

The Transformation of EU Geographical Indications Law

The Present, Past and Future of the
Origin Link

Andrea Zappalaglio

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	xiv
<i>List of tables</i>	xv
<i>List of cases</i>	xvi
<i>Table of legislation</i>	xvii
<i>National laws and statutes</i>	xix
<i>Foreword</i>	xxi
<i>Preface</i>	xxiii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xxv

Introduction 1

<i>1 This book: a research on the ‘origin link’ in the EU Law of Geographical Indications</i>	1
<i>2 The concept of ‘origin link’</i>	3
<i>3 The origin link in EU Regulation 1151/2012</i>	6
<i>4 EU policy and debates on GIs: the state of the art</i>	7
<i>5 The academic debate on GIs and the contribution of the present research</i>	10
<i>6 Structure of the book</i>	14
<i>7 A note on methodology</i>	17
<i>References</i>	21

PART I

The origin link: roots, nature and structure 29

1 Terroir, the early *sui generis* IGO regimes and the roots of PDO 31

<i>1.1 Introduction</i>	31
<i>1.2 The French legislation: brief chronology and context</i>	35

1.2.1	<i>Phylloxera and its consequences: adulteration and fraud</i>	35
1.2.2	<i>The French legislation from 1905 to 1935: an outline</i>	36
1.3	<i>Terroir or terroirs? Origin and evolution of the concept</i>	40
1.3.1	<i>Terroir today: overview of the concept</i>	40
1.3.2	<i>A possible classification of terroir(s): a tripartite structure</i>	42
1.3.2.1	<i>Terroir as a dual concept</i>	43
1.3.2.2	<i>Physical terroir</i>	44
1.3.2.3	<i>Cultural terroir</i>	45
1.3.3	<i>The genesis of terroir in France</i>	45
1.4	<i>The evolution of terroir in the French parliamentary debate on AO and AOC</i>	48
1.4.1	<i>Terroir in the French AO policy: phase I (1905–1925)</i>	48
1.4.1.1	<i>The period 1905–1913</i>	48
1.4.1.2	<i>The road to the Law of 1919 and the early 1920s</i>	49
1.4.2	<i>The turning point: the protection of Roquefort and the doctrine of Capus</i>	51
1.4.2.1	<i>Joseph Capus and his doctrine</i>	51
1.4.2.2	<i>The Roquefort AO</i>	52
1.4.3	<i>The Law of 1927 and Calmel's definition of terroir: phase II begins</i>	55
1.4.4	<i>The 1930s: the transformation of terroir outside and inside the parliament</i>	56
1.4.4.1	<i>Outside the parliament</i>	56
1.4.4.2	<i>Inside the parliament</i>	57
1.5	<i>IGO rules and terroir: only a French story? The case of Italy</i>	58
1.5.1	<i>Background: the Italian situation</i>	58
1.5.2	<i>The main features of the Italian system in the 1920s</i>	60
1.5.2.1	<i>The consortia</i>	60
1.5.2.2	<i>The definition of 'vino tipico' and identification of the designated areas</i>	62
1.5.3	<i>The reforms of the 1930s and the demise of the system</i>	63
1.5.4	<i>The first Italian law on AOs for wines (1963): an outline</i>	65
1.5.5	<i>Terroir in Italy?</i>	66
1.6	<i>Conclusion</i>	68
	<i>References</i>	69

2	The reputational link and the roots of PGI	76
2.1	<i>Introduction</i>	76
2.2	<i>The origin of the reputational link</i>	80
2.2.1	<i>Alternatives to appellation of origin: indication of source and unfair competition law</i>	80
2.2.2	<i>IGO protection based on unfair competition law and passing off in Europe before 1992</i>	83
2.2.2.1	<i>The German approach to IGO protection before 1992</i>	83
2.2.2.2	<i>The British approach to IGO protection before 1992</i>	85
2.2.3	<i>Conclusions on the origin of the reputational link</i>	87
2.3	<i>Mapping the reputational link: literature review and proposal for a twofold structure</i>	87
2.4	<i>Analysis of the twofold structure of the reputational link</i>	89
2.4.1	<i>The market reputation</i>	89
2.4.2	<i>The historical element: general concept and structure overview</i>	91
2.4.3	<i>The historical element: analysis of its three-part structure</i>	93
2.4.3.1	<i>Part 1: historical information and recount of the roots of the product</i>	93
2.4.3.2	<i>Part 2: traditional know-how</i>	95
2.4.3.3	<i>Part 3: socio-economic relevance and importance for rural development</i>	96
2.5	<i>Conclusion</i>	97
	<i>References</i>	99
PART II		
3	The origin link in the evolution of EU GI law and policy	101
3	Joining <i>terroir</i> and reputation: the path to the EU <i>sui generis</i> GI regime	103
3.1	<i>Introduction</i>	103
3.2	<i>The Sekt and Bocksbeutel cases and the need for harmonisation</i>	105
3.3	<i>The foundations of the policy of the EU <i>sui generis</i> GI system: brief history of the CAP from 1985 to 1992</i>	107
3.3.1	<i>The Green Paper (1985)</i>	108

3.3.2	<i>The report on 'Environment and Agriculture' and the communication on 'The Future of Rural Society' (1988)</i>	109
3.3.3	<i>The reflection paper on 'The Development and Future of the CAP' (1991) and the MacSharry reforms</i>	110
3.4	<i>The role of the EC in the Uruguay Round</i>	111
3.4.1	<i>The 1988 EC proposal: the definition of 'Geographical Indication' and the emergence of the reputational link</i>	112
3.4.2	<i>The 1988 EC proposal: the level of protection granted</i>	115
3.5	<i>The path to Regulation 2081/1992 and the making of PGI</i>	117
3.5.1	<i>The report of the WIPO Committee of Experts (28 May to 1 June 1990)</i>	118
3.5.2	<i>The proposal of the Commission and the opinion of the EESC</i>	120
3.5.2.1	<i>The Wiesbaden GI symposium (17–18 October 1991)</i>	122
3.5.2.2	<i>The discussions of the European Parliament and the role of the supporters of a broad regime</i>	123
3.5.2.3	<i>The agreement on the final text: the role of PGI</i>	125
3.6	<i>The early years of the EU sui generis GI regime</i>	127
3.6.1	<i>The Exportur decision and the recognition of 'reputation' as a standalone origin link</i>	127
3.6.2	<i>Applicants and nature of the origin link in the specifications of the first registered EU GIs</i>	128
3.7	<i>Conclusion</i>	130
	<i>References</i>	131
4	The evolution of the origin link in the EU sui generis GI regime: the centrality of the historical element	
4.1	<i>Introduction</i>	135
4.2	<i>The evolution of the EU sui generis GI rules and of the CAP after 1992</i>	136
4.3	<i>The evolution of the origin link in the EU sui generis GI regime: methodology</i>	141
4.4	<i>Quantitative assessment of the evolution of the origin link in the EU sui generis GI regime: general trends</i>	143

4.4.1 Overview	143
4.4.2 Regional trends: northern/central Europe	144
4.4.3 Regional trends: southern Europe	146
4.5 GI policies in the ‘new EU member states’	148
4.5.1 The legal background	148
4.5.2 The choice of PGI and the use of TSG by the new EU member states	151
4.6 The nature of the origin link in the quality schemes: empirical assessment	155
4.6.1 Reputation and historical element in PDO specifications	155
4.6.2 Qualitative link and historical element in PGI specifications	156
4.6.3 The importance of the historical element	157
4.7 Focus 1: why the PGI quality scheme has become predominant	158
4.7.1 PGI is more flexible than PDO and grants the same level of protection	159
4.7.2 PGI protects local products that do not qualify for PDO	160
4.7.2.1 Overview of the issue	160
4.7.2.2 Specific focus: fruit, vegetables, cereals – fresh or processed	162
4.7.3 The majority of PDOs were registered at the beginning of the EU sui generis system	163
4.7.4 Do the national competent authorities influence the type of GI that is granted?	165
4.8 Focus 2: the why of the success of the historical element as a linking factor	167
4.8.1 Is mentioning the history of the product in the specifications a legal requirement?	167
4.8.2 The relevance of the history of the product in the text of Regulation 1151/2012	169
4.8.2.1 The relevant provisions in Regulation 1151/2012	169
4.8.2.2 The EU ‘Guide to Applicants’	170
4.8.3 History has always been an inherent component of the origin link	171
4.9 Conclusion	173
References	174

PART III

The historical element and its role in the future
of the EU *sui generis* GI regime 179

5 The suitability of history to constitute the basis
of the origin link 181

- 5.1 *Introduction* 181
- 5.2 *Why history constitutes a valid basis for the origin link* 182
 - 5.2.1 *History and terroir are related and operate in a similar way* 182
 - 5.2.2 *History is the description of the interaction between a place and a human community* 185
- 5.3 *History outlines the identity of a product: case studies* 186
 - 5.3.1 *History and appellation of origin: the case of Gruyère cheese* 186
 - 5.3.2 *History and PGI: selected case studies* 187
 - 5.3.2.1 *Product class 1: pasta* 188
 - 5.3.2.2 *Product class 2: baker's wares* 189
 - 5.3.2.3 *Product class 3: cured meat* 190
- 5.4 *Evidence* 191
 - 5.4.1 *The function of evidence* 191
 - 5.4.2 *Types of acceptable evidence* 193
 - 5.4.2.1 *Official and public documents* 193
 - 5.4.2.2 *Newspapers, magazines and other* 193
 - 5.4.2.3 *Oral sources* 194
- 5.5 *The limits of history as a basis of the origin link* 194
 - 5.5.1 *The history and the tradition of the product can be invented or mystified* 195
 - 5.5.1.1 *Objection 1: tradition is an invention* 196
 - 5.5.1.2 *Objection 2: the traditional version of the product is a mere marketing tool* 197
 - 5.5.2 *The product is not linked to its tradition and history* 198
- 5.6 *When history does not establish an origin link: practical cases* 199
 - 5.6.1 *Scenario 1: the production method does not match the traditional image of the product* 200
 - 5.6.2 *Scenario 2: the raw materials are sourced from areas completely unrelated to the reputation of the product* 202

5.6.2.1	<i>The raw materials are unrelated to the area to which the reputation of the product is linked</i>	202
5.6.2.2	<i>The area of origin of the raw materials is excessively broad</i>	203
5.6.3	<i>Scenario 3: the present and the historical versions of the product are unrelated</i>	205
5.7	<i>Some policy prescriptions for a stronger origin link</i>	206
5.8	<i>Conclusion</i>	208
	<i>References</i>	209

6 Protection for non-agricultural products: the future of the EU *sui generis* GI regime? 215

6.1	<i>Introduction</i>	215
6.2	<i>The debate on non-agricultural GIs in the EU</i>	218
6.3	<i>Sui generis and 'quasi-sui generis' approaches: some case studies from France and Italy</i>	221
6.3.1	<i>The French sui generis regime for the protection of non-agricultural products</i>	221
6.3.2	<i>Two case studies from Italy: the trade marks 'Ceramica artistica e tradizionale' and 'Vetro di Murano'</i>	223
6.3.2.1	<i>Ceramica artistica e tradizionale (artistic and traditional pottery)</i>	223
6.3.2.2	<i>Vetro artistico di Murano (artistic Murano glass)</i>	224
6.4	<i>The possible role of the EU quality schemes in the protection of non-agricultural IGOs</i>	225
6.4.1	<i>Dual or single system of protection? The opinion of the stakeholders in 2014</i>	225
6.4.2	<i>An argument in favour of a single system of protection based on PGI</i>	226
6.5	<i>The Geneva Act and its possible impact on the protection of non-agricultural products in the EU</i>	228
6.6	<i>Conclusion</i>	233
	<i>References</i>	234

General conclusions	237
Index	242