indication” (PGI), produces signs of quality to the market (Vlachvei et al., 2012; Coneely& Mahon, 2015) indicating the producer is distinguished from others in its unique local competencies.

There is a reputation attached to GI (Bienabe& Vivien, 2015). And this reputation reflects all the local traits that characterize the place of origin in terms of cultural identity, history and customs of local communities. Campelo et al. (2014) synthesize this with the idea of sense of place. Studying destination branding in New Zealand, these authors identified as determinants of the concept “sense of place”, the following constructs: time, ancestry, landscape and community. They argue that a destination is not necessarily physical, a geographical place, but also a metaphysical space formed by a network of meanings and values attached to it.

The connection with the place embedded in geographical indication also addresses to the concept of *terroir*, a French word denoting soil. The literal meaning is soil, the upper layer of the Earth where plants grow, but the real signification is something abstract related to local identity. Charters (2010) translates *terroir* using the example of wine, as the interpretation of the place. This author unfolds this concept in three dimensions, as follows: (1) physical, the environment where the vines grow, (2) mystical, or a place of identity, and (3) commercial, as the marketing place. So, there is an aura involving the construct with good practical results: *terroir* is used all over the world as a justification for an endorsement of the quality of wine.

A basic rationale supporting geographical indication is that consumers value the fact that there is a place of origin attached to the product. This is not that simple. From the consumer point of view, difficulties in assessing the authenticity of a GI are not unusual. In the case of wine, clients cannot differentiate the drink by taste precisely; they must count on label information to evaluate the quality associated to a place (Lecocq et al., 2005; Boncinelli et al, 2018). Small regions of origin are something confusing for consumers to identify and remember; these unknown regions must be informed in conjunction with larger regions, more easily spotted by the clients (Atkins,

2017). Also, research has shown that region of origin is important only to highly involved consumers, those willing to pay a premium price for the product (Charters, 2010; Verdonk et al., 2015). Therefore, there is no guarantee that the consumer will be attracted by and attribute value to the locality information provided by GI in the product. Govers (2013) mentions a rule of thumb in these situations where a name of a place (country, city, region) is written on a T-shirt and then a test is made to check if someone is willing to pay any amount of money for it. In other words, it is a matter of utmost concern to investigate how much value the consumer perceives in the GI information.

### **3 GEOGRAPHIC INDICATION MANAGEMENT AND LOCAL BRAND DEVELOPMENT**

The management of a geographic indication can be quite complex, and it starts by the legal requirements necessary to obtain the right. Once GI is considered an intellectual property (IP) since the Paris Convention in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century (1883), the adoption of this kind of market defense demands the following of several steps in order to guarantee the effectiveness of the protection both locally and internationally. These steps involve defining the product characteristics, organizing the group of producers, setting up quality standards, devising the right to use the indication, establishing control schemes, planning marketing strategies and obtaining legal protection (WIPO, 2017).

A very first procedure to be taken is to get the protection in the local jurisdiction (region, municipality, country). The two more used modalities for that are: (a) *sui generis*, an exclusive and specific system of protection used by EU countries, and (b) collective marks and/or certification marks, guided by trademark laws, adopted in Australia, China and USA. Once the local protection is provided, then the international safeguard can be filed with the aid of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) with the following options: (1) obtaining protection directly in the jurisdiction concerned; (2) through the Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and International Registration; (3) through the Madrid System for the International Registration of Marks; and (4) by means of bilateral agreements between States and commercial partners.

Geographical indication is not only about protection, enforcement and traceability (Barjolle et al., 2017, Gangjee, 2017). GI is intensively related to brand management (WIPO, 2017), but not the ordinary business process under the control of a brand manager in firms and companies. It is the brand management of a place (locality), a collective form of intellectual property (Neilson et al, 2018), a social process involving many players and interactions (Berg &Sevon, 2014; Andersson et al, 2013; Campelo et al., 2014; Karavatzis&Kalandidies, 2015) among actors like producers,

suppliers, consumers, investors, entities, government, researchers and academia. As a collective process, there is no clear authority (Kaufmann & Durst, 2008) that makes imperative the role of local leadership. Azevedo et al. (2018) studying the Vinhedo valley in Southern Brazil, identified the relevant contribution of the entity Aprovale (Sophisticated Wine Association of Producers from Vinhedo Valley) in managing the local collective brand of the wine cluster. Donner et al. (2016) emphasize that place branding as a collective process fostering cooperation rather than competition between areas, addressing the importance of institutions and organizations in the brand construction (Waeraas et al., 2015, Barjolle et al., 2017).

The branding of a region is a comprehensive concept (Clifton, 2014). Park et al. (1986) suggested a categorization of brand including the following dimensions: functional (solving external needs), symbolic (satisfying internal needs) and experiential (supplying sensory stimulation). This multidimensionality of the construct calls the attention for a partnership that has been growing stronger among geographical indication, place branding and tourism. In the wine and spirits sector, Vlachvei et al. (2012) argues that wineries are becoming points through which producers communicate intangible aspects of wine, the story of winemaking generations, company philosophies and so on. “The winery is built following the experiential, symbolic, social and emotional values concerning the product and the place” (p.4). Atkins et al.(2017) mention the wine tourists, a segment of travelers to whom the wine is the primary reason to visit a place. Azevedo et al. (2018) also stress the relevance of “enotourism” (the tourism of wine) for the development of a wine cluster branding in the Vinhedo valley (Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil).

Therefore, although the geographical indication involves an intricate legal process(locally and internationally) created primarily to protect producers, especially in rural areas, it also becomes a challenge to the participant actors in terms of creating and managing a collective place brand.

There are studies claiming that Geographic Indications is not considered in the same intensity and may create conflicts between countries, especially in negotiations on trade agreements between countries and economic blocks. The reasons of those potential conflicts relate mainly to the fact that some countries use trademarks instead of Geographic Indications to protect the producers (Viju et al., 2012). So, it seems to exist a potential conflict due to the overlapping use of trademarks and Geographic Indications, since not all countries consider both tools in the same way.

#### **4 GEOGRAPHIC INDICATIONS WORLDWIDE**

As of June 30, 2019, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO, 2019b) had a total of 131,414 GI related registrations in 66 different countries (Table 1).

‘Wines and spirits’ represent the main product category for which GIs are registered. In total, 123,331 GI related registrations for ‘Wines and spirits’ (93.85% of all GIs). The second product category in numbers of GI registrations are ‘Others’, which are not further defined, and count for 6,509 (4.95%) of GI registrations at WIPO. ‘Handicrafts’ represent 1,480 (1.13%) and ‘Services’ only 14 (0.01%) of GI registrations (WIPO, 2019b) (Tables 1, 2).

Table 1. Number of GI-related registrations by continent, country and product category at the World Intellectual Property Organization, June 30, 2019.

Continent	Country	Handicrafts	Others	Services	Wines and spirits	Total
Africa	Kenya	2	1			<b>3</b>
	Morocco	47		1	15	<b>63</b>
Americas	Argentina				100	<b>100</b>
	Brazil	6	8	1	16	<b>31</b>
	Canada				646	<b>646</b>
	Chile	9	4		236	<b>249</b>
	Colombia	12	3		84	<b>99</b>
	Costa Rica	12	181		694	<b>887</b>
	Cuba	1	1		2	<b>4</b>
	Ecuador	2	2		7	<b>11</b>
	Honduras		2		92	<b>95</b>
	Jamaica				1	<b>1</b>
	Mexico	3	918		5	<b>926</b>
	Peru	1	925		78	<b>1,004</b>
	Asia	Bangladesh		1		
Cambodia			2			<b>2</b>
China		149	208		77	<b>434</b>
China, Hong Kong SAR			11	1	5	<b>17</b>
China, Macao SAR				1	1	<b>2</b>
Georgia		54	111		2,828	<b>2,993</b>
India		185	9		11	<b>205</b>
Iran		109	60			<b>169</b>
Israel		42	74		584	<b>700</b>
Japan					15	<b>15</b>
Malaysia						<b>79</b>
Mongolia		1				<b>1</b>
Thailand		1				<b>1</b>
Viet Nam	98	14	9	56	<b>177</b>	
Europe	Andorra				1	<b>1</b>
	Austria		418		5,426	<b>5,844</b>

Belarus			21	<b>21</b>		
Belgium			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	7		2,022	<b>2,029</b>		
Bulgaria	53	47	4,136	<b>4,236</b>		
Croatia	3		3,422	<b>3,425</b>		
Cyprus			3,435	<b>3,435</b>		
Czech Republic		1,259	3,422	<b>4,681</b>		
Denmark			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Estonia			3,423	<b>3,423</b>		
Finland			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
France			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Germany	85	1	12,275	<b>12,361</b>		
Greece			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Hungary	374	3	4,307	<b>4,684</b>		
Ireland			3,425	<b>3,425</b>		
Italy	36	983	3,448	<b>4,467</b>		
Kazakhstan		2	22	<b>24</b>		
Latvia			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Lithuania			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Luxembourg			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Malta			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Moldova	60	61	2,934	<b>3,055</b>		
Netherlands			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Poland			3,425	<b>3,425</b>		
Portugal	15		3,422	<b>3,437</b>		
Romania			3,423	<b>3,423</b>		
Russia	41	3	69	<b>113</b>		
Serbia	3	1,186	9	<b>1,199</b>		
Slovakia	1		3,422	<b>3,423</b>		
Slovenia			3,425	<b>3,425</b>		
Spain			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Sweden			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Turkey	67	9	10	<b>86</b>		
Ukraine			2,283	<b>2,283</b>		
United Kingdom			3,422	<b>3,422</b>		
Oceania	Australia	1	2	2,085	<b>2,088</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,480</b>	<b>6,509</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>123,331</b>	<b>131,414</b>

Source: WIPO (2019b).

It is remarkable that European countries own 120,411(91.63% of 131,414) GI related registrations at WIPO. Wines and spirits represent the main product category with GI registration in European and Asian countries. In Americas and Oceania, the product category ‘Others’ represent

the biggest number of GI registrations. African countries have more ‘Handicraft’ related GI registrations (WIPO, 2019b) (Table 2).

Table 2. Number of GI-related registrations by continent and product category at the World Intellectual Property Organization, June 30, 2019.

Continent	Handicrafts	Others	Services	Wines and spirits	Total
Africa	49	1	1	15	<b>66</b>
Americas	46	2,044	1	1,961	<b>4,053</b>
Asia	639	490	11	3,577	<b>4,796</b>
Europe	745	3,972	1	115,693	<b>120,411</b>
Oceania	1	2	0	2,085	<b>2,088</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,480</b>	<b>6,509</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>123,331</b>	<b>131,414</b>

Source: WIPO (2019b).

## 5 GEOGRAPHIC INDICATIONS IN BRAZIL

Geographic indication in Brazil are quite recent. The legal framework related to GIs include: (a) Law Nr. 9,279/1996 (National Law on Industrial Property), (b) Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), (c) Decree Nr. 4,062/2001, (d) Resolution Nr. 75/2000-INPI, and (e) Normative Instruction Nr. 095/2018 (Defines the conditions to register a Geographic Indication in Brazil)(Wilkinson et al.,2015).

Brazilian legal framework (Law Nr. 9,279/1996, Art. 177) does not define genus, only species of Geographic Indications:

- Indication of Provenance (*Indicação de Procedência (IP)*): Geographic name of a country, city, region or locality in its territory that became **known** as a center of extraction, production or manufacture of a determined product or service provision.
- Appellation of Origin (*Denominação de Origem (DO)*): Geographic name of a country, city, region or locality in its territory that refers to a product or service whose quality attributes or characteristics are **exclusively** or **essentially** defined by geography, including natural and human factors.

The registration of Indications of Provenance is the most frequent GI label in Brazil. Until July 09, 2019, a total of 53 different Indications of Provenance were registered in Brazil. All of them refer to Brazilian products only (Table 3).

Table 3. Labels registered in Brazil as Indication of Provenance, July 09, 2019.

GI label	Brazilian state	Product	Year <sup>*)</sup>
Vale dos Vinhedos	RS	Wines	2002
Região do Cerrado Mineiro	MG	Coffee	2005
Pampa Gaúcho da Campanha Meridional	RS	Beef	2006
Paraty	RJ	Cane brandy (cachaça)	2007
Vale do Sinos	RS	Leather	2009
Vale do Submédio São Francisco	PE, BA	Grapes and mangoes	
Pinto Bandeira	RS	Wines	2010
Região da Serra da Mantiqueira de Minas Gerais	MG	Coffee	2011
Região do Jalapão do Estado do Tocantins	TO	Handicrafts	
Pelotas	RS	Traditional confectionery and fruit sweets	
Goiabeiras	ES	Clay pots	
Serro	MG	Cheese	
São João del-Rei	MG	Handmade tin pieces	2012
Franca	SP	Footwear	
Vales da Uva Goethe	SC	Wine (sweet)	
Canastra	MG	Cheese	
Pedro II	PI	Precious Opal and Handmade Opal Jewelry	
Cachoeiro de Itapemirim	ES	Marble	
Norte Pioneiro do Paraná	PR	Coffee	
Linhares	ES	Cocoa	
Paraíba	PB	Cotton textiles (natural colors)	
Região de Salinas	MG	Cane brandy (cachaça)	
Porto Digital	PE	Information and Communication Technology Services	
Altos Montes	RS	Wines	
Divina Pastora	SE	Lace	
São Tiago	MG	Biscuit	2013
Alta Mogiana	SP	Coffee	
Mossoró	RN	Melon	
Cariri Paraibano	PB	Renaissance lace	
Monte Belo	RS	Wines	
Piauí	PI	Cashew soft drink	2014
Rio Negro	AM	Ornamental fishes	
Microrregião Abaíra	BA	Cane brandy (cachaça)	
Pantanal	MS, MT	Honey	2015
Farroupilha	RS	Wines	
Maracaju	MS	Sausages	
Região de Mara Rosa	GO	Saffron	2016
Região das Lagoas Mundaú-Manguaba	AL	Embroidery	
Carlópolis	PR	Guava	
Região de Pinhal	SP	Coffee	
Região São Bento de Urânia	ES	Yam	
Marialva	PR	Grapes	2017
São Matheus	PR	Mate tea	
Oeste do Paraná	PR	Honey	
Cruzeiro do Sul	AC	Cassava flour	
Maués	AM	Guarana	2018
Sul da Bahia	BA	Cocoa	
Colônia Witmarsum	PR	Cheese	
Venda Nova do Imigrante	ES	Pork inlaid	
Sabará	MG	Jabuticaba derivatives	
Tomé-Açu	PA	Cocoa	2019
Oeste da Bahia	BA	Coffee	
Pirenópolis	GO	Handcrafted silver jewelry	

Total number of Indication of Provenance: 53

\*) Year of registration (approval).

Source: INPI (2019).

The registration of GI labels as Appellation of Origin is more restricted, following its definition. So far, only 20 Appellations of Origin were registered in Brazil, being 11 national and 09 foreign ones (Table 4).

Table 4. Labels registered in Brazil as Appellation of Origin, February 12, 2019.

GI label	Country or Brazilian state	Product	Year <sup>*)</sup>
Região dos Vinhos Verdes	Portugal	Wines	1999
Cognac	France	Brandy	2000
Franciacorta	Italy	Wines	2003
San Daniele	Italy	Ham	2009
Litoral Norte Gaúcho	RS	Rice	2010
Costa Negra	CE	Shrimps	2011
Porto	Portugal	Wines	2012
Região Pedra Carijó Rio de Janeiro	RJ	Gneiss	
Região Pedra Madeira Rio de Janeiro	RJ	Gneiss	
Região Pedra Cinza Rio de Janeiro	RJ	Gneiss	
Manguezais de Alagoas	AL	Propolis	
Napa Valley	United States of America	Wines	
Vale dos Vinhedos	RS	Wines	
Champagne	France	Sparkling wines	
Roquefort	France	Cheese	2013
Região do Cerrado Mineiro	MG	Coffee	
Ortigueira	PR	Honey	2015
Região da Própolis Verde de Minas Gerais	MG	Propolis	2016
Banana da Região de Corupá	SC	Bananas	2018
Tequila	Mexico	Agave distillate	2019
Total number of Appellation of Origin: 20			
National: 11			
Foreign: 09			

\*) Year of registration (approval).

Source: INPI (2019).

It is remarkable, that Brazil so far only received foreign GI labels of Appellation of Origin.

Brazil seems to be an important emerging market for GI labeled products. In addition to the nine foreign Appellations of Origin, there are several registration requests of foreign GI labels, including wines, cheese, whiskey, cutlery, quinoa and sweets (Table 5).

Table 5. Registration requests for foreign GI labels received and under processing by Brazilian authorities by July 31, 2019.

Country	GI label	Product
Italy	Parma	ham
	Asti	wines

	Conegliano	
	Barbaresco	
	Barolo	
	Emilia	
	Prosecco	
	Chianti Classico	
	Grana Padano	cheese
	Campana	
	Gorgonzola	
	Parmigiano Reggiano	
Germany	Solingen	cutlery
Portugal	Douro	wines
	Aveiro	sweets
Great Britain	Scotch Whisky	whiskey
Spain	Rioja	wines
Bolivia	Quinoa Real del Altiplano	quinoa
	Sur de Bolívia	
Ireland	Irish Whiskey	whiskey

Source: INPI (2019).

If those additional GI labels in processing (Table 5) are approved, they will certainly induce changes in the Brazilian market, mainly for wines and cheese.

In Brazil there are also critical studies on the subject that still point to a very recent aspect of the use of the concept, with methodology still poorly defined and with results still incipient. The study by Niederle (2009) presents criticisms in this regard, for the author the case of wine production in the Vale dos Vinhedos expo shows that it is not yet possible to quantify results from the use of Geographical Indication as a strategy for enhancing production.

There are authors such as Fligstein (2001) who also draw attention to the problems that may be generated for collectivities that do not have the social skills necessary to consolidate cooperation processes and broader or lasting political coalitions. This case also includes the contribution of Anjos et al. (2013). For these authors, there are many differences between Geographical Indication use cases around the world, and in their research, they evaluate the differences in construction, projection and opportunities between Latin America and the European Union.

Anjos et al. (2013) compare the structures that support the projects in Europe and Latin America and draw attention to the difference in structure of regulation and regulatory frameworks, instruments of protection for regions, instruments of autonomy for regions, with the intent of fostering product valorization and regions. Thus, many studies and discussions on this topic will surely have to be done soon.

**6 OUTLOOK AND PERSPECTIVES**

Consumption trends towards originality, typical products, expressing certain quality attributes may further develop businesses in different parts of the world. Consumers with higher income may prefer certain quality attributes for the products and services they consume. Geographic Indications represent a strong and sustainable strategy to provide those goods and services to those demanding consumers.

**REFERENCES**

Anderson M, Solitander A & Ekman, P (2013) Cluster branding and marketing: a handbook on cluster brand management. Tendensor – ClusterBrands.

Anjos FSD, Aguilar Criado E & Caldas NV (2013) Indicações geográficas e desenvolvimento territorial: um diálogo entre a realidade europeia e brasileira. *Dados, Revista de Ciências Sociais*, v. 56, n. 1, p. 207-236.

Atkin T, Wilson D, Thach L & Olsen J (2017) Analyzing the impact of conjunctive labeling as part of a regional wine branding strategy. *Wine Economics and Policy*, v. 6, n. 2, p. 155-164.

Azevedo AC, Silva WLC, Pereira CEC & Boaventura JMG (2019) Cluster branding: the case of the vale dos vinhedos. *Gestão & Regionalidade*, v. 35, n. 104, p. 61-81. doi: 10.13037/gr.vol35n104.4859.

Barjolle D, Quinones-Ruiz XF, Bagal M & Comoe H (2017) The Role of the State for Geographical Indications of Coffee: Case Studies from Colombia and Kenya. *World Development*, v. 98, p. 105–119. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.12.006.

Berg PO & Sevón G (2014) Food branding places – a sensory perspective. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, v. 10, n. 4, p. 289-304. doi:10.1057/pb.2014.29.

Bienabe E & Marie-Vivien D (2017) Institutionalizing Geographical Indications in Southern Countries: Lessons Learned from Basmati and Rooibos. *World Development*, v. 98, p. 58–67. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.04.004.

Bonanno A, Sekine K & Feuer HN (2019) Geographical Indication and Global Agri-Food: Development and Democratization. London: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780429470905.

Boncinelli F, Casinia L, Continia C, Gerinia F & Scozzafava G (2016) The consumer loves typicality but prefers the international wine. *Agriculture and Agricultural Science Procedia*, v. 8, p. 236–242. doi: 10.1016/j.aaspro.2016.02.098.

Campelo A, Aitken R, Thyne M & Gnoth J (2014) Sense of Place: The Importance for Destination Branding. *Journal of Travel Research*, v. 53, n. 2, p. 154–166. doi: 10.1177/0047287513496474.

Cerdan CM, Bruch KL & Silva AL (Orgs.) (2010) *Curso de propriedade intelectual & inovação no agronegócio: Módulo II, indicação geográfica*. 2ª ed. Brasília: MAPA, Florianópolis: SEaD/UFSC/FAPEU.

Charters S (2010) Marketing terroir: a conceptual approach. Referred paper – 5<sup>th</sup> International Academy of Wine Business Research Conference, 10 Feb. Auckland (NZ).

Clifton N (2014) Towards a holistic understanding of county of origin effects? Branding of the region, branding from the region. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, v. 3, n. 2, p. 122-132. doi: 10.1016/j.jdmm.2014.02.003.

Coneely R & Mahon M (2015) Protected geographical indications: institutional roles in food systems governance and rural development. *Geoforum*, v. 60, p. 14-21. doi: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2015.01.004.

Donner M, Horlings L, Fort F & Vellema S (2016) Place branding, embeddedness and endogenous rural development: Four European cases. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, v. 13, n. 4, p. 273-292. doi: 10.1057/s41254-016-0049-z.

Donner M, Fort F & Vellema S (2017) From Geographical Indications to Collective Place Branding in France and Morocco. In: van Caenegem W & Cleary J (eds.) *The Importance of Place: Geographical Indications as a Tool for Local and Regional Development*. *Ius Gentium: Comparative Perspectives on Law and Justice*, v. 58. pp 173-196, Springer, Cham.

Fligstein N (2001) Social skill and the theory of fields. *Sociological Theory*, v. 19, n. 2, p. 105-125.

Gangjee DS (2017) Proving provenance? Geographical indications certification and its ambiguities. *World Development*, v. 98, p. 12-24. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.04.009.

Govers R (2013) Why place branding is not about logos and slogans. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, v. 9, n. 2, p. 71–75. doi: 10.1057/pb.2013.11.

INPI - Instituto Nacional de Propriedade Industrial [Brazilian Institute of Industrial Property]. (2019). Guia básico de indicação geográfica. Available at <<http://www.inpi.gov.br/menu-servicos/indicacao-geografica>>. Retrieved June 30, 2019.

Kaufmann HR & Durst S (2008) Developing inter-regional brands. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, v. 3, n. 1, p.38-62. doi: 10.1108/14502190810873812.

Kavaratzis M & Kalandides A (2015) Rethinking the place brand: The interactional formation of place brands and the role of participatory place branding. *Environment and Planning A*, v. 47, n. 6, p. 1368-1382. doi: 10.1177/0308518X15594918.

Lecocq S, Magnac T, Pichery M & Visser M (2004) The impact of information on wine auction prices: results of an experiment. *Annales d'Économie et de Statistique*, v. 77, p. 37-57. doi: 10.2307/20079115.

Park CW, Jaworski BJ & MacInnis DJ (1986) Strategic brand concept-image management. *Journal of Marketing*, v. 50, n. 4, p. 135-145. doi: 10.1177/002224298605000401.

Neilson J, Wright J & Aklmawati L (2018) Geographical indication and value capture in the Indonesian coffee sector. *Journal of Rural Studies*, v.59, p. 35-48. doi: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.01.003.

Niederle PA (2009) Controvérsias sobre a noção de indicações geográficas enquanto instrumento de desenvolvimento territorial: a experiência do Vale dos Vinhedos em questão. *Congresso da Sober*, 47.

Rahmah M (2017) The protection of agricultural products under geographical indication: an alternative tool for agricultural development in Indonesia. *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, v. 22, p. 90-103.

Vandecandelaere E, Teyssier C, Barjolle D, Jeanneaux P, Fournier S & Beucherie O (2018) Strengthening sustainable food systems through geographical indications. *FAO Investment Centre. Directions in Investment (FAO)*. Available at <<http://www.fao.org/3/I8737EN/i8737en.pdf>>. Retrieved June 30, 2019.

Viju C, Yeung MT & Kerr WA (2012) Geographical indications, barriers to market access and preferential trade agreements. *CATPRN Commissioned Paper 2012-01*.

Vlachvei A, Nottab O & Efterpia T (2012) Branding strategies in Greek wine firms. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, v. 1, p. 421–430. doi: 10.1016/S2212-5671(12)00048-2.

Verdonk NR, Wilkinson KL & Bruwer J (2015) Importance, use and awareness of South Australian geographical indications. *Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research*, v. 21, n. 3, p.361–366. doi: 10.1111/ajgw.12145.

Wæraas A, Bjørnå H & Moldenæs T (2015) Place, Organization, Democracy: Three Strategies for Municipal Branding. *Journal of Public Management Review*, v. 17, n. 9, p. 1282-1304. doi: 10.1080/14719037.2014.906965.

Wilkinson J, Cerdan C & Dorigon C (2015) Geographical indications and “Origin” products in Brazil – the interplay of institutions and networks. *World Development*, v. 98, p. 82-92. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.05.003.

WIPO (2017) Geographical indication: an introduction. World Intellectual Property Organization.

WIPO (2019a) Geographic indications. World Intellectual Property Organization. Available at <[https://www.wipo.int/geo\\_indications/en/](https://www.wipo.int/geo_indications/en/)>. Retrieved June 30, 2019.

WIPO (2019b) WIPO IP Statistics Data Center. World Intellectual Property Organization. Available at <<https://www3.wipo.int/ipstats/index.htm?tab=geographical>>. Retrieved June 30, 2019.

WTO (2019) Geographic indications. World Trade Organization. Available at <[https://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/trips\\_e/gi\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/trips_e/gi_e.htm)>. Retrieved June 30, 2019.