



oriGIn paper

Geographical Indications in the United States: Developing a Preliminary List of Qualifying Product Names

Authors: Richard Mendelson and Zachary Wood

oriGIn

Organization for an International
Geographical Indications Network

Layout: Flame Design, South Africa

© oriGIn 2013

All rights reserved. No part of this publication
can be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system,
transmitted in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise,
without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Geographical Indications in the United States: Developing a Preliminary List of Qualifying Product Names

By Richard Mendelson¹ and Zachary Wood²
March 2013

Introduction

This paper explains the methodology and findings of our research on U.S. Geographical Indications (GIs). The preliminary list of candidate U.S. GIs that we have assembled is found in Appendices A and B. Part I of this paper sets forth the established international definition of “Geographical Indication” and explains the sources analyzed and methodology undertaken to assemble this preliminary list of candidate U.S. GIs. Parts II and III discuss, in turn, the three sources of candidate GIs that we examined: for wines, American Viticultural Areas and state and county appellations, and for other goods, registered certification marks. Part IV elaborates on the lessons that we learned and the problems that we encountered in our effort to distinguish GIs from the candidate GIs, particularly with respect to the issue of reputation. These problems and lessons extend beyond our candidate lists and apply equally to collective marks, geographic trademarks (that is, those trademarks that include geographic names or otherwise refer to geographic origin) and unregistered product and brand names, all of which may qualify as GIs but are beyond the scope of this study. Our conclusions are presented in Part V.

I. Background of Geographical Indications and the Scope of This Project

Geographical Indications are defined in Article 22 of the World Trade Organization’s 1995 Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) as “indications, which identify a good as originating in the territory of a Member, or a region or locality in that territory, where a given quality, reputation or other characteristic of the good is essentially attributable to its geographical origin.”³ GIs might be thought of as names identifying “placed-based products, labels of origin, or origin products.”⁴

The United States government does not currently recognize GIs as a separate item of intellectual property, and there is no single list of eligible products. In this project, we reviewed three currently recognized categories of origin products’ names: wines labeled with American Viticultural Areas, and other goods labeled or advertised with certification trademarks. This list of candidate GIs is by no means exhaustive. It excludes collective marks, trademarks that include a geographic name or otherwise refer to a geographic area, unregistered goods that have a nexus to a specific place and state and county appellations. These other GI candidates will be reviewed in the future.

1 Richard Mendelson teaches courses on Wine Law and Geographical Indications at the University of California Berkeley School of Law. He also directs the Program on Wine Law and Policy there. This research was funded in part by a grant from oriGIn.

2 Zachary Wood is a second year law student at the University of California Berkeley School of Law.

3 Uruguay Round Agreement: TRIPS, Section 3, Article 22: *Protection of Geographic Indications*

4 ORIGIN, AMERICAN ORIGIN PRODUCTS (AOPs): PROTECTING A LEGACY 1 (Elizabeth Barham ed., 2010).

II. Wine Appellations

A. American Viticultural Areas

American Viticultural Areas (AVAs) are designations of origin for wine. The boundaries of a given AVA are established through public rulemaking by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) in the U.S. Treasury Department.⁵ To use an AVA on a wine label, not less than 85 percent of the wines must be derived from grapes grown within the boundaries of the named AVA.⁶ The petition to establish an AVA must include “boundary evidence” that “outline[s] the commonalities or similarities within that boundary and must explain with specificity how those elements are different in the adjacent areas outside that boundary.”⁷ Such evidence typically would include but are not limited to geographical features, geology, soil type, elevation, aspect and climate. Additionally, the petition must include “distinguishing features” in the form of “a description of the common or similar features of the proposed AVA affecting viticulture that make it distinctive.” That is, the petition must state “in what way these features affect viticulture and how they are distinguished viticulturally from features associated with adjacent areas outside the proposed AVA boundary.”⁸

For purposes of assembling a list of U.S. GIs, we have assumed that all AVAs qualify. The boundaries of an AVA correspond to a defined set of viticulturally distinctive place-based characteristics, which TTB determines exist inside but not outside of the AVA. This focus on viticulturally distinctive physical features, what the French might call “terroir,” meets the threshold for a “characteristic of the good [that] is essentially attributable to its geographical origin,” common to all wine made from grapes that originate with the AVA.⁹ Additionally, TTB’s requirement that the name identified for the proposed AVA must be recognized locally or nationally and “be currently and directly associated with an area in which viticulture exists”¹⁰ might satisfy the reputation element of the TRIPs definition. We recognize, however, that the reputation of AVA wines varies widely, from the Napa Valley that stands at the pinnacle of global recognition to many relatively unknown AVAs.

Appendix A contains a list of AVAs recognized by TTB as of December 31, 2012. This list is sorted alphabetically by AVA name. In addition to the AVA name, the list includes the state(s) in which the AVA is located, the Code of Federal Regulations citation that sets forth the boundary description and name of the AVA and the name and website of the association, if any, that represents and promotes the grape growers, vintners and wines of the AVA.

B. State and County Wine Appellations

The U.S. also allows the use of appellations of origin based on political boundaries.¹¹ These political or administrative appellations include the United States, a State, two or no more than three States which are all contiguous, a county which must be identified with the word “county” in the same size of type and in letters as conspicuous as the name of the county and two or no more than three counties in the same State.¹² In order to use this type of appellation on a wine label, at least 75 percent of the grapes must have been grown within the named area.¹³ In addition to this

5 27 C.F.R. § 9.11, *et seq.*

6 27 CFR § 4.25(e)(3).

7 27 C.F.R. § 9.12(a)(2); *see also* American Viticultural Area Manual for Petitioners, TTB P 5120.4 (09/2012), available at www.ttb.gov/wine/p51204_ava_manual.pdf (last accessed January 9, 2013).

8 27 C.F.R. § 9.12(a)(3).

9 AVA wines need only be made from 85% of grapes grown within the named AVA, not 100%. The 85% threshold was established to allow for blending to improve the wine and to deal with the vagaries of Mother Nature while still preserving the unique characteristics of the AVA in the finished product.

10 27 C.F.R. § 9.12(a)(1)

11 *See* 27 C.F.R. § 4.25

12 *Id.*

13 *Id.*

minimum requirement, the wine “must [conform] to the laws and regulations of the named appellation area governing the composition, method of manufacture and designation of wines made in such a place.”¹⁴

Because a common quality or characteristic – viticultural, enological or otherwise – is not necessarily imparted to all wines from a given political or administrative appellation, the factor of reputation is likely the best way to evaluate these appellations for GI status. It is possible that some states and many counties might have boundaries that coincide with and capture distinguishing, viticulturally relevant physical features or might have adopted regulations regarding origin and processing requirements for wines from these areas such that the appellation’s wines exhibit a common characteristic or quality, but the examination of these factors must be done on a case-by-case basis and is beyond the scope of this project. Similarly, the examination of each appellation’s established reputation within the wine community and/or the broader consuming public was not undertaken in this project but is a direction for future research.

III. Certification Marks

A. Certification Mark Background and Evaluation Methodology

Certification marks are trademarks that act as a “seal of approval” for certifying “material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy, or other characteristics of goods or services.”¹⁵ Certification marks are owned by organizations or governmental bodies that must actively act as a gatekeeper and control the mark.¹⁶ The certifier itself cannot use the mark on its own goods, thus insuring impartiality. The requirements for certification may include a characteristic that either expressly or impliedly limits the geographical region of origin, and geographical terms may be used as part of the mark.¹⁷ A certification mark that is a geographical term may be used even if the “public does not recognize the certification function of the mark,” as long as the mark indicates origin from the geographical area.¹⁸ Additionally, the certifying agency need not (although it may) adopt additional quality standards as “a valid certification mark may indicate only exclusive geographical origin, with no additional quality requirement.”¹⁹

Unlike AVAs for wine, certification marks do not clearly and categorically meet the essential factors for recognition as GIs. Certification marks cover a broad range of certifications, from agricultural products to business services. The breadth of certification marks that were explored leads to interesting considerations, as the exercise of drawing the line between GIs and non-GIs for this broad category of products necessarily involves difficult decisions that can help to guide future research efforts.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ LOUIS ALTMAN & RUDOLF CALLMANN, *CALLMANN ON UNFAIR COMPETITION, TRADEMARKS AND MONOPOLIES* § 17A:15 (4th ed. 2012). *See also* 15 U.S.C. § 1054 (2012) (“[C]ollective and certification marks, including indications of regional origin, shall be registrable.”).

¹⁶ *See* ALTMAN & CALLMANN, *supra* note 15.

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.*

To review certification marks for possible inclusion on the list of U.S. GIs, we began with a list of all active certification trademarks registered with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO),²⁰ each of which we reviewed.²¹ At the time of this research (fall 2012), there were 5,810 certification marks to examine. The list was first narrowed by identifying the marks that, in their certification criteria or otherwise, provided some indication that the qualifying goods might be geographically based. To make this determination, we reviewed (1) the words or images comprising the mark, (2) the categories of goods or services claimed in the mark, (3) the description of the mark provided by the applicant, and (4) the certifying group or organization, that is, the owner of the mark. Certification marks with geographical terms in their name were automatically included, along with marks whose description indicated a geographical origin requirement. In addition to these obvious inclusions, marks that could conceivably encompass an origin requirement based upon clues in the documents available on the USPTO data base were included, such as a description that required locally sourced agricultural products combined with a geographically based certifying organization such as a county government, livestock certified by a breeders organization and agricultural products that qualified for the mark through compliance with a state statute such as the California Organic Food Act but evidenced no specific origin requirement. Certification marks were not excluded from this first, narrower sub-list simply due to a lack of information. Marks were only excluded for reasons that could be affirmatively identified from the USPTO's trademark file. Examples included marks for services only, marks for goods with a non-U.S. origin, and certifications clearly unrelated to geographical location.

The smaller list that was derived after this initial investigation included 319 marks. These marks were then evaluated in greater depth. We endeavored to rate each mark's potential for GI status. The final list was divided into five categories based upon the variations in GI potential among the marks. First, marks that, upon further examination, obviously were lacking a quality, reputation or characteristic that was geographically based were placed into an "obviously not a GI" category. Many of these marks initially showed only a remote, theoretical tie to geography or were physical goods that survived the initial cull only because they could not be clearly identified as *not* having a tie to geography. Second, marks that ultimately showed no real tie to geography but that certify a characteristic of the good that might have a geographical nexus were placed into a category of "maybe, but eliminated upon further research." Third, marks that were in some way geographically related but whose inclusion would, in our opinion, extend the concept of GI too far were placed in a "maybe with further proof" category. Many of these marks would cause informed minds to differ about their inclusion on a list of U.S. GIs. We attempted to provide clear reasons why marks in this category were considered unfit for recognition as GIs. Most marks in this category conceivably could be moved onto the list of candidate GIs if specific proof were offered or discovered that support a reputation, quality or characteristic of the certified good tied to the place of origin. Fourth, marks were identified as clear candidate GIs if we could readily identify a reputation, quality or characteristic that ties the product to its origin. Fifth, for accurate record-keeping, multiple marks for the identical products were noted.

20 This list was generated using the Trademark Electronic Search System (TESS) accessible at <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/index.jsp>. The "Free Form" search function was used to generate a list of active certification marks. The Boolean search used was "(a or b)[ic] and live[ld]." This search generated a list of certification marks, and each certification mark links to an information page that contains words or images of the mark, the type of goods and services claimed, the owner of the mark, and a category of "Other Data" that often, but not always, includes a description of the requirements of the mark. Each information page also includes a hyperlinked button labeled "TSDR." This links to the certification mark's "Trademark Status & Document Retrieval (TSDR)" page. More detailed information about the mark and the documents that accompany its application were found here, when needed to clarify the purpose of the mark.

21 This project focused on identifying potential GIs for U.S. origin products. Goods that do not originate in the United States but are merely registered in the U.S. were therefore excluded. Such excluded goods include Darjeeling tea from the Darjeeling region of India (Registration #2685923); Jabugo, Iberian pork from the Spanish city of Jabugo (Registration #4222093); Reggiano cheese from the Parma-Reggio region of Italy (Registration #3438648); and Stilton cheese from three specific counties in England (Registration #2758026).

Appendix B sets forth the certification marks in the third category (“maybe GIs with further proof”) and fourth category (U.S. candidate GIs) of our methodological scheme.²² For each of these two categories, Appendix B contains six columns of information: serial number, name, relevant region, analysis, further proof and certifying agency. The serial number and name are the identifying number and registered words (or a brief description for purely pictorial marks) of the mark as recorded by the USPTO. Some trademark titles were shortened for clarity, particularly where the registered words are repetitious or include a lengthy tagline. The relevant region for which the mark might be a GI was also recorded if it was identifiable. For each mark, the “analysis” column includes a brief rationale for the mark’s inclusion or possible exclusion from the list of GIs. Finally, the certification agency and its website, if available, are listed.

Some types of certification marks were categorically excluded from consideration. As noted above, certification marks for non-U.S. goods were excluded. Marks that certify individuals for performing a service were not included, as the definition of GI applies specifically to goods. Service-oriented marks might have been further examined if they hinted at a resulting good that could be tied to a particular geographical area, but no such marks were encountered. Mass-produced, manufactured goods, including but not limited to electronic goods and medical devices, were also not included for consideration. We also did not include common law certification marks because they are, by definition, not registered.

B. Examples of Certification Marks that Represent Potential GIs

One of the most common examples of a certification mark that qualifies as a GI is the case of a single agricultural product from a single state. Well-known examples of this type of certification mark include Michigan Apples, Idaho Potatoes and Louisiana Shrimp. In addition to trade organizations’ assertions that these products exhibit qualities and characteristics unique to the state, these examples often benefit greatly from the reputation prong of GI analysis. Reputation, as identified here, consists primarily of online searches for the product, focusing both on the total number of pages that reference the specific product and the existence of websites that specifically reference the reputation of these products.²³ However, lesser known²⁴ products such as Wisconsin ginseng also fit this basic model. That particular certifying organization claims that the reputation for Wisconsin ginseng is growing and cites specific qualities of the product tied to both natural and human factors.²⁵

Some products associated with larger regions are included on the list. These products are generally limited to a geographical area in which a consistent quality or characteristic is likely to be found throughout the region. For example, the claimed area for the certification of Wild North American Blueberries is limited only to North America. However, “wild blueberries,” upon further examination, actually refers to the lowbush blueberry (*V. angustifolium*) which has grown in its current habitat, limited mostly to Maine and parts of Canada, for 10,000 years.²⁶ A relatively restricted growing area such as this most likely leads to a common characteristic in the species of berry, and the emphasis on “wild”²⁷ ensures that the characteristics will be maintained even after human intervention, in contrast to purely farmed or cultivated products. The requirement that these plants be wild and not cultivated also reduces the risk of diluting the GI by taking plants of this variety to a new region and cultivating the product there.

22 The list of certification marks in the first, second and fifth categories is not included in Appendix B but is available upon request.

23 The reputation element and the need for further development of this analysis are discussed in Part IV, *infra*.

24 “Lesser known” is not meant to imply that there is no reputation, rather that the reputation is not as widespread based on online searches.

25 See Ginseng Board of Wisconsin, <http://www.ginsengboard.com> (“Wisconsin has cool summers, rolling hills and virgin soil to grow highly potent American ginseng. Producers in Wisconsin also have generations of growing experience. Their hard work and advanced farming practices produce the world’s highest quality cultivated ginseng.”).

26 See WildBlueberries.com, <http://www.wildblueberries.com/about/index.php>.

27 The blueberries are not planted or cultivated. The fields of these blueberries are managed through activities such as pruning, importation of bees for pollination, and pest control, but the plants reproduce primarily by underground runners. Wild Blueberry Association of North America, *Growing Wild Blueberries*, WILDBLUEBERRIES.COM, <http://www.wildblueberries.com/about/growing-wild-blueberries.php>.

C. Certification Marks that Might Be GIs with Additional Proof

There were several certification marks that exhibit some feature(s) that could potentially qualify the relevant products as GIs if further proof were provided or more extensive research were conducted. These are listed in the first part of Exhibit B. The constraints of this study required us to rely on readily available information, most often the website of the certifier or related background publications. Although each product presents its own unique set of facts, there were some issues in evaluating the registered certification marks that occurred frequently enough to merit specific mention. Those issues follow, along with a brief description of the challenges presented, examples where illustrative and implications for future research.

D. Organic and Sustainable

General certifications of organic or sustainable practices were not included on the list of potential GIs. These certifications are generally too broad to convey a reputation, quality or characteristic that is tied to a specific geographical area. Most certifications for organic or sustainable practices with no stated tie to geography were not even included on the preliminary list. However, some of these certification programs did contain a geographical limitation. Most often these limitations were in the form of state boundaries. Certifications of sustainable or organic products from a given state were not considered GIs largely because of the large the number of products covered by the certification. It is unlikely that all products that are grown in an environmentally friendly manner within a given state share an identifiable quality, reputation or characteristic. This is particularly true because many sustainably grown products may have no characteristic imparted by the certified practice. For example, water conservation or renewable energy use may not change the characteristics of the final product.

Certifications for sustainable wine are an exception to the general rule. Marks that indicate that a wine is sustainably produced within a relatively small geographical area (a county, for example) are considered as potential GIs. These were included on the list both because they are a single product (thus increasing the uniformity of reputation, quality or characteristic) and because wine grapes and the resulting wine are considered particularly sensitive to subtle variations in the growing environment, thus making it likely that human factors like sustainable farming will lead to identifiable characteristics and/or quality in the end product. If an appellation of origin for wine (AVA or political appellation) is considered a GI, a sustainability designation for that same appellation should likely be considered a GI as well. Thus, organic, sustainable and other certification marks that restrict the farming and/or processing of particular goods are worthy of further examination because these human controls could very well result in goods that exhibit a distinctive reputation, quality or other characteristic.

E. Locally Made and Locally Grown

Several registered marks certify that products are locally made or grown in a given area. This obviously constitutes a tie to the land, so proof of a reputation, quality or characteristic of the good associated with that local origin would likely qualify the specific product as a GI. However, as was the case with sustainable product certifications, not all products that are locally made or grown will exhibit such features. For that reason, further research is needed. While GIs are almost certainly contained within the category of locally made/locally grown goods,²⁸ the lack of meaningful limitation on the area or on the allowable products makes researching or proving quality, reputation or characteristics of the product extremely difficult.

28 The “locavore” movement, for example, promotes the consumption of food that is grown “locally,” usually within a few hundred miles of the place of sale. For a discussion of the relevance of GIs to the local food movement as well as general background on the local food movement and locavores, see Daniele Giovannucci, Elizabeth Barham, and Richard Pirog, *Defining and Marketing “Local” Foods: Geographical Indications for US Products*, 13 J. World Intel. Prop. 94 (2010).

F. Certifications Covering Any and All Products from a Given Area

Many states and some cities and other regions hold certification marks that include all products grown, produced or manufactured within their respective boundaries. These certifications cover too many products to be a GI, as every product cannot be assumed to have an identifiable quality, reputation or characteristic. However, these certifications probably encompass many products that would qualify as GIs. Individual products within a state or smaller area would be similar to the archetypical GIs that cover one state and one product (e.g., Wisconsin Cheese and Florida Oranges). Proof of reputation or of product characteristics deriving from the place of origin would then suffice to recognize these products as candidate GIs. This type of certification mark is another fertile ground to search for U.S. GIs that are not presently on our list.²⁹

G. Non-native Livestock and Strictly Controlled, Man-Made Growing Environments

While agricultural products that have evolved in an area and that are grown in the characteristic soil and climate of an area will often be GIs, non-native products or products grown or raised in a controlled, man-made environment present special concerns. One example of this type of product is ostrich oil. Ostriches, which are not native to the U.S., will not inherently possess characteristics or qualities associated with the land that might be present in animals that have adapted to a particular geographical region. Additionally, animals might be less likely to quickly adapt qualities associated with the land than plants, which can quickly “absorb” the qualities of a place through interaction with the soil and the climate. While animals that graze on local flora may in some cases produce products that quickly take on a characteristic of the place (such as milk and cheese produced from cows, goats and sheep that graze on local plants), animals fed on manufactured feed shipped from outside the area would be particularly insulated from developing characteristics of place. In this case, the most likely way that these products would qualify for GI status is through a reputation or quality imparted from the human factors involved in raising and processing the livestock. This reputation or quality would need to be more geographically oriented than simple purity standards or safety controls such as testing for chemicals or controlling for hormone additives. However, adherence to a set of raising and processing techniques within an area may be enough to impart GI status. For these products, specific proof of the quality, reputation or characteristic would need to be provided.

Similar to non-native animals, plants and animals raised in a more laboratory-like environment might not exhibit features that are associated with the land. For example, farmed fish may be raised entirely in tanks from existing breed stock. These man-made environments would not themselves impart features that are unique to an area, as the industrial setup of tanks could be replicated anywhere within a wide range of acceptable temperatures with identical results. Plants grown in a laboratory and bred specifically for consistency such as grass seed developed for golf courses or similar applications would also not exhibit distinctive characteristics of the land.

H. Breeds

Several certification marks are used by breeders associations to control the integrity of and promote a specific breed. As a general rule, the breeds covered by certification marks are too generalized to qualify as GIs. While breeds can certainly exhibit consistent qualities or characteristics, these features are not necessarily tied to a specific geographical area. Most often, breeds are developed in one area and then exported as farmers in other areas adopt the breed because of one or more of its features. To this end, most certifying associations for breeds place importance on spreading the breed and promoting its use both within the U.S. and internationally. Breeds might qualify as GIs, at least in theory, if the breed were developed and maintained in a given geographical area. An example of this type of breed

²⁹ There will also be overlap between state-wide “made in” certifications and more specific certifications of individual products for the same state.

would be Kobe beef, as it is a breed (Wagyu) that is officially only raised in one prefecture in Japan (Hyogo).³⁰ A U.S. breed with similar reputation tied to an area, such as Texas longhorn cattle, might exhibit characteristics of place. However, the certification mark for this breed fails to restrict the area of origin. Proof that a breed is controlled for both characteristics and origin or that a breed is only raised in a particular area for reasons other than control by the particular association might be sufficient to qualify such a breed as a GI. However, no such breeds were found during our certification mark search.

I. Tribal Marks

There are many certification marks that indicate the involvement of federally recognized Native American tribes. These marks will not themselves fit the requirements of a GI because they are not for a specific product, but they do raise an interesting potential for GI status. Native American made products in many cases would demonstrate a particular reputation, quality or characteristic due to the tribe's rich and long history and the associated, traditional production techniques. These features are also likely to be tied to a particular area historically associated with the tribe. The human factors performed by indigenous peoples would impart characteristics that have come to be associated with the given geographical area. Traditional handicrafts would almost certainly qualify as GIs, but these do not appear as individual certification marks. Any further efforts to identify U.S. GIs should examine the products produced by registered tribes.

J. Timber

Certification marks for a particular state's timber resources raise interesting questions about the extent to which single species from a single state should be considered to be GIs. Certifications for specific types of timber were pulled from the initial list of registered marks as potential GIs. Products like "Genuine Incense-Cedar" are found in a very limited geographical range and have developed specific species characteristics over hundreds, thousands or millions of years that are tied to a particular place. On the other hand, certifications such as "Premium Indiana Forest Products" do not limit the potentially certified products in the same way. This latter certification could apply equally to native and non-native tree species. Typically, the associations promoting timber products from a state focus more on the management aspects (e.g., reliability of timber management techniques, infrastructure for access and transportation) than the qualities or characteristics of the timber tied to its origin. While these human factors might result in a GI (e.g., if timber management and clearing were place specific and resulted in particularly strong lumber), this type of feature is not mentioned by the certifying organizations.

Timber certification marks also present an interesting comparison to more readily apparent GIs such as Michigan Apples. The apples that have gained a reputation as having a particular quality come from particular species of trees, just as timber comes from a particular species. Is it equitable to extend GI status to apples from a state (where the boundary is, in reality, arbitrarily drawn) and not to timber, which may be as unique to a place as apple varieties? The main distinction may be that apples, but not timber, are promoted and their quality is controlled by the state. This requires us to focus squarely on the reputation element of GIs, which we turn to in the next section.

IV. Importance of the Reputation Element and Directions for Future Research

Due to the difficulty of determining or confirming qualities or characteristics of a given product and the tendency of U.S. products to be differentiated by the relatively arbitrary boundaries of states, reputation becomes an important consideration for compiling a list of U.S. GIs. Products with widely known reputations are easy to identify. They include Wisconsin Cheese, Idaho Potatoes and Florida Oranges. However, lesser-known products may still have a historical or deeply rooted local or national reputation such as Chimayo Peppers, grown historically in and around the town of

30 Even "Kobe beef" is now a generic term in the United States, and most beef sold as "Kobe beef" does not meet the Japanese requirements for the term. See Larry Olmsted, *Food's Biggest Scam: The Great Kobe Beef Lie*, FORBES.COM, Apr. 12, 2012, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/larryolmsted/2012/04/12/foods-biggest-scam-the-great-kobe-beef-lie/2/>.

Chimayo, New Mexico. We have attempted to identify as GIs those products that have a demonstrated reputation. In addition to “common knowledge,” online searches were used as one measure of the reach of a product’s reputation and its tie to a particular place or origin. We relied on total search results for the relevant product phrase as the primary objective measure. Online results also provided subjective evidence of reputation, as substantive mention of the product and its origin on websites other than that of the certifying organization showed that the product was recognized beyond the (potentially biased) view of the certifier. A more complex, detailed, and quantifiable examination of the reputation metric would be useful.

Ultimately, to develop a comprehensive and official list of U.S. GIs, we recommend that a single body, whether it is the USPTO or another public agency or a private “certifying” group, be assigned the task of researching and/or reviewing the relevant data for each good proposed for inclusion on a registry of U.S. GIs. Whoever takes on this task should have clear and transparent operating procedures and substantive guidelines, including a public application process covering examination, opposition and registration. In view of the wide variety of potential GI products, this process of “certifying the certifier” would ensure consistency and efficiency.³¹

To qualify for recognition and protection as GIs under U.S. law, each GI should have an owner, whether that is a certifying body in the case of a certification mark, a trade association, government agency, licensee or otherwise. Who owns wine appellations is not so clear. TTB establishes AVAs based on petitions that it receives. But the petitioners do not own the AVA. Nor does the TTB adjudicate competing ownership claims to AVA names. This issue is beyond the scope of this paper, but clarifying who owns a GI is critical to the preparation of a U.S. GI registry that accords with TRIPs and U.S. intellectual property laws.

Conclusion

The list of U.S. GIs presented here is not complete, nor are the determinations made to differentiate between GI and non-GI goods within the categories of registered certification marks closed to further examination. It is possible that some products identified here as GIs do not, in fact, exhibit a quality, reputation or characteristic that is unique to the claimed geographical area, as the analysis for this project was often focused on assertions made by trade organizations or on incomplete information about reputation.

It is equally possible that products determined not to be GIs do, in fact, demonstrate the requisite quality, reputation, or characteristic to be classified as GIs. Some industry organizations may have decided not to focus their marketing efforts on the geographical qualities of the product because this is not considered to be a cost-effective means of advertising and selling the product. For example, timber products may show characteristics tied to place as well as human factors relating to the growing and harvesting of the timber, but efficiency of local timber management seems to be the preferred selling point.

Many associations motivated by intellectual property protection in the form of a GI list would almost certainly offer sufficient proof of natural or human factors that tie their respective products closely to a particular area. Hence, there is a circularity problem: the absence of an official list of U.S. GIs leads to associations not describing their products in the language of GIs, and this lack of GI-specific wording makes it difficult to assemble a definitive list as a starting point for research. Further, there are certainly products that would qualify as GIs that are neither wine nor currently registered certification marks.

With all its limitations, we offer this list as a useful beginning to a conversation about U.S. GIs and a launching point for further research.

31 For a detailed discussion of “certifying the certifier,” see Tara Capsuto, *Criteria for U.S. Geographic Indications*, ORIGIN, http://www.origin-gi.com/images/stories/PDFs/English/papers/Tara_Capsuto_OriGin_paper_May_2012.pdf.

APPENDIX A

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Alexander Valley	California	27 CFR 9.53	Alexander Valley Winegrowers	www.alexandervalley.org	Oct. 24, 1984 Aug. 26, 1986 May 13, 1988 Aug. 9, 1990 Oct. 4, 2001 Mar. 11, 2008
Alexandria Lakes	Minnesota	26 CFR 9.177	Minnesota Grape Growers Association	www.mnrapegrowers.com	July 1, 2004
Alta Mesa	California	26 CFR 9.195	Lodi Winegrape Commission	www.lodiwine.com	July 17, 2005
Altus	Arkansas	26 CFR 9.77	Arkansas Wine Producers Association	www.postfamilie.com/awpa/	May 30, 1983
Ancient Lakes of Columbia Valley	Washington	26 CFR 9.227	Washington Wine Commission	www.washingtonwine.org	Nov. 19, 2011
Anderson Valley	California	26 CFR 9.86	Anderson Valley Winegrowers Association	www.avwines.com	Aug. 18, 1982
Antelope Valley of the California High Desert	California	26 CFR 9.219	Antelope Valley Winegrowers Association	www.avwinegrowers.org	May 24, 2010
Applegate Valley	Oregon	26 CFR 9.165	Rogue Valley Winegrowers Association	www.rvwinegrowers.org	Dec. 14, 1999
Arkansas Mountain	Arkansas	26 CFR 9.112	Arkansas Wine Producers Association	www.postfamilie.com/awpa/	Sept. 26, 1985
Arroyo Grande Valley	California	26 CFR 9.129	San Luis Obispo Vintners Association	www.slowine.com	Jan. 4, 1989

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Arroyo Seco	California	27 CFR 9.59	Arroyo Seco Winegrowers & Vintners Association	www.montereywines.org/Associate%20Members/arroyo-seco-winegrowers-vintners-association/	Apr. 15, 1983 June 15, 2006
Atlas Peak	California	26 CFR 9.140	Atlas Peak Appellation Association	www.atlaspeakappellation.com	Jan. 22, 1991
Augusta	Missouri	26 CFR 9.22	Missouri Wine & Grape Board	www.missouriwine.org	June 20, 1979
Bell Mountain	Texas	26 CFR 9.55	Texas Wine & Grape Growers Association	www.txwines.org	Oct. 10, 1985
Ben Lomond Mountain	California	26 CFR 9.118	Santa Cruz Mountains Winegrowers Association	www.scmwa.com	Dec. 9, 1986
Benmore Valley	California	26 CFR 9.138	Lake County Winegrape Commission	www.lakecountywinegrape.org	Oct. 18, 1990
Bennett Valley	California	26 CFR 9.142	Bennett Valley Grape Growers	www.bvvgg.org	Oct. 30, 2002
Borden Ranch	California	26 CFR 9.196	Lodi Winegrape Commission	www.lodiwine.com	July 17, 2005
California Shenandoah Valley	California	27 CFR 9.37	Amador Winegrowers	www.amadorwinegrapes.com	Dec. 28, 1982 Feb. 27, 1987
Calistoga	California	26 CFR 9.209	Calistoga Winegrowers	www.calistogawinegrowers.com	Dec. 8, 2008
Capay Valley	California	26 CFR 9.176	Roots to Wine	www.rootstowine.com	Dec. 20, 2001
Carmel Valley	California	27 CFR 9.58	Monterey County Vintners and Growers Association	www.montereywines.org	Dec. 14, 1982 Feb. 1, 2011
Catoctin	Maryland	27 CFR 9.67	Association of Maryland Wineries & Maryland Grape Growers Association	www.marylandwine.com	Oct. 13, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987
Cayuga Lake	New York	26 CFR 9.127	Finger Lakes Wine Alliance	www.fingerlakeswinealliance.com	Mar. 25, 1987

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Central Coast	California	27 CFR 9.75	Central Coast Wine Growers Association	www.ccwga.org	Oct. 24, 1985 Jan. 20, 1999 June 15, 2006
Central Delaware Valley	New Jersey, Pennsylvania	27 CFR 9.49	Garden State Wine Growers Association; Pennsylvania Winery Association	www.newjerseywines.com ; www.pennsylvaniawine.com	Mar. 19, 1984 Feb. 27, 1987
Chalk Hill	California	27 CFR 9.52	Sonoma County Winegrape Commission	www.sonomawinegrape.org	Oct. 21, 1983 May 13, 1988
Chalone	California	26 CFR 9.24	Monterey County Vintners and Growers Association	www.montereywines.org	June 14, 1981
Chehalem Mountains	Oregon	26 CFR 9.205	Chehalem Mountains Winegrowers Association	www.chehalemmountains.org	Nov. 27, 2005
Chiles Valley	California	26 CFR 9.154	Napa Valley Vintners	www.napavintners.com	Feb. 17, 1998
Cienega Valley	California	26 CFR 9.38	San Benito Winegrowers Association	www.sbcwinegrowers.org	Aug. 19, 1981
Clarksburg	California	26 CFR 9.95	Clarksburg Wine Growers & Vintners Association	www.clarksburgwinecountry.com	Jan. 23, 1983
Clear Lake	California	26 CFR 9.99	Lake County Winegrape Commission	www.lakecountywinegrape.org	May 8, 1983
Clements Hills	California	26 CFR 9.197	Lodi Winegrape Commission	www.lodiwine.com	July 17, 2005
Cole Ranch	California	26 CFR 9.42	Mendocino County Wine & Winegrapes	www.mendowine.com	Apr. 15, 1982
Columbia Gorge	Oregon, Washington	26 CFR 9.178	Columbia Gorge Winegrowers	www.columbiagorgewine.com	May 10, 2003

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Columbia Valley	Washington, Oregon	27 CFR 9.74	Columbia Valley Wineries Association	www.columbiavalleywine.com	Nov. 13, 1984 Feb. 27, 1987 Mar. 31, 1987 July 28, 1993 Feb. 26, 2001
Coombsville	California	26 CFR 9.223	Coombsville Vintners and Growers	www.coombsvillenapa.org	Dec. 14, 2010
Cosumnes River	California	26 CFR 9.198	Lodi Winegrape Commission	www.lodiwine.com	July 17, 2005
Covelo	California	26 CFR 9.187	Mendocino County Wine & Winegrapes	www.mendowine.com	Feb. 16, 2005
Cucamonga Valley	California	26 CFR 9.150	Cucamonga Valley Vintners Cooperative	www.cucamongacoop.org	Mar. 31, 1994
Cumberland Valley	Maryland, Pennsylvania	27 CFR 9.105	Association of Maryland Wineries & Maryland Grape Growers Association	www.marylandwine.com	July 23, 1985 Feb. 27, 1987
Diablo Grande	California	26 CFR 9.156	San Joaquin Valley Wine Growers Association	www.idrinkwine.net	June 22, 1997
Diamond Mountain District	California	26 CFR 9.166	Napa Valley Vintners	www.napavintners.com	June 1, 2000
Dos Rios	California	26 CFR 9.175	Mendocino County Wine & Winegrapes	www.mendowine.com	Oct. 14, 2004
Dry Creek Valley	California	27 CFR 9.64	Winegrowers of Dry Creek Valley	www.wdcv.com	Aug. 4, 1983 Oct. 4, 2001
Dundee Hills	Oregon	26 CFR 9.180	Dundee Hills Winegrowers Association	www.dundeehills.org	Nov. 30, 2003
Dunnigan Hills	California	26 CFR 9.145	Roots to Wine	www.rootstowine.com	May 13, 1992

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Edna Valley	California	27 CFR 9.35	San Luis Obispo Vintners Association	www.slowine.com	May 12, 1982 Feb. 27, 1987
El Dorado	California	27 CFR 9.61	El Dorado Winery Association	www.eldoradowines.org	Oct. 13, 1983 June 24, 1987
Eola-Amity Hills	Oregon	26 CFR 9.202	Oregon Winegrowers Association	www.eolaamityhills.com	July 17, 2005
Escondido Valley	Texas	26 CFR 9.141	Texas Wine & Grape Growers Association	www.txwines.org	May 15, 1991
Fair Play	California	26 CFR 9.168	Fair Play Winery Association	www.fairplaywine.com	Feb. 26, 2000
Fennville	Michigan	26 CFR 9.33	Michigan Grape & Wine Industry Council	www.michiganwines.com	Sept. 18, 1980
Fiddletown	California	27 CFR 9.81	Amador Winegrowers	www.amadorwinegrapes.com	Oct. 4, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987
Finger Lakes	New York	27 CFR 9.34	Finger Lakes Wine Alliance	www.fingerlakeswinealliance.com	Sept. 1, 1982 Feb. 27, 1987
Fort Ross-Seaview	California	26 CFR 9.221	Sonoma County Winegrape Commission	www.sonomawinegrape.org	Dec. 14, 2010
Fredericksburg in the Texas Hill Country	Texas	26 CFR 9.125	Texas Wine & Grape Growers Association	www.txwines.org	Dec. 22, 1987
Grand River Valley	Ohio	26 CFR 9.87	Ohio Wine Producers Association; Wine Growers of the Grand River Valley	www.ohiowines.org ; www.wggrv.com (website in inoperative)	Oct. 21, 1982
Grand Valley	Colorado	26 CFR 9.137	Grand Valley Winery Association	www.grandvalleywine.com	Nov. 25, 1990
Green Valley of Russian River Valley	California	27 CFR 9.57	Russian River Valley Winegrowers	www.rrvw.org	Nov. 21, 1983 Mar. 23, 2007

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Guenoc Valley	California	26 CFR 9.26	Lake County Winegrape Commission	www.lakecountywinegrape.org	Nov. 19, 1980
Hames Valley	California	26 CFR 9.147	Monterey County Vintners and Growers Association	www.montereywines.org	Mar. 25, 1993
Happy Canyon of Santa Barbara	California	26 CFR 9.217	Santa Barbara County Vintners' Association	www.sbcountywines.com	Oct. 8, 2008
Haw River Valley	North Carolina	26 CFR 9.214	North Carolina Winegrowers Association	www.ncwinegrowers.com	Mar. 30, 2008
Hermann	Missouri	27 CFR 9.71	Missouri Wine & Grape Board	www.missouriwine.org	Aug. 18, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987
High Valley	California	26 CFR 9.189	Lake County Winegrape Commission	www.lakecountywinegrape.org	July 1, 2005
Horse Heaven Hills	Washington	26 CFR 9.188	Horse Heaven Hills Wine Growers	www.horseheavenhillswinegrowers.org	July 1, 2005
Howell Mountain	California	27 CFR 9.94	Howell Mountain Vintners & Growers Association	www.howellmountain.org	Dec. 30, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987
Hudson River Region	New York	26 CFR 9.47	New York Wine & Grape Foundation	www.newyorkwines.org	June 4, 1981
Inwood Valley	California	26 CFR 9.226	Shasta-Cascade Viticulture Association	www.shastacascadeviticultureassociation.org	Oct. 15, 2011
Isle St. George	Ohio	26 CFR 9.51	Ohio Wine Producers Association	www.ohiowines.org	Aug. 20, 1981
Jahant	California	26 CFR 9.199	Lodi Winegrape Commission	www.lodiwine.com	July 17, 2005
Kanawha River Valley	West Virginia	26 CFR 9.111	West Virginia Department of Agriculture	www.wvagriculture.org	Apr. 8, 1985

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Knights Valley	California	26 CFR 9.76	Sonoma County Winegrape Commission	www.sonomawinegrape.org	Oct. 21, 1982
Lake Chelan	Washington	26 CFR 9.215	Lake Chelan Wine Growers Association	www.lakechelan.com	Apr. 29, 2008
Lake Erie	New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio	26 CFR 9.83	Lake Erie Quality Wine Alliance	www.lakeeriewine.com	Oct. 21, 1982
Lake Michigan Shore	Michigan	27 CFR 9.79	Michigan Grape & Wine Industry Council; Wineries of the AVA	www.michiganwines.com ; www.lakemichiganshorewinetrail.com	Oct. 13, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987
Lake Wisconsin	Wisconsin	26 CFR 9.146	Wisconsin Grape Growers Association	www.wigrapes.org	Jan. 5, 1993
Lancaster Valley	Pennsylvania	26 CFR 9.41	Pennsylvania Winery Association	www.pennsylvaniawine.com	May 12, 1981
Leelanau Peninsula	Michigan	26 CFR 9.40	Leelanau Peninsula Vintners Association	lpwines.com	Mar. 30, 1981
Lehigh Valley	Pennsylvania	26 CFR 9.210	Lehigh Valley Wine Trail	www.lehighvalleywinetrail.com	Mar. 11, 2007
Leona Valley	California	26 CFR 9.212	Antelope Valley Winegrowers Association	www.avwinegrowers.org	Oct. 29, 2007
Lime Kiln Valley	California	27 CFR 9.27	San Benito Winegrowers Association	www.sbcwinegrowers.org	June 4, 1982 Feb. 27, 1987
Linganore	Maryland	26 CFR 9.63	Association of Maryland Wineries & Maryland Grape Growers Association	www.marylandwine.com	Aug. 18, 1982
Livermore Valley	California	27 CFR 9.46	Livermore Valley Winegrowers Association	www.lvwine.org	Sept. 1, 1982 June 15, 2006
Lodi	California	27 CFR 9.107	Lodi Winegrape Commission	www.lodiwine.com	Feb. 13, 1986 Sept. 4, 2002
Long Island	New York	26 CFR 9.170	Long Island Wine Council	www.liwines.com	May 15, 2000

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Loramie Creek	Ohio	26 CFR 9.62	Ohio Wine Producers Association	www.ohiowines.org	Nov. 26, 1981
Los Carneros (Carneros)	California	27 CFR 9.32	Carneros Wine Alliance	www.carneros.com	Aug. 18, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987 Nov. 15, 2006
Madera	California	27 CFR 9.92	Madera Vintners Association	www.maderawinetrail.com	Dec. 12, 1984 Jan. 22, 1985 Feb. 27, 1987
Malibu-Newton Canyon	California	26 CFR 9.152	California Association of Winegrape Growers	www.cawg.org	June 13, 1995
Martha's Vineyard	Massachusetts	26 CFR 9.73	Massachusetts Farm Wineries & Growers	www.masswinery.com	Jan 3, 1984
McDowell Valley	California	27 CFR 9.36	Mendocino County Wine & Winegrapes	www.mendowine.com	Dec. 4, 1981 Feb. 27, 1987
McMinnville	Oregon	26 CFR 9.181	McMinnville Winegrowers Associations	www.mcminnvilleava.org	Jan. 18, 2004
Mendocino	California	27 CFR 9.93	Mendocino County Wine & Winegrapes	www.mendowine.com	June 15, 1984 Apr. 7, 1998
Mendocino Ridge	California	26 CFR 9.158	Mendocino County Wine & Winegrapes	www.mendowine.com	Oct. 27, 1996
Merritt Island	California	27 CFR 9.68	Clarksburg Wine Growers & Vintners Association	www.clarksburgwinecountry.com	May 17, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987
Mesilla Valley	New Mexico, Texas	26 CFR 9.100	New Mexico Wine Growers Association; Texas Wine & Grape Growers Association	www.nmwine.com ; www.txwines.org	Feb. 14, 1984
Middle Rio Grande Valley	New Mexico	26 CFR 9.119	New Mexico Wine Growers Association	www.nmwine.com	Feb. 2, 1987

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Middleburg Virginia	Virginia	26 CFR 9.225	Virginia Wine Board	www.virginiawine.org	Oct. 15, 2011
Mimbres Valley	New Mexico	26 CFR 9.103	New Mexico Wine Growers Association	www.nmwine.com	Nov. 21, 1984
Mississippi Delta	Mississippi, Tennessee, Louisiana	26 CFR 9.96	Tennessee Farm Winegrowers Association	www.tennesseewines.com	Aug. 30, 1983
Mokelumne River	California	26 CFR 9.200	Lodi Winegrape Commission	www.lodiwine.com	July 17, 2005
Monterey	California	27 CFR 9.98	Monterey County Vintners and Growers Association	www.montereywines.org	June 15, 1984 Feb. 27, 1987
Monticello	Virginia	27 CFR 9.48	Virginia Wine Board	www.virginiawine.org	Jan. 23, 1984 Feb. 27, 1987 June 24, 1987
Mt. Harlan	California	26 CFR 9.131	San Benito Winegrowers Association	www.sbcwinegrowers.org	Nov. 15, 1989
Mt. Veeder	California	27 CFR 9.123	Mt. Veeder Appellation Council	www.mtveederwines.com	Feb. 20, 1990 Dec. 13, 1993
Naches Heights	Washington	26 CFR 9.222	Washington Wine Commission	www.washingtonwine.org	Dec. 14, 2010
Napa Valley	California	27 CFR 9.23	Napa Valley Vintners	www.napavintners.com	Jan. 28, 1981 Mar. 29, 1985
Niagara Escarpment	New York	26 CFR 9.186	New York Wine & Grape Foundation	www.newyorkwines.org	Sept. 8, 2004
North Coast	California	26 CFR 9.30	California North Coast Grape Growers Association	www.cncgga.com	Sept. 21, 1982
North Fork of Long Island	New York	26 CFR 9.113	Long Island Wine Council	www.liwines.com	Oct. 10, 1985
North Fork of Roanoke	Virginia	27 CFR 9.65	Virginia Wine Board	www.virginiawine.org	Apr. 15, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
North Yuba	California	26 CFR 9.106	Sierra Wine & Grape Growers Association	www.sierragrapegrowers.org	July 30, 1984
Northern Neck George Washington Birthplace	Virginia	26 CFR 9.109	Virginia Wine Board	www.virginiawine.org	Apr. 21, 1986
Northern Sonoma	California	27 CFR 9.70	Sonoma County Winegrape Commission	www.sonomawinegrape.org	May 17, 1985 Aug. 26, 1986 Aug. 9, 1990 Nov. 16, 2011
Oak Knoll District of Napa Valley	California	26 CFR 9.161	Oak Knoll District of Napa Valley	www.oakknolldistrictofnapavalley.com	Feb. 25, 2003
Oakville	California	26 CFR 9.134	Oakville Winegrowers	www.oakvillewinegrowers.com	July 2, 1992
Ohio River Valley	Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, West Virginia	27 CFR 9.78	Ohio Wine Producers Association; Kentucky Wine (State Gov.); Indiana Wine Grape Council; West Virginia Department of Agriculture	www.ohiowines.org ; www.kentuckywine.com ; www.indianawines.org ; www.wvagriculture.org	Sept. 7, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987
Old Mission Peninsula	Michigan	26 CFR 9.114	Michigan Grape & Wine Industry Council; Wineries of the AVA	www.michiganwines.com ; wineriesofoldmission.com	June 8, 1986
Outer Coastal Plain	New Jersey	26 CFR 9.207	Outer Coastal Plain Vineyard Association	www.outercoastalplain.com	Feb. 9, 2006
Ozark Highlands	Missouri	26 CFR 9.115	Missouri Wine & Grape Board	www.missouriwine.org	Aug. 31, 1986
Ozark Mountain	Arkansas, Missouri, Oklahoma	27 CFR 9.108	Arkansas Wine Producers Association; Missouri Wine & Grape Board; Oklahoma Grape Growers and Wine Makers Association	www.postfamilie.com/awpa ; www.missouriwine.org ; oklahomawines.org	July 2, 1986 July 14, 1986

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Pacheco Pass	California	26 CFR 9.88	Central Coast Wine Growers Association	www.ccwga.org	Mar. 12, 1983
Paicines	California	26 CFR 9.39	San Benito Winegrowers Association	www.sbcwinegrowers.org	Aug. 16, 1981
Paso Robles	California	27 CFR 9.84	Paso Robles Wine Country Alliance	www.pasowine.com	Oct. 4, 1983 June 13, 1996 Jan.21, 2009
Pine Mountain-Cloverdale Peak	California	26 CFR 9.220	Pine Mountain-Cloverdale Peak Winegrowers Association	www.pinemountainava.org	Oct. 27, 2010
Potter Valley	California	26 CFR 9.82	Potter Valley Growers	www.pvgrowers.com	Oct. 13, 1982
Puget Sound	Washington	26 CFR 9.151	Puget Sound Wine Growers Association	www.pswg.org (inoperative)	Oct. 4, 1994
Ramona Valley	California	26 CFR 9.191	Ramona Valley Vineyard Association	www.ramonavalleyvineyards.org	Dec. 7, 2004
Rattlesnake Hills	Washington	26 CFR 9.193	Rattlesnake Hills Wine Trail	www.rattlesnakehills.com	Feb. 16, 2005
Red Hill Douglas County, Oregon	Oregon	26 CFR 9.190	Oregon Winegrowers Association	www.oregonwine.org	Oct. 14, 2004
Red Hills Lake County	California	26 CFR 9.169	Lake County Winegrape Commission	www.lakecountywinegrape.org	July 12, 2003
Red Mountain	Washington	26 CFR 9.167	Red Mountain AVA Alliance	www.redmountainava.com	Apr. 10, 2000
Redwood Valley	California	26 CFR 9.153	Mendocino County Wine & Winegrapes	www.mendowine.com	Dec. 23, 1995
Ribbon Ridge	Oregon	26 CFR 9.182	Chehalem Mountains Winegrowers Association	www.chehalemmountains.org	June 1, 2004
River Junction	California	26 CFR 9.164	McManis Family Vineyards (only commercial operation in AVA)	www.mcmanisfamilyvineyards.com	May 9, 2000

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Rockpile	California	26 CFR 9.173	Sonoma County Winegrape Commission	www.sonomawinegrape.org	Feb. 28, 2001
Rocky Knob	Virginia	27 CFR 9.43	Virginia Wine Board	www.virginiawine.org	Jan. 12, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987 Feb. 1, 2011
Rogue Valley	Oregon	26 CFR 9.132	Rogue Valley Winegrowers Association	www.rvwinegrowers.org	Jan. 23, 1990
Russian River Valley	California	27 CFR 9.66	Russian River Valley Winegrowers	www.rrvw.org	Oct. 21, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987 Dec. 2, 2003 Sept. 8, 2005 Nov. 16, 2011
Rutherford	California	26 CFR 9.133	Rutherford Dust Society	www.rutherforddust.org	July 2, 1992
Saddle Rock - Malibu	California	26 CFR 9.203	California Association of Winegrape Growers	www.cawg.org	July 17, 2005
Salado Creek	California	26 CFR 9.163	California Association of Winegrape Growers	www.cawg.org	June 29, 2003
San Antonio Valley	California	26 CFR 9.194	San Antonio Valley Vintners and Growers Association	www.sawga.org	June 8, 2005
San Benito	California	26 CFR 9.110	San Benito Winegrowers Association	www.sbcwinegrowers.org	Oct. 5, 1986
San Bernabe	California	26 CFR 9.171	Monterey County Vintners and Growers Association	www.montereywines.org	June 29, 2003
San Francisco Bay	California	27 CFR 9.157	Central Coast Wine Growers Association	www.ccwga.org	Jan. 20, 1999 June 16, 2006 Mar. 11, 2008

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
San Lucas	California	27 CFR 9.56	Monterey County Vintners and Growers Association	www.montereywines.org	Jan. 29, 1987 June 29, 2004
San Pasqual Valley	California	26 CFR 9.25	San Diego County Vintners Association (the sole winery may not be a current member, but was listed as a past member on 3rd party site)	www.sandiegowinecountry.wordpress.com	Sept. 23, 1980
San Ysidro District	California	26 CFR 9.130	Central Coast Wine Growers Association	www.ccwga.org	Nov. 15, 1989
Santa Clara Valley	California	26 CFR 9.126	Wineries of Santa Clara Valley	www.santaclarawines.com	Mar. 28, 1988
Santa Cruz Mountains	California	26 CFR 9.31	Santa Cruz Mountains Winegrowers Association	www.scmwa.com	Dec. 4, 1980
Santa Lucia Highlands	California	27 CFR 9.139	Wine Artisans of Santa Lucia Highlands	www.santaluciahighlands.com	May 15, 1992 June 15, 2006
Santa Maria Valley	California	26 CFR 9.28	Santa Maria Valley Wine Country	www.santamariavalleywinecountry.com	Dec. 29, 2009
Santa Ynez Valley	California	26 CFR 9.54	Santa Barbara County Vintners' Association	www.sbcountywines.com	Apr. 15, 1982
Seiad Valley	California	26 CFR 9.148	no producers anymore		May 19, 1993
Seneca Lake	New York	26 CFR 9.128	Seneca Lake Wine Trail	www.senecalakewine.com	July 3, 2002
Shawnee Hills	Illinois	26 CFR 9.206	Illinois Grape Growers and Vintners Association	www.illinoiswine.org	Nov. 27, 2005
Shenandoah Valley	Virginia, West Virginia	27 CFR 9.60	Shenandoah Valley Wine Growers Association	www.shenandoahvalleywinetrail.com	Dec. 28, 1982 Feb. 27, 1987
Sierra Foothills	California	26 CFR 9.120	Sierra Wine & Grape Growers Association	www.sierragrapegrowers.org	Nov. 18, 1986

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Sierra Pelona Valley	California	26 CFR 9.218	Antelope Valley Winegrowers Association	www.avwinegrowers.org	July 22, 2009
Sloughhouse	California	26 CFR 9.201	Lodi Winegrape Commission	www.lodiwine.com	July 17, 2005
Snake River Valley	Idaho, Oregon	26 CFR 9.208	Idaho Grape Growers and Wine Producers Commission	www.idahowines.org	Mar. 9, 2006
Snipes Mountain	Washington	26 CFR 9.213	Washington Wine Commission	www.washingtonwine.org	Jan. 21, 2008
Solano County Green Valley	California	26 CFR 9.44	Green Valley Vintners	www.greenvalleyvintners.com	Dec. 29, 1981
Sonoita	Arizona	26 CFR 9.97	Arizona Wine Growers Association	www.arizonawine.org	Oct. 26, 1983
Sonoma Coast	California	26 CFR 9.116	Sonoma County Winegrape Commission	www.sonomawinegrape.org	June 11, 1986
Sonoma Mountain	California	27 CFR 9.102	Sonoma County Winegrape Commission	www.sonomawinegrape.org	Jan. 23, 1985 Feb. 27, 1987
Sonoma Valley	California	27 CFR 9.29	Sonoma County Winegrape Commission	www.sonomawinegrape.org	Dec. 4, 1981 Mar. 29, 1985 Feb. 27, 1987
South Coast	California	26 CFR 9.104	California Association of Winegrape Growers	www.cawg.org	Nov. 21, 1984
Southeastern New England	Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts	26 CFR 9.72	Coastal Wine Trail	www.coastalwinetrail.com	Mar. 28, 1983
Southern Oregon	Oregon	26 CFR 9.179	Oregon Winegrowers Association	www.oregonwine.org	Dec. 8, 2003
Spring Mountain District	California	26 CFR 9.143	Spring Mountain District Association	www.springmountaindistrict.org	May 13, 1992
St. Helena	California	26 CFR 9.149	Appellation St. Helena	www.appellationstheleena.org	Sept. 11, 1994
Sta. Rita Hills	California	27 CFR 9.162	Sta. Rita Hills Winegrowers Alliance	www.staritahills.com	May 31, 2001 Dec. 7, 2005

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Stags Leap District	California	26 CFR 9.117	Stags Leap District Winegrowers	www.stagsleapdistrict.com	Jan. 27, 1988
Suisun Valley	California	26 CFR 9.45	Suisun Valley Vintners & Grape Growers Association	www.suisunvalley.com	Nov. 24, 1981
Swan Creek	North Carolina	26 CFR 9.211	North Carolina Winegrowers Association	www.ncwinegrowers.com	Apr. 25, 2007
Temecula Valley	California	27 CFR 9.50	Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association	www.temeculawines.org	Oct. 23, 1984 Oct. 29, 1984 Jan. 8, 1986 Feb. 27, 1987 Apr. 19, 2004
Texas Davis Mountains	Texas	26 CFR 9.155	Texas Wine & Grape Growers Association	www.txwines.org	Mar. 11, 1997
Texas High Plains	Texas	26 CFR 9.144	High Plains Winegrowers	www.highplainswinegrowers.org	Mar. 2, 1992
Texas Hill Country	Texas	27 CFR 9.136	Texas Wine & Grape Growers Association	www.txwines.org	Nov. 29, 1991 July 28, 1993
Texoma	Texas	26 CFR 9.185	Texas Wine & Grape Growers Association	www.txwines.org	Dec. 7, 2004
The Hamptons, Long Island	New York	27 CFR 9.101	Long Island Wine Council	www.liwines.com	May 16, 1985 July 28, 1993
Tracy Hills	California	26 CFR 9.204	Tracy Hills Growers & Vintners Association	no website, listed as non-profit on several 3rd party sites	Nov. 8, 2005
Trinity Lakes	California	26 CFR 9.184	Klamath/Trinity Wine Growers Association	www.willowcreekchamber.com/klamathtrinity-wine-growers-association.html	Feb. 28, 2004
Umpqua Valley	Oregon	26 CFR 9.89	Umpqua Valley Winegrowers Association	www.umpquavalleywineries.org	Mar. 29, 1983

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
Upper Mississippi River Valley	Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois	26 CFR 9.216	Minnesota Grape Growers Association; Iowa Wine Growers Association; Wisconsin Grape Growers Association; Illinois Grape Growers and Vintners Association	www.mnrapegrowers.com ; www.iowawinegrowers.org ; www.wigrapes.org ; www.illinoiswine.org	June 22, 2008
Virginia's Eastern Shore	Virginia	26 CFR 9.135	Virginia Wine Board	www.virginiawine.org	Jan. 2, 1990
Wahluke Slope	Washington	26 CFR 9.192	Washington Wine Commission	www.washingtonwine.org	Dec. 7, 2004
Walla Walla Valley	Washington, Oregon	26 CFR 9.91	Walla Walla Valley Wine Alliance	www.wallawallawine.com	Feb. 26, 2000
Warren Hills	New Jersey	26 CFR 9.121	Garden State Wine Growers Association	www.newjerseywines.com	Aug. 8, 1987
West Elks	Colorado	26 CFR 9.172	West Elks AVA	www.westelksava.com	Mar. 6, 2000
Western Connecticut Highlands	Connecticut	26 CFR 9.122	Connecticut Vineyard and Winery Association	www.ctwine.com	Feb. 9, 1987
Wild Horse Valley	California	26 CFR 9.124	Napa Valley Vintners	www.napavintners.com	Nov. 30, 1987
Willamette Valley	Oregon	26 CFR 9.90	Oregon Winegrowers Association	www.oregonwine.org	Dec. 1, 1982
Willow Creek	California	26 CFR 9.85	Klamath/Trinity Wine Growers Association	www.willowcreekchamber.com/klamathtrinity-wine-growers-association.html	Aug. 18, 1982
Wisconsin Ledge	Wisconsin	26 CFR 9.224	Wisconsin Grape Growers Association	www.wigrapes.org	Mar. 22, 2011
Yadkin Valley	North Carolina	26 CFR 9.174	Yadkin Valley Winegrowers Association	www.yadkinvalleywineries.com	Dec. 9, 2001
Yakima Valley	Washington	26 CFR 9.69	Yakima Valley Winegrowers Association	www.wineyakimavalley.org	Apr. 4, 1982
Yamhill-Carlton	Oregon	27 CFR 9.183	Yamhill-Carlton Winegrowers' Association	website is dead	Dec. 9, 2004 Nov. 3, 2010

Name of AVA	U.S. State in Which Located	Regulation Citation	Associated AVA Organization*	Organization Website	Date of Establishment and Any Revision
York Mountain	California	27 CFR 9.80	Central Coast Wine Growers Association	www.ccwga.org	Aug. 24, 1983 Feb. 27, 1987
Yorkville Highlands	California	26 CFR 9.159	Yorkville Highlands Growers and Vintners Association	www.yorkvillehighlands.org	Apr. 7, 1997
Yountville	California	26 CFR 9.160	Yountville Appellation	www.yountvillewines.com	Mar. 19, 1998

APPENDIX B

I. Possibly a GI, subject to further proof

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
77484974	Grown in the USA rice	USA	The breadth of the mark (all of the U.S.) could be a problem as with other commodity crops. The general approach has been to not automatically consider a product a GI unless the area claimed is smaller than the U.S.	Reputation, characteristic or quality that is uniform across the U.S. rice industry such that the whole industry could be considered a GI.	http://www.usarice.com/
76447103	Cattlemen's Texas Longhorn Registry	?	Same problems as other breed-based marks: the cattle could be taken anywhere and retain the genetic uniqueness that has been bred into the animals. However, the development of this breed may reflect some qualities tied to a specific area.	Proof that there is a quality and reputation of the breed tied to the land which overcomes the general consideration of breeds as generic.	http://www.ctr.org/
74003137	Soyoil	USA?	Soybeans have been established in the U.S. for a long time; the association itself has existed for 90 years. This crop is widely grown in many areas of the U.S., and it is possible that it has some characteristics of a GI. However, it is a commodity crop that isn't promoted or advertised for its place-based characteristics.	Proof that soybeans grown in the U.S. have particular qualities or that the reputation for U.S. soybean oil is particularly strong.	http://www.soygrowers.com/
75218252 & 74122502 & 74116140	Fresh American Lamb & Certified FAL & Certified Fresh American Lamb	USA	Single product, which is good. However, it covers the entire U.S. sheep population (45 states, 82,000 producers) so a geographic tie represented by this many sources is unlikely. Promotes sheep products through reputation marketing.	Proof of a common quality or reputation that derives from the land.	http://www.sheepusa.org/
73312030 & 73244735 & 73148616	Real	?	U.S. dairy is probably too broad; claims of uniqueness from areas like California and Wisconsin would erode a claim that all U.S. dairy should be lumped into one GI (although multiple levels of GIs are possible).	Defining characteristics common to all U.S. dairy; reputation and qualities that separate U.S. dairy from other dairy industries.	United Dairy Industry Association
76242718	Certified American Ostrich	USA	Same concerns as ostrich oil; these products will likely rise or fall together as GIs.	Qualities tied to the land or a particular reputation for American ostrich products.	http://www.ostriches.org/index.html
76242704	Genuine American Ostrich Leather	USA	Same concerns as ostrich oil; these products will likely rise or fall together as GIs.	Qualities tied to the land or a particular reputation for American ostrich products.	http://www.ostriches.org/index.html

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
76470517	U.S. Farm-Raised Catfish	USA	Catfish farming in the U.S. is practiced in the south, so the area is smaller than the entire U.S. There is at least some quality control, but whether this is sufficient to say that there is a special quality or characteristic tied to the land is unclear.	Limits on the areas of production or control for a quality that is tied to the land.	http://www.uscatfish.com/
74222015 & 74218083 & 74218080 & 73183201 & 73183200 & 73183202 & 73183188 & 73183152 & 73183193 & 73183149	SPFS & West CDR & West Woods & WW & PPSP & PP-LP & ES-AF & WR CDR & ES LP AF & Aspen	?	Association represents softwood producers and sawmill in “the 12 western states and Alaska.” This geographic area might be specific enough for an individual species designation to be a GI. The grades provide quality control on the end products.	Further proof of species quality, reputation or characteristics tied to the land that are captured by the Western Wood Products Association’s grade marks.	wwpa.org
85576508	American Akaushi Association	Texas?	Specific breed native to Japan. Largest non-Japanese herd is in Texas, but no requirement that it be from this area. Fact that it is a domesticated, non-native animal means that it could be raised anywhere with suitable climate. No claim that the product be from any place or have any quality other than the breed.	Evidence of reputation, specifically the American herd or some quality of this breed that is associated with a particular geographic area.	American Akaushi Association
78792746 & 78792744	Indiana Fresh From the Farm Beef	Indiana	Beef must be from Indiana. But the emphasis of the mark is that people want to know where their beef comes from. Very similar to “locally grown” except that the type of product is at least consistent. Does not claim any particular quality that is associated with Indiana Beef, and the organization is not promoting Indiana beef as special (certification focuses on local source and process of production).	Some claim or proof that Indiana beef is in some way different than other beef or proof of a particular reputation of Indiana beef.	Indiana Beef Cattle Association
85086496	New Appalachian Cuisine	Appalachia	Tempting to say that this approach to traditional food is a GI because of its reputation, history and geographical tie. However, “foods” is functionally as broad as certifying all agricultural products from a state (and Appalachia is larger than a single state). Probably too many potential products to say that all items under this mark are a single GI.	Proof that the broad range of products has enough of a distinguishing factor to make it a GI; some limit to the category to keep out non-qualifying cuisine that would dilute the potential reputation; this certification might cover individual products that could meet the requirements for a GI.	Collaborative for the 21st Century Appalachia

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
78825275	Premium Indiana Forest Products	Indiana	“Forest Products” is somewhat broad. More importantly, the effort to certify does not focus on any inherent quality of the products that relate to its origin. Instead, the reputation sought to be promoted is the quantity, convenience of harvest, and quality of management. The individual products (trees) are not claimed to be any different, just easier to exploit as a resource. Quantity might be a bigger consideration if Indiana were widely known for its timber, but it is not.	Proof that Indiana forest products are different or have a special reputation AND that this reputation is tied to the land; e.g., something about the management that makes the product special, other than just easy to access.	Indiana Hardwood Lumbermen’s Association
85352631 & 85352681	Certified Blue Crab	?	No apparent tie to a specific geographic area or reputation (Chesapeake Bay is widely known for Blue Crab). The habitat for Blue Crab covers the West Atlantic coast from Canada to Argentina. The crab is also found in the Pacific. Without a tie to geography or reputation, this certification is too broad to be a GI.	Limitation of the claimed area; seems that they are claiming only the species, which is too broad, but a specific fishery of blue crab might be a GI.	Registered to an individual.
85530091	Certified California Sustainable Winegrowing	California?	Broad area, although “California wines” are likely sufficiently specific and well known to be a GI. However, this certification is aimed at sustainable practices, many of which do not alter the character of the product (although some do). Unclear that this certification would impart a more uniform quality than that imparted by the soil and climate of a smaller area (or even of CA generally). Existence of AVAs and political appellations probably preempts this as a GI.	Would need to show a distinguishing quality, characteristics or reputation of sustainable wines from California, beyond the political appellations and AVAs that cover the state.	California Sustainable Winegrowing Alliance
78843259	100% Pure Berkshire Pork Certified by the American Berkshire Association	?	Breed of swine. Has been bred in the U.S. (although not native), which might give it qualities tied to the geography. However, it is a domesticated animal that could be bred anywhere from certified parentage.	Proof that the breed is more than generic.	American Berkshire Association

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
85173363	Certified American Ostrich Oil	America	Certification through American Ostrich Association leads to standardized quality, growing techniques, feed aspects, etc. However, no claims are made (beyond quality) of particular characteristics of American-grown ostrich. Further, ostriches are non-native and are therefore farmed animals in the U.S. Any claim that products are tied to the land (i.e., local feed sources) would need a narrower region than the entire U.S., it would seem. There is also no immediate evidence of widespread reputation that differentiates this product from any other ostrich product. "American ostrich oil" returned 5,540 Google hits, and all of the first page of hits referenced the certification mark.	Proof that American ostrich oil has some characteristic that is not found in other ostrich oil, or that its reputation is known, or that the certifying agency and certification standards make a difference in the product other than just a threshold of quality control.	American Ostrich Association
	Hampshire	?	American breed of swine. Seems to be original to U.S., which might give it qualities tied to its origin. However, it is a domesticated animal, and because it could be bred anywhere from certified parentage, it seems doubtful that it is really tied to any particular geography.	Proof that the breed is more than generic.	
78804559	Quality Highland Beef	?	Breed of cattle. Has been bred in the U.S. (although not native), which might give it qualities tied to the geography. However, it is a domesticated animal, and because it could be bred anywhere from certified parentage, it seems doubtful that it is tied to any particular geography.	Proof that the breed is more than generic.	American Scotch Highland Breeders Association
78612295	True North Woods	Minnesota forests	Allowable products are too broad; only 50% or more must be from Minnesota forests. More importantly, the effort to certify does not focus on any inherent quality of the products that is tied to its location. Instead, the reputation sought to be promoted is the quantity, convenience of harvest, and quality of management. The individual products (trees) are not claimed to be any different, just easier to exploit as a resource. There is also a focus on sustainable forest management, which is not necessarily a quality of the land (as used here).		Minnesota Wood Campaign, Inc.

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
77517738	Michigan Honeycrisp	Michigan	Somewhat of a repeat of “Michigan Apples,” although this is narrower because it is one well known variety. Could be its own GI but could also be subsumed under the broader GI. “Michigan honeycrisp” gets 16,400 hits in a Google search. Michigan apples website states that: “Michigan Apple shippers have released the state’s 2011 crop earlier this week to the marketplace. The Michigan Honeycrisp consistently earns first place in consumer taste tests, beating Honeycrisp apples grown in other parts of the United States as well as other varieties.”	Further proof that the Honeycrisp variety is distinct or well known enough to justify a separate GI (and is not so narrow as to be closer to a brand).	http://www.michiganapples.com/crisp-juicy-michigan-honeycrisp-apples-now-available.html
77088419 & 77088399	Kaua'i Made	Kaua'i	Covers too many products for the entire category to have a reputation and/or a unifying quality; it covers crafts, music, publications, food and health products. More tempting than other marks such as “Go Texan” that cover an enormous range of possibilities. This mark focuses on: “Every product you’ll find on this site was made or crafted on Kauai. By the people of Kauai. With love and respect for the aina (land) of Kauai.” There seems to be a focus on more traditional items, although things like modern t-shirts are also included.	Proof of a reputation distinct to Kaua'i products generally; or some kind of quality control that would make the list of products distinctive in quality or other characteristics; or narrowing the range of products. Almost certainly there are some GIs within this broader category.	http://kauaimade.net/
75605402	Quality USA	USA	10 states are shown to produce peanuts. There may be a distinctive characteristic of U.S. peanuts and separating them from other areas of the world. (The peanut is thought to have originated in South America and moved with the Spanish.) Trade association seems to promote the product well. Difficult to say that any “U.S.” product is distinctive, but the relatively limited growing regions (10 states produce 99%; Georgia produces 42%) may suffice. The recognition of Virginia-area peanuts as special and separate cuts against this broad category as a GI.	Proof of characteristics or quality unique to and shared by all U.S. peanuts; or break out individual areas (there are four main varieties of peanut grown in U.S.; this could be a guide).	http://www.peanutsusa.com
74686258	Kyi-Leo	?	Standard problem of the generic nature of breeds. However, this dog was introduced in the 1950s in the San Francisco Bay area and has spread slowly throughout the U.S. This is probably one of the best examples of a breed tied directly to the U.S. However, how a dog breed is tied to the land is not intuitively obvious.	Proof of some characteristic of the breed that is tied to the land. Difficult because the breed is so new and was bred from two non-U.S. breeds.	http://www.arba.org/kyi_leo.htm

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
73708777	DFA of California	California	Organization covers food safety and quality for dried fruits and tree nuts. Too broad an association, but the individual categories are likely to be GIs due to efforts of DFA to ensure quality. Offers a “Red Seal” certification for almonds, cut dried fruit, figs, prunes, and walnuts. “Real Seal inspections require products to meet more stringent specifications than USDA top grades, are packed under continuous in-line inspection, and can help your company meet the demands of your most scrutinizing customers.” However, DFA offers to act as a certifier for “other commodities,” and the final category is likely too broad without further narrowing.	Some individual industries serviced by DFA are likely to be GIs; narrow the range of products.	http://www.agfoodsafety.org/
73683420	Solid Hardwood from the USA	USA	Association promotes the use of American hardwood in building, particularly mentioning hardwood flooring, cabinetry, millwork, and furniture. There does not appear to be a control for particular qualities. The association markets the products and certifies that the hardwoods are U.S. owned throughout the process. This, combined with the large number of hardwood types, likely means that a distinguishing reputation or quality isn't available.	Proof that there is quality control of the finished product; specify individual hardwoods for reputation analysis.	http://hmamembers.org/
78506951	AMIA	USA	“Made in the USA” is tempting as a GI for a single-source line of products. However, the U.S. alpaca herds were relatively recently imported, and their qualities (and thus the quality of their coats) will not be tied to a U.S. region or even to the U.S. as a whole. No indication that there is anything special about the U.S. alpaca herds that is not present elsewhere. Also, no U.S. area (nor the U.S.) has a reputation for alpaca production.	Proof of characteristics, quality or reputation tied to the U.S.	Georgia Mountain Fiber, Inc.
77687682	Napa Green	Napa County	The AVA is a GI, so a more stringent requirement would encompass the uniqueness of Napa Valley wines with additional qualities of green farming practices so long as those practices result in qualities, characteristics or reputation tied to the land. Can apply to grapes or wine.		Napa Valley Vintners Association

II. Candidate GIs

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
74556380	Genuine Incense-Cedar A Renewable Resource	California	Incense cedar is native to areas of California and Oregon. This certification is for pencils and other products, but the limited area of origin and the specificity of the species probably indicate that it is a GI. The institute does not have a website (at least that is easily found) to further clarify.		Incense Cedar Institute
77481594	(no words) 	North Pacific Ocean off West Coast	Limited to albacore tuna and a specific region (North Pacific Ocean off the West Coast of the United States). If Alaskan products (specifically named) are GIs, this region should be similarly treated.		http://www.wfoa-tuna.org
76645589 & 76539685	Wild American Shrimp	USA	Limited per the association website to the Gulf and South Atlantic. This area seems as narrow as recognized limitations like Alaskan salmon. Particularly, the association differentiates its product from the farm-raised shrimp that is more prevalent.		http://www.wildamericanshrimp.com/main.html
75439882	Guaranteed Louisiana Origin Sweet Potatoes Yams	Louisiana	131,000 Google results for “Louisiana sweet potatoes.”		http://www.sweetpotato.org/
74171568	Wisconsin Ginseng	Wisconsin	Association claims reputation is growing. Also, claims distinctive qualities of the land: “Wisconsin has cool summers, rolling hills and virgin soil to grow highly potent American ginseng. Producers in Wisconsin also have generations of growing experience. Their hard work and advanced farming practices produce the world’s highest quality cultivated ginseng.” 70,600 Google results for “Wisconsin ginseng.”		http://www.ginsengboard.com/
77541537	Ohio Quality Wine Q	Ohio	GI, but will overlap the political appellation of the same area.		The Ohio Grape Industries Committee
73572540	USA	USA	Tied to Oregon, Washington, and California (not all of U.S.). Oregon and Washington produce 84% of pears grown in the U.S. and account for 92% of America’s fresh pear exports. Marketing efforts of USA Pears seems to be widespread; 44,100 Google hits for “USA pears.”		http://www.usapears.com/

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
74342317	Kula (onions)	Kula region of Maui	Smaller area of the broader Maui onion GI (somewhat of a repeat). See this article stating that the Maui onion is well known (also, 148,000 Google hits for “Maui onion”): http://www.hawaiiibusiness.com/Hawaii-Business/May-2009/Don-039t-Cry-Eat-a-Maui-Onion/		http://www.co.maui.hi.us/index.aspx?NID=622
74342316	Maui (onions)	Maui, HI	See this article describing that the Maui onion is well known (also, 148,000 Google hits for “Maui onion”): http://www.hawaiiibusiness.com/Hawaii-Business/May-2009/Don-039t-Cry-Eat-a-Maui-Onion/		http://www.co.maui.hi.us/index.aspx?NID=622
75397106	100% Oahu Coffee	Oahu, HI	Probably as much a GI as other one-state, one-product categories (Washington Apples, California Wine). “Hawaii coffee” returned 88,800 hits on Google. Kona coffee is a specific, well known example, but as an Island, Hawaii has as good a claim to unique geographical characteristics as any other state (even more so). The individual areas are more geographically distinctive, so those will also qualify as GIs.		Department of Agriculture of the State of Hawaii
75397105	100% Molokai Coffee	Molokai, HI	Probably as much a GI as other one-state, one-product categories (Washington Apples, California Wine). “Hawaii coffee” returned 88,800 hits on Google. Kona coffee is a specific, well known example, but as an Island, Hawaii has as good a claim to unique geographical characteristics as any other state (even more so). The individual areas are more geographically distinctive, so those will also qualify as GIs.		Department of Agriculture of the State of Hawaii
75397104	100% Maui Coffee	Maui, HI	Probably as much a GI as other one-state, one-product categories (Washington Apples, California Wine). “Hawaii coffee” returned 88,800 hits on Google. Kona coffee is a specific, well known example, but as an Island, Hawaii has as good a claim to unique geographical characteristics as any other state (even more so). The individual areas are more geographically distinctive, so those will also qualify as GIs.		Department of Agriculture of the State of Hawaii

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
75397103	100% Kona Coffee	Kona, HI	Probably as much a GI as other one-state, one-product categories (Washington Apples, California Wine). “Hawaii coffee” returned 88,800 hits on Google. Kona coffee is a specific, well known example, but as an Island, Hawaii has as good a claim to unique geographical characteristics as any other state (even more so). The individual areas are more geographically distinctive, so those will also qualify as GIs.		Department of Agriculture of the State of Hawaii
75397103	100% Kauai Coffee	Kauai, HI	Probably as much a GI as other one-state, one-product categories (Washington Apples, California Wine). “Hawaii coffee” returned 88,800 hits on Google. Kona coffee is a specific, well known example, but as an Island, Hawaii has as good a claim to unique geographical characteristics as any other state (even more so). The individual areas are more geographically distinctive, so those will also qualify as GIs.		Department of Agriculture of the State of Hawaii
75397101	100% Hawaii Coffee	Hawaii	Probably as much a GI as other one-state, one-product categories (Washington Apples, California Wine). “Hawaii coffee” returned 88,800 hits on Google. Kona coffee is a specific, well known example, but as an Island, Hawaii has as good a claim to unique geographical characteristics as any other state (even more so). The individual areas are more geographically distinctive, so those will also qualify as GIs.		Department of Agriculture of the State of Hawaii
72048461	RIS	?	Native habitat of these trees is California and a smaller part of Oregon. This is a localized tree that has developed over the years due to the qualities of the place. Redwood is well known as a desirable building material.		http://www.calredwood.org/index.htm
77825018	Antioxidant rich wild blueberries premium by nature	North America	Wild, not cultivated, blueberries, grown in an area without the potentially strict controls of cultivation. This certification is directed to the lowbush Wild Blueberry, which has a limited range (Maine and Canada) and has grown there for 10,000 years. This is not strictly limited to U.S., but the region defined by the Association is probably a better fit than politically defined boundaries.		http://www.wildblueberries.com/

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
77773568	Wisconsin Dairy	Wisconsin	Wisconsin is certainly known for cheese, and dairy is a logical extension. "Wisconsin dairy" returns 285,000 hits on Google.		http://www.eatwisconsincheese.com/
77682137	Real California Cheese	California	"California cheese" returns 579,000 hits on Google.		http://www.realcaliforniamilk.com/
77280139	Washington	Washington	Refers to Washington apples. Washington is well known for apples and their distinctive quality designation (Hunt v. Washington State Apple Advertising Commission). "Washington apples" returns 112,000 Google hits.		http://www.bestapples.com/index.aspx
77279013 & 77278847	California Ice Cream	California	Maybe not as well known as other dairy products (although "California ice cream" returned 375,000 Google results), if milk and cheese are GIs, then ice cream made from the milk should have the same quality and much of the reputation.		http://www.realcaliforniamilk.com/
74026870	Vidalia	Georgia	Extensive marketing and government-based controls. Claimed to be "America's Favorite Sweet Onions" which is an attempt to differentiate it from other U.S. onions. Strong certifier. 91,100 Google hits for "Georgia vidalia onions"		http://www.vidaliaonion.org/
74272085	California King Salmon	California	Particular product and a geographical area that is tied to other GIs (California wines, etc). Claims of particular qualities, and an association that promotes the product. Particularly newsworthy that there have been shortened seasons recently for California King Salmon and that the 2012 catch was back to good levels. One negative: Googling "king salmon" returns mostly hits for Alaskan fisheries.		http://www.calkingsalmon.org/
73390887 & 73390875	Michigan Asparagus	Michigan	Michigan ranks 3rd in the nation in asparagus production. "Michigan asparagus" returns 17,800 hits in Google. Not as well marketed or seemingly well known as Michigan apples, but the large amount produced and the efforts of the certifier are probably sufficient.		http://www.asparagus.org/
72452192	Certified Indian River Fruit Indian River Citrus League	Florida (Indian River area)	Smaller area for citrus fruits, so if Florida citrus is a GI, this should be too. Association talks about historical roots of citrus in the area.		http://ircitrusleague.org/

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
85544909 & 85544903	Certified Genuine Idaho Potatoes Grown in Idaho	Idaho	Huge reputation (commonly known; 280,000 Google hits for "idaho potatoes"). Very well known, specific product from a specific area. Supported by the Idaho Potato Commission.		
78824897	FMAA Flag Manufacturers Association of America Certified Made in USA	USA	Must be made in USA with materials originating in USA by USA labor. If any product will be a GI based on a "made in the USA" theory, this is probably it. Sourced materials and labor will have qualities imparted by being made in U.S., and the fact that is an American Flag means that the "quality" of the place could very easily be understood. Supported by the Flag Manufacturers Association of America.		Flag Manufacturers Association of America
77890896	Idaho Eastern Oregon Spanish Sweet Onions	Idaho or Malheur County, Oregon	Very specific area and a single crop (onions) with only a few varieties (yellow, red, and white varieties of sweet Spanish seed). Supported by the Idaho-Eastern Oregon Onion Committee ("Like grapes grown for fine wine, onions also respond to soil qualities, sunlight, and the latitude and longitude of their growing area. The rich volcanic soils and dry climate that produce outstanding potatoes also produce some of the finest onions in the world, with a unique combination of mild flavor, large size and tight, dry skins.")		Idaho-Eastern Oregon Onion Committee
78757487	Idaho High Desert Durum	Idaho	Specific product (durum wheat) and specific place of production (Idaho). Supported by the Idaho Wheat Commission. Reputation is not nearly as strong as potatoes, but specific wheat from this farming area likely has qualities tied to the land.		Idaho Wheat Commission
85560158 & 85560200	IQ Iowa Quality Wine IQWC	Iowa	Claims "distinct styles representing the Iowa growing region." Supported by Iowa Quality Wine Consortium. Likely overlapped by AVAs or political appellations. If CA wines are a GI, other states should be treated similarly upon proof of a reputation or product characteristics tied to the state of origin.		Iowa Wine Growers Association
77812607	Lodi Rules	Lodi	If Lodi AVA is a GI, the same area with additional quality constraints that might result from sustainable practices would also be a GI. However, this is likely to be absorbed into the "larger" GI of the Lodi AVA.		Lodi Winegrape Commission

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
77976748 & 77976747	Oregon Certified Sustainable Wine	Oregon	Like most sustainable claims, this will depend on whether the Oregon political appellation can be considered a GI (very possibly) and will probably be absorbed into that GI unless sustainable practices contribute more to the final product than the character of the soil, etc.		State of Oregon
78526958 & 78526949	South Dakota Certified	South Dakota	Certifies beef that is sourced from SD. Emphasis is on a “safe, wholesome, quality” product. Qualities and characteristics tied to the geographical area are added through specific production practices and management controls. They are just starting out, so reputation is minimal.		State of South Dakota, Department of Agriculture
78781458	(no words) peanuts 	Virginia-Carolina region	Association promotes reputation of product (Peanut Growers Cooperative Marketing Association). Claim is that the product has distinctive characteristics because of the region in which it is grown. “Sandy soil and warm, sunny growing conditions create noticeably large peanuts renowned for their robust flavor and crunchiness.”		Peanut Growers Cooperative Marketing Association
78119689	Bristol Bay Wild Salmon	Bristol Bay, Alaska	Alaska has a reputation for wild salmon. Bristol Bay has made an effort to promote the “wild” part specifically by allowing consumers to determine which fisherman caught their product (through the website). Although the quality of the product might be the same in other larger areas, this seems equivalent to a small AVA. The added reputation is supportive.		Bristol Bay Economic Development Corp.
78817051	California	California	Applies to peaches, plums, and nectarines. More akin to “Michigan apples” with its many varieties than to “Alaska seafood” with too many products. The fruits are related, and the California Tree Fruit Agreement (a Department of Agriculture entity) promotes the market in these products.		California Tree Fruit Agreement, Department of Agriculture
85018559	Certified Wild Louisiana Shrimp	Louisiana	Reputation is strong (Bubba Gump!), and limited to one product for which Louisiana is known. As with all state-based GIs, the area is arbitrary, but the reputation is overriding. 115,000 hits for “Louisiana shrimp” on Google. Associations promote the product and quality standard. This mark was applied for by Louisiana Dept. of Wildlife & Fisheries.		Louisiana Department of Wildlife & Fisheries

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
78920649	Chimayo	Chimayo, New Mexico	Historical, heirloom Chile pepper grown in and around the town. Specific effort to re-establish this industry and promote the unique product. Supported by the non-profit Chimayo Chile Farmers, Inc.		Chimayo Chile Farmers, Inc.
78822271	Summerwhite	California	Narrower version of the broader certification for California peaches and nectarines. This applies to white flesh peaches. If the broader certification is a GI, this should be also.		California Tree Fruit Agreement, Department of Agriculture
78504201	Wild Georgia Shrimp	Georgia	Although it has less of a reputation than Louisiana (about 1/3 the Google hits), there seems to be no principled way to allow "Louisiana Shrimp" and disallow this, especially when the shrimp may very well have different characteristics along the Georgia coast.		Georgia Shrimp Certification Operations
85241355	Wisconsin Cheese - Made With Wisconsin Cheese	Wisconsin	VERY strong reputation (evidenced by 542,000 Google hits for "Wisconsin cheese") and a strong quality control/marketing effort to promote the unique quality. Still the largest cheese producer in the U.S. Only state to offer a "Master Cheesemaker" program patterned on similar European programs.		Wisconsin Milk Marketing Board
78219418	100% Napa Valley	Napa Valley	Repeat		Napa Valley Vintners Association
78835322	Certified Maine Lobster	Maine coastal waters	Certification is tied to a specific region, and Maine has a reputation for lobster (many internet hits AND the American lobster is also known as the "northern lobster" or "Maine lobster"). The Council actively promotes the product, contributing to its reputation. Species is specific to area larger than just Maine waters, but reputation likely supports arbitrarily drawing the border within the state.		Maine Lobster Promotion Council
78447980	CORO	Mendocino County	Wine made entirely in Mendocino County with Mendocino County fruit. Specifically certified and marketed as having a particular quality unique to the area with a specific production protocol.		Mendocino Winegrowers Alliance

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
78702523	Michigan Apples	Michigan	Covers several varieties, but there is an established reputation (about 40,000 Google hits for “Michigan apples”). There is an effort to promote the product and control quality (apples are Michigan’s largest fruit crop). Probably enough control and reputation to consider Michigan Apples as different and distinguishable from other apples.		Michigan Apple Committee
85214493	Napa Valley	Napa Valley	Recognized through the AVA program.		Napa Valley Vintners Association
76318515	California Butter	CA	One manufacturer (California Dairies, Inc.) accounts for a claimed 22% of the U.S. butter market. “California dairy” gets 156,000 Google hits. “California butter” gets 19,900.		California Milk Producers Advisory Board
75594382 & 75589016	Nusun	?	Sunflower is native to the Americas, so it will through natural evolution have qualities of the land. The association appears to be active in promoting the product internationally to establish a reputation for a region as large as the U.S. “American sunflower oil” returned 418,000 Google hits, but one problem with this result is that some hits were for “pure south american sunflower oil.” “Nusun” is one particular type.		http://www.sunflowernsa.com/default.asp
75040316 & 75040315 & 75040313 & 75040312	Custom Clear & Architect Clear & Custom Knotty & Architect Knotty	?	Western red cedar has a historical range mostly tied to the areas covered by the certifying association (Washington, Oregon, British Columbia). The association represents only 16 members, but as a product, it seems well limited as a plant that developed in this area and represents specific qualities that builders find appealing. Members account for 65% of all cedar produced in the world.		http://www.wrcla.org/about_us/history.asp

Serial #	Name	Relevant Region	Final Analysis	Further Proof, if Any	Certification Agency
73249231	Florida	Florida	<p>“Citrus” could be overbroad, but goods and services in the registration mention oranges, grapefruit, and tangerines (and products, mostly juice, from them). Additionally, the Florida Department of Citrus domestic marketing plan has two major sections: one for oranges and one for grapefruit. These two are likely GIs due to a strong reputation, and other Florida citrus products should also be considered. Even the broad term “Florida citrus” received 1,050,000 hits in Google. “Florida oranges” received 522,000, and “Florida grapefruit” received 116,000.</p>		http://www.fdocgrower.com/
73546254	100% Pure Florida’s Seal of Approval	Florida	<p>Narrower version of the broader certification for Florida citrus (which was labeled as a GI). “Florida orange juice” received 288,000 Google hits.</p>		http://www.fdocgrower.com/