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Why are collective efforts needed for GI registration in the EU?

- Decision making for involving diverse stakeholders to go for GI

- Discussing, negotiating, and agreeing on:
  - geographical boundaries,
  - product quality standards,
  - production techniques,
  - PDO/PGI, ...

- Information gathering and social learning on GI processes
What is the relevance of this study?

- PGI/PDO registration needs collective action from numerous supply chain actors and diverse organizations.

- So far, little insights into the efforts for collective action and associated risks and benefits along the GI registration process.

- Our results might support the decision making for producer groups considering GI applications in and outside the EU (e.g. developing countries are now applying for EU GIs).
Analytical framework

Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) Framework

1. Link between product and territory
2. Attributes of community
3. Rules in use

Action arena
- Interactions of participants (e.g., conflicts and other risks, patterns of information sharing)

Outcome

Transaction Cost Theory

- Main ex-ante efforts
- Ex-ante benefits (ranked)

Comparative cross-case analysis

- Sorana bean (Italy)
- Mostviertel perry (Austria)

Source: Based on North, 1987; Allen, 1991; Ostrom, 2007; Enengel et al., 2011; Penker & Klemen, 2010
Research design

Guiding research questions

- What are the most critical and (time) demanding phases in the GI registration processes and how many efforts are required?

- What types of public and private actors are involved along the GI processes and what is the scope of their contributions?
Research design (2)

Comparative case study approach

- Document analysis and semi-structured interviews/questionnaires (e.g. farmers, producers, cooperative members, technical experts, GI-experts, local public organizations) – including time efforts measured in person years.

- Field work: Italy and Austria took place 10 / 2013 – 04/2014.

Data analysis and interpretation

- Deductive categories of analysis: time efforts in person years.

- Benefits and risks as derived from literature and inductive ones.
Cases and selection criteria

Sorana bean  Perry from Mostviertel

- Registered PGIs with similar value chains
- Producers managing directly the processing phase
- Products marketed via short and local chains
## Comparative case study approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Sorana bean, Italy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mostviertel perry, Austria</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GI management</strong></td>
<td>Il Ghiareto ONLUS Associazione dei Piccoli Produttori del Fagiolo/Sorana</td>
<td>Regional Management Mostviertel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Affiliation & number of interviewees** | - Tuscany Region Office (3)  
- Municipality of Pescia (1)  
- Ghiareto Association (1)  
- Producers (4) | - Regional Management Mostviertel (3)  
- Association of fruit producers, Mostviertel (1)  
- Experts (2) |
| **Documents**        | GI documents and protocols, reports from Tuscany Region Office, inspection body, Door Database | Reports from Patent Office, GI documents and protocols, Door Database |

Qualitative interviews (e.g. for understanding the PGI registration process, for open questions on benefits and risks)

Structured questionnaires (e.g. for assessing the time effort of the individuals involved, for ranking the risks and benefits derived from literature)
Results (2): Timeframe from GI conception to PGI registration

1. Patent office inquired for not using the PGI label,
2. Producers did not agree on external control body.
Results (3): Transaction efforts until PGI registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work packages</th>
<th>Sorana bean</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mostviertel perry</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>Person years</td>
<td>Total of people involved</td>
<td>Time frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Conception and consensus on GI strategy</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agreement and drafting of the Product Specifications</td>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2001-2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. National phase of the GI registration</td>
<td>1995-2000</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EU phase of the PGI registration</td>
<td>2000-2002</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2003-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaires answered by interviewees

Note: Time effort was estimated as person years (7.5 working hours/day, 220 working days/year)

*Not possible to sum up because of overlap/double counting between work packages

Co-decision making by the majority of producers

5 Key-actors deciding on behalf of and informing other producers: Additional 0.02 person years of discussion until rejection
## Results (4): Main risks until registration – average Likert score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks until registration for the <strong>Sorana case</strong></th>
<th>Score &gt;3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in consensus on Product Specifications (definition of the territorial area)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks until registration for the <strong>Perry case</strong></th>
<th>Score &gt;3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long and tedium GI registration</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the GI concept</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in consensus on Product Specifications (quality definition, pears specifications)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Semi-structured interviews

The score is calculated as the average of agreement expressed by interviewees, measured according to the following scale: 1= strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree
# Results (5):
## Main benefits until registration

### Benefits until registration for the **Sorana case**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher <em>pride</em> of local firms on the product</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased <em>motivation</em> to produce <em>better quality</em></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad acceptance of a common quality standard</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeper <em>knowledge</em> and awareness of external actors of product <em>characteristics</em> of different beans produced in Tuscany</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of relations between private actors (firms) and public actors in territories</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Semi-structured interviews

The score is calculated as the average of agreement expressed by interviewees, measured according to the following scale: 1= strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree
### Results (6): Main benefits until registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits until registration for the Perry case</th>
<th>Score &gt; 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better Product Specifications and product description</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of a debate about the future of the region and its development</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of horizontal relations and communication between perry producers</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Semi-structured interviews

The score is calculated as the average of agreement expressed by interviewees, measured according to the following scale: 1= strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree
Discussion

- Similar GI registrations process with divergent amount of efforts and results & benefits (e.g. formally rejecting the PGI recognition)

- Group heterogeneity \( \rightarrow \) increases the length of the registration processes (Poteete et al. 2010).

- Less collective efforts invested in the ex-ante phase of the Perry case had to be spent afterwards (Hanna, 1995) – without GI recognition in the end

- Higher levels of participation before registration promote
  - clear and broadly accepted rules,
  - trust,
  - horizontal communication,
  - collective learning on GI
Lessons learned

- The two cases suggest that the collective efforts might pay off when there is:
  - the inclusion of all potential users (e.g. specialized or not, big or small)
  - the degree of participation (collectively decided? or some else decided?)
  - collective GI learning (producers and public authorities)
  - the existence of a supportive institutional environment
    (e.g. legal framework and support by public authorities)

- Future research on how to effectively organize and promote the interaction among heterogeneous producer groups and actors
Thank you for your attention!
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