

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>	<i>1</i>
<i>2 The concept of 'origin link'</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>3 The origin link in EU Regulation 1151/2012</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>4 EU policy and debates on GIs: the state of the art</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>5 The academic debate on GIs and the contribution of the present research</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>6 Structure of the book</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>7 A note on methodology</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>References</i>	<i>21</i>
PART I	
The origin link: roots, nature and structure	29
1 Terroir, the early <i>sui generis</i> IGO regimes and the roots of PDO	31
<i>1.1 Introduction</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>1.2 The French legislation: brief chronology and context</i>	<i>35</i>

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 *Introduction* 76
- 2.2 *The origin of the reputational link* 80
 - 2.2.1 *Alternatives to appellation of origin: indication of source and unfair competition law* 80
 - 2.2.2 *IGO protection based on unfair competition law and passing off in Europe before 1992* 83
 - 2.2.2.1 *The German approach to IGO protection before 1992* 83
 - 2.2.2.2 *The British approach to IGO protection before 1992* 85
 - 2.2.3 *Conclusions on the origin of the reputational link* 87
- 2.3 *Mapping the reputational link: literature review and proposal for a twofold structure* 87
- 2.4 *Analysis of the twofold structure of the reputational link* 89
 - 2.4.1 *The market reputation* 89
 - 2.4.2 *The historical element: general concept and structure overview* 91
 - 2.4.3 *The historical element: analysis of its three-part structure* 93
 - 2.4.3.1 *Part 1: historical information and recount of the roots of the product* 93
 - 2.4.3.2 *Part 2: traditional know-how* 95
 - 2.4.3.3 *Part 3: socio-economic relevance and importance for rural development* 96
- 2.5 *Conclusion* 97
- References* 99

PART II**The origin link in the evolution of EU GI law and policy 101****3 Joining *terroir* and reputation: the path to the EU *sui generis* GI regime 103**

- 3.1 *Introduction* 103
- 3.2 *The Sekt and Bocksbeutel cases and the need for harmonisation* 105
- 3.3 *The foundations of the policy of the EU sui generis GI system: brief history of the CAP from 1985 to 1992* 107
 - 3.3.1 *The Green Paper (1985)* 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	135
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