

Revision of the EU geographical indications (GIs) systems in agricultural products and foodstuffs, wines and spirit drinks

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The European Union protects almost [3 400 names](#) of specific products – agricultural products and foodstuffs, fishery and aquaculture products, wines, spirit drinks and aromatised wine products – under one of its [quality schemes](#). Among them, the Geographical Indications Scheme, comprising Protected Designations of Origin (PDO), Protected Geographical Indications (PGI) and Geographical indications (GI), confers intellectual property rights, granting the right to producers in a defined geographical area to use the registered name if they comply with a product specification. Alongside the Geographical Indications Scheme, the Traditional Specialities Guaranteed scheme (TSG) attests traditional production methods and can be produced anywhere as long as the producers comply with the corresponding product specification.

The Commission undertook in the [Farm to Fork Strategy](#) to strengthen the legislative framework of GI schemes, to improve the schemes' contribution to sustainable production, and to strengthen the position of farmers and GI producer groups in the food supply chain. [Council Conclusions](#) on the Farm to Fork Strategy welcomed a better integration of sustainable development into Union quality policy, and invited the Commission to reaffirm the relevance and importance of EU quality schemes and to strengthen the legislative framework on geographical indications.

The initiative 'EU geographical indications scheme (revision)' is included in the [Commission Work Programme 2021](#) under the regulatory fitness and performance (REFIT) initiatives. It is part of the [European Green Deal](#). In addition, the [IP Action Plan](#) calls for improving the protection system for geographical indications to make it more effective and to combat counterfeiting.

This public consultation invites citizens and organisations, and national and regional public authorities to contribute to the assessment of how to strengthen geographical indications' system. The aim is to gather views on the major challenges identified that would need to be addressed in the planned revision as well as their underlying causes, the set of policy options that can be envisaged to address these challenges and the impacts stemming from these different options.

The results of the consultation will inform the Impact Assessment, accompanying the Commission proposal for revising the EU geographical indications scheme. To be noted, the Commission has published on 30 November 2020 a Roadmap on the EU-wide protection of geographical indications for non-agricultural products.

About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)

- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* First name

* Surname

* Email (this won't be published)

* Scope

- International
- Local
- National
- Regional

* Level of governance

- Local Authority
- Local Agency

* Level of governance

- Parliament
- Authority
- Agency

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)

- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

*Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica | <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Maldives | <input type="radio"/> Serbia |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini | <input type="radio"/> Mali | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands | <input type="radio"/> Martinique | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia | <input type="radio"/> Fiji | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia |
| <input type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> Mauritius | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia |
| <input type="radio"/> Azerbaijan | <input type="radio"/> France | <input type="radio"/> Mayotte | <input type="radio"/> Solomon Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahamas | <input type="radio"/> French Guiana | <input type="radio"/> Mexico | <input type="radio"/> Somalia |

- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga

- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen

- Czechia
- Lebanon
- Saint Helena
Ascension and
Tristan da
Cunha
- Zambia
- Democratic
Republic of the
Congo
- Lesotho
- Saint Kitts and
Nevis
- Zimbabwe
- Denmark
- Liberia
- Saint Lucia

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, ‘business association, ‘consumer association’, ‘EU citizen’) country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, your country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself.

Public

Your name, the type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, your country of origin and your contribution will be published.

* Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Question for stakeholders/experts with a specific interest in GIs and TSGs

To allow us to better understand your interest in EU quality schemes (i.e. geographical indications of PDO, PGI, GI as well as TSG), please indicate the stakeholder category that you represent

One answer possible

- Producer
- Processor
- Other supply chain operator (e.g. traders, wholesalers, retailers)*
- Producers' organisation**
- Processors' organisation
- Consumer
- Consumers' organisation
- Member State national authority
- Member State regional authority
- Other*

*please specify:

1500 character(s) maximum

I. GI schemes today – What challenges are they facing, and what are the underlying causes?

Although the fundamental structure of geographical indications (GIs) is sound, there are some shortcomings in the GI schemes as shown by the external evaluation, notably in the area of protection and enforcement, sustainability aspects, role of GI producer groups, consumer awareness and regulatory procedures. Improving those would increase attractiveness of the GI schemes for both producers and consumers and strengthen the GI system. In addition, the Traditional Specialities Guaranteed (TSG) scheme could change to better promote the EU famed traditional products.

In your opinion, which are the most important challenges the schemes are currently facing?

Please rate from 1 (not important) to 5 (most important). Not all need to be rated.

	1	2	3	4	5
Ensuring GI producers adhere to production standards	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Preventing fraud and counterfeit labelling of fake GIs, notably on the internet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Maintaining and increasing sustainability (environmental, social and economic aspects) of GI products	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Giving GI producer groups greater powers and responsibilities to manage, promote and enforce their GI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Increasing consumer awareness of the GI logos and the quality products guaranteed under GI schemes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Simplifying and reducing delays in the registration of GI applications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Preventing producers from deviating from production rules laid down for traditional products protected at EU level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other, please specify:

1500 character(s) maximum

In relation to the above-mentioned challenges, which of the following underlying issues are the most important in your view?

Please rate from 1 (not important) to 5 (most important). Not all need to be rated.

	1	2	3	4	5
There is no consolidated set of rules for controls and enforcement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased exploitation of reputation of GIs on internet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Changes in the market place develop faster than legislation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increasing societal concerns and consumer demand for sustainable products	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GI producer groups are not able to take decisions binding on their members	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of information and publicity about the schemes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
The GI logo message – guaranteeing authentic product from a particular region – does not come across	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The legislation is fragmented and hence difficult to understand and apply	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Traditional product names are a common heritage that should not be owned by registered producers nor restricted to legally binding recipes

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Other, please specify:

1500 character(s) maximum

II. The future of GIs/TSGs – What objectives to pursue?

The ambition of this revision is to strengthen GIs by increasing take up across the EU while ensuring effective protection of these rights. The initiative contributes to the objectives of the Green Deal and Farm to Fork strategy in terms of economic, environmental and social sustainability, and the IP Action Plan in terms of the fight against counterfeiting and fraud. Falling under the Commission’s regulatory fitness and performance programme (REFIT), the revision will also consider simplification and administrative burden reduction.

To what extent do you consider the following objectives contribute to the overarching goal of strengthening GIs?

Please rate from 1 (no contribution) to 5 (major contribution). Not all need to be rated.

	1	2	3	4	5
Improved protection and enforcement of GIs in the Member States to prevent fraud, unfair competition and misleading consumers, including on the Internet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
GIs produced to an ambitious standard of environmentally and socially sustainable criteria to meet societal demands and consumer expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
GI producer groups empowered to manage their GIs to improve economic sustainability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Clear information on GIs, through the logo and labelling information, to enable consumers to make informed choices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Efficient GI procedures through clear and coherent rules for producers, other operators and administrations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Focus on promotion of European gastronomic heritage to preserve traditional products and production methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Other, please specify:

1500 character(s) maximum

III. The road in between - Overall policy approach

Improved protection and enforcement

Member States' authorities face difficult choices of where to allocate enforcement resources. In the food sector, hygiene and safety is usually given priority while food fraud, intellectual property protection and consumer information also have to be enforced. In this context, where can the right balance be found to ensure the appropriate level of protection and enforcement of GIs across the EU within the resources available?

Which options below are the most relevant?

Please rate from 1 (not relevant) to 5 (most relevant). Not all need to be rated.

	1	2	3	4	5
More guidance and training to Member State's authorities, control bodies and GI producers groups on controls and enforcement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Protection of a GI should prevent the use of words, images and look-alike product that the consumer might link to the GI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Give authorities and GI producer groups effective powers to stop misuses and fraud of GIs on internet platforms and in internet domain names	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Require Member States to establish standardised control check lists and harmonised sanctions, replacing their choice of means to suit national circumstances	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Make GI certificates available to accompany GI product throughout distribution channels	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other, please specify:

1500 character(s) maximum

Reinforce sustainable production of GI-designated product

GIs have by nature a strong link to the area where they are produced with its natural features and human skills, and respect of tradition. Increasing societal demands and consumer expectations to incorporate sustainability considerations into food production requires a new approach that will encourage GI producers to place on the market environmentally, climate and socially sustainable GI products. Among these options, which do you think are the most relevant to reach the above objective?

Please rate from 1 (not relevant) to 5 (most relevant). Not all need to be rated

	1	2	3	4	5
GI producers should not be required to follow higher sustainability standards than any other producer, because GIs intrinsically include natural features, human skills and tradition in the region	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

GIs produced in conformity with a high voluntary sustainability standard should be clearly identified (by a label or other information means)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identify a guidance methodology on a high standard of sustainable production for voluntary use	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Request GI producer groups to define a high standard of sustainable production for their GIs	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide specific financial support to GI producers who meet a high standard of sustainable production	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Establish a list of non-sustainable techniques/practices for GI production	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other, please specify:

1500 character(s) maximum

GI producers group should be able to include higher sustainable criteria but it should not be mandatory

Improved position of GI producers and GI producer groups in the value chain

GI instrument could become more attractive to GI producers and GI producer groups across the EU, if it helped them better cope with pressures in the food value chain, provided lacking tools to have their rights fully enforced in the market and empower them to manage their GI asset better. This could maintain and increase a fair return to producers from the market and their economic sustainability.

Among these options, which do you think are the most relevant to reach the above objective?

Please rate from 1 (not relevant) to 5 (most relevant). Not all need to be rated.

	1	2	3	4	5
Provide guidelines to producers on how to set up a GI group and manage their GI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide guidelines to producers on financial support GI producers could benefit from	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Empower GI groups to regulate the supply	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Introduce new powers for GI groups to take legal steps to enforce their GI including seeking court injunctions and other remedies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Introduce new powers for GI groups to licence or regulate the terms under which a GI used as an ingredient can be named in front-of-pack labelling of a processed product	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Other, please specify:

1500 character(s) maximum

Higher consumer recognition of the EU logos

Consumer knowledge of EU schemes is very high for the leading GI products, but recognition of the EU logos for PDO, PGI and TSG products is low according to Eurobarometer survey, thus hindering the full potential of quality schemes. There is a need to enable consumers to make informed choices on GIs by giving clear information through the logo and labelling information. Which options are the most relevant to reach this objective?

Please rate from 1 (not relevant) to 5 (most relevant). Not all need to be rated.

	1	2	3	4	5
Reinforce information actions on EU quality schemes and logos	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Make the use of EU logos more flexible (e.g. with GI ingredients; allow use PDO, PGI and TSG acronyms; use logos on websites instead of packaging)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The use of EU logos should be optional for all producers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Add distinctive elements to EU logo for those GIs which adhere to higher sustainability standards	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Replace current EU PDO and PGI logos by a single one	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other, please specify:

1500 character(s) maximum

GIs should be considered a major pillar of the Farm to Fork (F2F) strategy for a transition towards a European sustainable food system. It ensure economic sustainability thanks to conditions of fair competition and higher producers income; ensure sustainable food production through the protection of rural landscape and sustainable management and reproduction of natural resources;

Less burdensome GI schemes

GI rules are laid down in four different legal acts and in some cases, legal concepts need to be clarified. Combined with long registration procedures, this can discourage producers in joining the schemes and creates administrative burden for public administrations. Clarity of the legal framework, while maintaining wine and spirit drinks specificities, and increased efficiency of GI registration procedures will make the existing EU schemes more targeted and reduce unnecessary burdens.

Among these options, which do you think are the most relevant to reach the above objective?

Please rate from 1 (least relevant) to 5 (most relevant). Not all need to be rated.

	1	2	3	4	5
Provide public guidelines for standardised examinations of GI applications at EU and national level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Implement a lighter approval procedure for changes which increase sustainable production	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Merge the registration and opposition aspects of all GIs into one single system while keeping distinct the substantive rules for food, wine, and spirit drinks GIs	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensure that GI producers are clearly offered existing derogations from sanitary and hygiene standards for quality products	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Finance GI producer groups to scientifically analyse the sustainability of production, nutritional profile of the GI, and adaptability to climate change	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Ensure full digitalisation of the GI registration process (including for producers making applications to national authorities and for applications from non-EU countries)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Appoint an IP agency to manage GI registration and oppositions on condition that there is a substantive increase in efficiency and quality of the registration procedure	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Introduce a dedicated GI appeal-body procedure in respect of decisions on registration, amendment, opposition and cancellation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other, please specify:

1500 character(s) maximum

origIn EU support the simplification of GI procedures and GI modification and not only for procedural changes which increase sustainable production.

Replacing the Traditional Specialities Guaranteed (TSGs) scheme

TSG scheme has not been effective nor efficient in protecting nor promoting the Union’s famed traditional products: 64 names registered in 28 years is as few as 1 name per Member State per decade. The TSG system entails a relatively long EU-level procedure to register a name as a ‘TSG’. It requires producers of the traditional products to be registered and subject to control inspections for which they pay a fee. Traditional producers who decide not to join the scheme are prevented from using the traditional product name or are liable to sanctions. The scheme covers agricultural products and foodstuffs. It also covers traditional dishes created and served in restaurants, meaning the chefs have to be registered, inspected and required to follow the recipe laid down, and face sanctions if their dishes deviate or are embellished in a way not foreseen in the product specification. While TSGs are currently afforded the same level of protection as GIs (extending to ‘evocation’), the implications of such comprehensive protection have never been fully assessed. The objective of the revision is to fully and fairly valorise traditional products, reflect carefully whether restaurant chefs should be constrained at all by an EU regulation laying down the recipe to follow, and utilise well-tested mechanisms like GIs and trade marks where protection is really merited.

To what extent do you agree with these statements?

Please rate: from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) Not all need to be rated.

	1	2	3	4	5
Genuine traditional agricultural products from all regions of the EU should be listed, promoted and be easily identified to consumers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If a restaurant serves a traditional speciality prepared dish (a soup or a stew), the chef who made it should be required to follow an official recipe or face sanctions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Names of traditional agricultural products should be strictly protected, preventing producers who are not registered from referring to the names, or face sanctions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To identify genuine traditional agricultural products the term "Traditional Speciality Guaranteed" should be protected, but not necessarily the names of the products.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Protection of names of traditional products should only be made under tried and tested instruments like protected designations of origin and collective trade marks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No traditional speciality scheme is needed at EU-level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other, please specify:

1500 character(s) maximum

IV. ... and beyond. What impacts to expect from this review of geographical indications?

Protection and enforcement

Controls and enforcement are key issues for the effective implementation of GIs. The recent external evaluation found that the procedures in place are effective. However, the external evaluation also pointed to a lower effectiveness on the market (compared to the production stage), especially outside the Member State of production, as well as on the internet.

What impact do you think a more harmonised control and enforcement approach would have on the following issues?

Please rate : Very negative - Negative - Neutral - Positive - Very positive

	Very negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very positive
Protection of product names against infringements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Fair return for farmers and producers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Competitiveness of SMEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guarantee of product authenticity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Costs for GI producers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Burden for public administration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Sustainability

GIs have by nature a strong link to the area where they are produced. This was confirmed in the open public consultation, held in the context of the external evaluation, whereby 72% of the respondents agreed that GI policy plays an important role in the socio-economic sustainability of rural areas. However, when it comes to the consideration of environmental/climate and animal welfare issues figures are considerably lower (56% and 38% respectively).

If GI policy were to raise its ambition with regard to economic, social and environmental sustainable practices, what impact do you think such approach could have on the effects listed below?

Please rate : Very negative - Negative - Neutral - Positive - Very positive

	Very negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very positive
Competitiveness of SMEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Creation of new business opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strengthen the economic, social and territorial cohesion of rural areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Consumer awareness of the schemes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Environmentally friendly production patterns	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Preservation of biodiversity, habitats, landscapes, local plant varieties and breeds	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Costs for GI producers	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Burden for public administration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

GI Producer groups

The external evaluation found that the economic profile of GIs is highly variable and that GI producer groups can play an important role in their success. They can act as drivers for structuring the value chain, for improving the cooperation with stakeholders or for setting out a business strategy. However, the external evaluation also found that not all GIs are managed by a producer group, that their tasks are not always clearly defined or that they are lacking adequate means to perform those.

If the Commission were to reinforce responsibilities for producer groups in managing their GI asset, what impact do you think this could have on the effects listed below?

Please rate : Very negative - Negative - Neutral - Positive - Very positive

	Very negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very positive
Protection of product names against infringements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Position of GI producers in the value chain	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Competitiveness of SMEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Creation of new business opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Securing faster protection of GI producer's right	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strengthen the economic, social and territorial cohesion of rural areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Consumer awareness of the schemes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased take-up of GIs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Costs for GI producers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Burden for public administration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Consumers' knowledge of the EU logos

To address the issue of low consumer awareness of the EU schemes and EU logos, the Commission could reinforce information actions and make the use of the EU logos compulsory.

What impact do you think such an approach would have on the following aspects?

Please rate : Very negative - Negative - Neutral - Positive - Very positive

	Very negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very positive
Protection of product names against infringements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Position of GI producers in the value chain	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Competitiveness of SMEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Creation of new business opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strengthen the economic, social and territorial cohesion of rural areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Consumer awareness of the schemes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guarantee of product authenticity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Costs for GI producers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Less burdensome procedures

The external evaluation pointed to delays in the registration and amendment procedures, representing the main obstacle in the examination of GI applications.

In case there were to be a single regulation, while keeping specificities for the different sectors, and full digitalisation of the processes, what impact do you think such changes could have on the following aspects?

Please rate : Very negative - Negative - Neutral - Positive - Very positive

	Very negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very positive
Securing swift protection of GI producer's right	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transparency of the registration process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Understanding of the rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Costs for GI producers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Burden for public administration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>