

Evaluation of the CAP policy on protected designations of origin (PDO) and protected geographical indications (PGI)

Executive Summary

This study, financed by the European Commission, has been carried out by London Economics in association with ADAS and Ecologic

The conclusions, recommendations and opinions presented in this report reflect the opinion of the consultant and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Commission



November 2008

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

1.1 Objectives of the evaluation

The present evaluation of the scheme for protected designations of origins (PDO) and protected geographical indications (PGI) first provides a detailed description of the implementation and usage of the PDO/PGI scheme over the evaluation period 1992-2006. Second, the study assesses the effectiveness of the PDO/PGI scheme itself.

1.2 The PDO/PGI scheme

The EU PDO/PGI regulation (Regulation 510/2006 and its predecessor Regulation 2081/92) provides EU-wide protection to names of agricultural products and foodstuffs that have a close link to their geographic region of production.

Fundamentally, the regulation aims to prevent the use of registered names unless the products are produced in a specified territory and according to a certain production specification.

The protection is also open to names of products produced in third countries (countries outside the EU), where these names are themselves protected in their own country of origin.

In order to benefit from the PDO/PGI protection, EU producers make voluntary applications to register a name to their national authorities while applications from non-EU producers can be received by the Commission from the national authorities of third countries or directly from the producers.

These applications must contain a product specification including at least the following:

1. a product description;
2. a method of production;
3. the geographical area where it is produced.

In addition, applications must provide evidence that some quality, reputation or other characteristic associated with the product is linked to the region of production.

If the application is successful and the name is registered, then any producer complying with the product specification and controlled by a control body or national authorities can use the name.

In the case of a PDO, there must be an objective and exclusive link between the features of the product and its geographical origin. Further, all stages of the production process must take place in the defined geographical area.

For a PGI product, the link with the geographical area does not need to be 'essential or exclusive' but has to be causal. In this sense, it is sufficient that the features or the reputation of the product are 'attributable' to the geographic origin. Further, not all stages of production have to take place in the defined area (in fact, it is sufficient that only one stage of production takes place in the defined area).

Following registration of a name, PDO/PGI regulations are enforced by administrative bodies in the Member States. These institutions provide protection of the name and exclusive rights for its use to producers who meet the product specification.

2. The evaluation methodology

2.1 The methodology

According to the terms of reference of the project, the study had to provide:

1. a description of a) the development of the PDO/PGI scheme over the evaluation period, including the regulatory framework and the implementation mechanism and b) the use of the system over the evaluation period, in particular: the type of products and their respective value/turnover introduced in the scheme by farmers, producers and retailers; and
2. assess the effectiveness of the scheme.

A key limitation of the evaluation of the scheme is that, at the present time, data on the administrative implementation of the PDO and PGI scheme and on the PDO/PGI products are scant as, typically, Member States do not monitor the administrative and statistical aspects of the scheme such as value or volume of production, sales and prices of PDO and PGI products, etc.

To overcome this lack of data on the economic aspects of the scheme, the present evaluation relies to a large extent on a set of case studies of PDOs and PGIs in 10 Member States, namely: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Spain, Sweden and the UK. The case studies were

undertaken by national experts with considerable experience in working on PDO/PGI issues in their home Member State.

The selection of Member States aimed to achieve a balance between northern and southern Member States while including Scandinavian Member States and one new Member State.

Each case study covered two PDO/PGI products and two non-PDO/PGI products as comparators except the case studies of Denmark and Sweden which each covered only 1 PDO/PGI.

The PDO/PGI products were chosen so that the distribution of the case study products in each product category (e.g., cheeses, meat-based products, fresh meat (and offal), fruit, vegetables and cereals, oils and fats / olive oils, bread, pastry, cakes, confectionery, biscuits and other baker's wares, fresh fish, molluscs and crustaceans and products derived there from, other products of animal origin (eggs, honey, milk products excluding butter etc.)) broadly reflects the distribution of all PDO/PGI products across product categories. The full list of PDO and PGI products covered by the case studies is provided in Table 1.

The first step in the present evaluation involved a) the definition of judgement criteria for a number of pre-specified evaluation questions; and b) the identification of indicators to be used for each of the criteria.

2.2 Information sources

The second step involved the articulation of a research strategy for collecting the information necessary to populate the indicators. The main sources of information in the case studies were:

- a) surveys of producers of PDO/PGI products and comparator products;
- b) surveys of other stakeholders in the PDO/PGI value chains (farmers, processors, producers' groups, traders, retailers); and,
- c) surveys of consumer associations and public authorities;
- d) a special survey of a second group of producers of PDOs/PGIs and their comparator products whose products have faced specific difficulties associated with the implementation of the scheme. These difficulties may have related to the application and objection procedures, the coexistence rule, the labelling of processed products which contain PDO/PGI products as ingredients or the absence of a list of generics.

Table 1: List of PDO/PGI products covered in the case studies			
Country	Product	Type*	Comparator
BE	Fromage de Herve PDO	CH	Wynendale (brand)
	Jambon d'Ardenne PGI	MB	Jambon d'Aoste TM
DE	Lübecker Marzipan PGI	BP	Zentis
	Spreewälder Gurken PGI	FV	Kühne TM
EL	Feta PDO	CH	Cubable white cheese from both inside and outside Greece
	Sitia Lasithi Kritis PDO	OO	Non PDO Extra virgin Olive oil (unbranded)
ES	Jamón de Teruel PDO	MB	Uncertified ham
	Turrón de Alicante/ Jijona PGI	BP	Generic hard nougat (for T. de Alicante) and generic soft nougat (for T. de Jijona)
FR	Riz de Camargue PGI	FV	Taureau Ailé TM
	Volaille de Bresse PDO	FM	Le Gaulois TM
HU	Szegedi Szalámi PDO	MB	Herz Teli.szalami (Hertz Salami) TM
	Szegedi Fűszerpaprika PDO ¹	S	Chili-Trade Grounded Paprika TM
IT	Toscana PGI	OO	Extra-virgin olive oil from both inside and outside Tuscany
	Mela Val di Non PDO	FV	Consortio la Trentina TM
SE	Svecia PGI	CH	Vasterbotten TM
DK	Esrom PGI	CH	Havarti (several trademarks)
UK	Jersey Royal Potatoes PDO	FV	Cornish Earlies (several trademarks)
	Whitstable Oysters PGI	FF	Lindisfarne Oysters (several trademarks)

Notes; (1) Szegedi Fűszerpaprika is not yet a PDO but is expected to become a PDO in the near future. Legends: Cheeses (CH); Meat-based products (MB); Fresh meat (and offal) (FM); Fruit, vegetables and cereals (FV); Oils and fats / Olive oils (OO); Bread, pastry, cakes, confectionery, biscuits and other baker's wares (BP); Fresh fish, molluscs and crustaceans and products derived there from (FF); Other Annex I products (spices etc.) (S).

Table 2 provides more detailed information on the number of survey interviews which have been carried out as part of the case studies.

Table 2: Number of case study survey interviews	
Survey participants	Number
Producers (farmer or processor) of PDO/PGI and comparator product	77
Upstream (farmer) or downstream (processor) stakeholders	41
Producers' group	18
Producers whose products faced specific difficulties	22
Traders and retailers	23
Consumers' associations	10
Public authorities	19

In addition to the case study surveys, officials from the public authorities responsible for the implementation of the scheme in all Member States were surveyed about the implementation of the scheme and a pan-European consumer survey involving 16.718 interviews was undertaken as part of a broader omnibus survey run by one of the major European market research firms.

The evaluation also takes account of previous findings from the literature on PDOs/PGIs and uses all publicly available data.

2.3 Limitations of the evaluation

As already noted above, the main research methodology used in the evaluation is a case study approach. The limited number of case studies does not allow one to draw firm conclusions for the overall population of PDOs and PGIs. However, any commonalities in findings across the different PDO and PGI products examined by the present evaluation are suggestive of findings which are likely to apply to the population of PDOs and PGIs more generally.

That being said, our analysis of the uptake of the PDO/PGI scheme and the consumer survey do not face the same limitations in terms of representativeness as, by design, they either cover the whole population in the case of the analysis of the uptake of the PDO/PGI scheme or a representative sample of the population in the case of the consumer survey.

2.4 Key characteristics of PDO/PGI products covered by the evaluation

The PDO/PGI scheme covers a wide range of different products with different characteristics. Therefore, we developed a classification system using six different criteria to group the PDO/PGI products covered by the case studies and examine later in the evaluation whether there are any

differences in the impact of the scheme and the extent to which different objectives are achieved. The six criteria relate to:

1. the length of the distribution channel;
2. the degree of product maturity;
3. the location of the production (remote versus non-remote areas);
4. the level of production concentration;
5. the scale of production; and
6. the presence or not of a producers' group in the value chain.

Overall, of the 18 PDO/PGI products reviewed by the case studies:

- 2 products are relatively *new products* (Riz de Camargue and Whitstable Oysters) and the other 16 products are *mature products*;
- 5 products are produced on a *small scale* (Fromage de Herve, Riz de Camargue, Szegedi Fűszerpaprika, Toscano and Jersey Royal Potatoes) and the other 13 products are produced on a *large scale*;
- 2 products are mostly sold through *direct sales* (Szegedi Fűszerpaprika and Whitstable Oysters) while the other 16 products are sold through *long distribution channels*;
- 7 products are produced in *remote locations* (Jambon d'Ardenne, Sitia Lasithi Kritis, Jamón de Teruel, Riz de Camargue, Volaille de Bresse, Szegedi Fűszerpaprika and Jersey Royal Potatoes) while the other 11 products are produced in *non-remote areas*;
- The production of 6 products is *not concentrated* (Feta, Riz de Camargue, Volaille de Bresse, Toscano, Mela Val di Non and Jersey Royal Potatoes) while the production of the other 11 products is concentrated, i.e. less than 5 producers account for 50% or more of the total production;
- Finally, only PDO/PGI value chain, namely Feta, is characterised by the *absence of a producers' group*.

Thus, the typical product in the case studies is a mature product, whose production is concentrated and undertaken on a large scale in a non-remote location, and a producers' group is active in the PDO/PGI value chain.

3. Evaluation results

3.1 Implementation of the scheme

A harmonised implementation of the PDO and PGI scheme across the EU is one of the expected outcomes of Regulation 510/2006 (and its predecessor Regulation 2081/92). There is no evidence which suggests that the PDO/PGI regulatory framework is unclear *per se*, but the implementation of the regulation at Member State level is inconsistent.

In fact, there is significant disparity in terms of the institution responsible for promotion and administration, the level of support and guidance available for the application process, the time period allowed for objections at national level and the control of compliance and enforcement.

This suggests that the expected output of the PDO/PGI scheme of a “Harmonised implementation system across EU countries” is not fully achieved.

3.2 Usage of the scheme

According to the most recent information (as of June 2008), 779 names have been registered as PDO or PGI (446 PDOs and 333 PGIs). However, there is a large disparity in the number of registered names across the Member States.

France and Italy have considerably more registrations than any other Member State. These two Member States account for more than 40% of the total number of names registered as a PDO or a PGI. A second group of countries, Germany, Greece, Portugal and Spain each have between 111 and 69 registered names. These six countries account for almost 90% of all registrations at present.

A statistical analysis of the causes of the marked differences in the number of PDO/PGI registration across Member States shows that besides the size of the agricultural sector, other important factors are the level of encouragement and support given to PDO/PGI applicants, differences in food cultures and the EU accession date.

There exists very little data regarding the contribution of PDO and PGI products to the overall turnover of the agro-food sector. The information available for a few countries with a high number of PDOs/PGIs (France, Germany, Spain) suggests that the contribution of the PDOs/PGIs is small but economically still significant, accounting for between 1% and 5% of the turnover of the agro-food sector.

3.3 Use of PDO/PGI products as ingredients

The use and labelling of ingredients in processed products does not appear to cause problems for producers and there is evidence from some case studies (Parmigiano Reggiano, Turrón de Jijona and White and Blue Stilton) that industry can manage this on an agreed basis between producers and manufacturers.

This evaluation has found no court cases at the European level in which a dispute directly relates to PDO/PGI products used as ingredients in processed products (and identified on the labels as such).

Finally, there is some limited evidence that labelling of products using PDO/PGI as ingredients may be causing confusion among consumers in some cases but the data is not very comprehensive.

3.4 Reason for participating in a PDO/PGI scheme

The main reasons given by the producers interviewed in the case studies for taking up the scheme are economic reasons such as marketing, gaining/securing market share to keep businesses viable or profitable through the protection of the use of names, or sending quality assurance signals to consumers.

3.5 Impact on producer prices and costs

The PDO/PGI scheme also yields higher prices for many of the PDO/PGI products covered in the case studies. In 14 out of 18 cases, the price of a PDO/PGI product is higher than the price of its comparator product. The positive price premium ranges from 5% in the cases of Sitia Lasithi Kritis, Jamón de Teruel (5% in the case of farmers, 25% in the case of processors), and Turrón de Alicante/Jijona to 300% in the case of Volaille de Bresse.

However, the majority of PDO/PGI products are more costly to produce than their comparators. In 10 cases, the cost of producing a PDO/PGI is higher than the cost of producing its comparator and the additional cost ranges from 3% (Turrón de Alicante/Jijona) to 150% (Volaille de Bresse). And in 8 cases, the cost is equal or only slightly superior.

These higher costs reflect higher production costs, certification costs, and producers' group costs.

As a result of the higher cost, a higher price does not necessarily translate into a higher margin. However, the evidence collected in the case studies shows that PDO/PGI products are generally more profitable than their comparators.

In 12 cases, the margin is higher than for comparator products and ranges from 2% (Turrón de Alicante Jijona) to 150% (Volaille de Bresse). And, in 4

cases, the margin of a PDO/PGI product is the same as the margin of its comparator product. In 2 cases, there is no information on margins.

3.6 Traders and retailers and PDOs/PGIs

For most traders and retailers interviewed in the case studies, PDO/PGI products account for a very small share of their overall business and they are seen as quite unimportant. This is especially true for larger retailers. For small, specialist shops and traders who specialise in distributing certain types of product the PDO/PGIs are more important. The most important benefit is the enhancement of reputation from being associated with high quality products. Again this is most important for small or specialist companies.

3.7 Other benefits of PDOs/PGIs

Overall, a statistical analysis of the responses of the case study participants on the effect of being able to sell PDO/PGI products on business profitability, stability, reputation and access to new markets shows that producers of PDOs/PGIs located in remote areas see greater benefits in terms of profitability and reputation of their business.

In terms of the other aspects of the scheme, the analysis suggests that producers of PDOs/PGIs produced on a small scale see a greater impact of the scheme in terms of the stability of their business, while producers of PDOs/PGIs produced on a large scale see a greater impact of the scheme in terms of the reputation of their business.

3.8 Consumers and PDOs/PGIs

Regarding consumers, the key results of the consumer survey of awareness and understanding of the European PDO/PGI symbols are that the level of recognition of the PDO and PGI symbols is low in the EU27 even in Member States with large number of PDOs and PGIs. Across the EU27 Member States, just 8% of shoppers recognised any of the PDO or PGI symbols. This is in line with previous findings regarding consumer recognition of PDO/PGI symbol reported in the literature.

Moreover, there is confusion as to the meaning of the PDO and PGI symbols. Of those who recognised the PDO/PGI symbols, only 51% correctly identified that the symbols mean the product is produced in one specific area and only 42% correctly identified that the symbols mean that “guarantee of origin and compliance with product specifications are certified by a controlling body”. Moreover, only about one third were able to identify that the symbols identified products being produced according to an established specification or with a quality related to the area in which it is produced.

In addition, about a quarter of survey respondents erroneously believed that the PDO or PGI symbol referred to a product being produced in an environmentally friendly way (a characteristic of Organic products), or using a traditional recipe and distinguishing features (a characteristic of Traditional Specialty Guaranteed (TSG) products).

One should note that the use of the PDO and PGI symbols is not yet compulsory. It is only after May 2009 that the terms “protected designation of origin” and “protected geographical indication” or the associated EU symbols must be included on the labelling of products originating in the EU and marketed under a registered name.

Consumer associations in a number of Member States and most traders and retailers responded that the PDO/PGI scheme can provide useful information for consumers. However, there is only limited evidence that, so far, the scheme promotes consumer confidence in products with registered names.

3.9 Non-information on origin of raw materials

The impact of non-information on the origin of raw materials on a consumer depends entirely on whether the consumer believes that all the ingredients in a PGI are from the region named in the PGI name or is actually aware of the fact that the ingredients from outside the region can be used.

Non-information on raw material origin used in PGI products is a concern only in a few countries. No court cases have been identified in which consumers actually complained about having been misled. However, consumer associations in Italy and Germany have expressed concerns about the fact that consumers could be misled if the fact that some ingredients of the PGI, which are produced outside the PGI region, is not explicitly noted on the packaging of the PGI product.

3.10 Alternative means for protection of names

The alternative means of protection to PDO/PGI available to producers are individual and collective trademarks, and certification marks. The main difference between PDO/PGI and such alternatives is that more stringent conditions (related to special characteristics of the region) apply for the registration of a PDO/PGI.

The responses from the cases study participants indicate that, in general, a trademark is not viewed as being as effective as the PDO/PGI scheme for protecting a name. The case studies also show that a trademark is often used together with the PDO/PGI indication or symbol for marketing purposes. In this regard, a trademark is viewed as a means to segment the market and build producer-specific brand value while the PDO/PGI indication or symbol is viewed as sending a strong quality signal to consumers and as generating

evocations of “terroir”. Overall, trademarks and the PDO/PGI appear to be complements rather than substitutes.

3.11 Ensuring quality products

The analysis shows that, in most cases, the producers of PDO/PGI products believe them to be of higher quality, citing either particular production and/or consumption characteristics as the driver of quality. Consumer associations in most countries covered by the case studies also noted that PDO and PGI products provide good quality for their prices.

3.12 Improving incomes of farmers

In our analysis, we investigated to what extent producers having registered PDO/PGI names gained market share in the domestic and international markets and benefited financially from the demand for their PDO/PGI products.

The producers’ experience regarding domestic and export market shares is very varied for the different products for which quantitative or qualitative information is available. In some cases, domestic and export markets expanded (e.g. Toscano) while in other it did not (e.g. Riz de Camargue).

Overall, the registration and protection of a name under the PDO/PGI scheme in itself does not guarantee that market shares will increase. Such market share is likely to expand when a number of additional factors are also present, including:

- Intention and effort (e.g. marketing strategy) to increase market shares
- Interest from consumers
- Combination with a trademark
- Niche markets (directed to a narrow group of potential customers)
- Available means producers have for increasing their market share (collective trademarks, good collective organisations).

Regarding the distribution of profits and revenues along the supply chain of PDO/PGI products, the main finding from our analysis of the evidence from the case studies is that this distribution varies according to the product in question.

In short, the responses indicate that in general, the scheme is perceived by PDO/PGI producers as having significant benefits for producers in terms of reputation. But, on average, responses note a lower impact on their

profitability although, in the cases of a few PDO/PGI products, a significant profit impact is reported by producers.

It proved impossible to undertake a comprehensive quantitative assessment of the impact of the PDO/PGI scheme on the profitability of PDO and PGI products covered by the case studies as, because of the commercial sensitivity of financial information, most producers participating in the case studies did not provide data on their profits.

Interestingly, the scheme is highly rated across many of the indicators (namely, impact on profitability, stability of the business, reputation of the business, and access to new marketing channels) by certain producers (in particular Jamón de Teruel and Jersey Royal Potatoes) and lowly (less than one on average) by producers of Feta. Producers of Toscano believe the scheme is very positive in terms of their reputation and access to new marketing channels, but not in terms of profitability or stability of their business. The responses of the producers of other products are more mixed.

3.13 Prevention of effects impacting normal market operations of non-PDO/PGI products, in particular in the absence of the list of generics

Whilst, in theory, it is possible that the protection and rights awarded to protected product names under the PDO/PGI scheme may impact the normal market operations of non-PDO/PGI products, the absence of evidence suggests that this has generally not been the case. That being said, producers of a product sold under a name which they can no longer use following the registration of that name will incur marketing and rebranding costs to re-establish their product in the market place.

It is possible that the uncertainty over the generic status of a name (or process) could have an impact on investment and production decisions of producers who are uncertain about the generic nature of the name(s) of their product(s).

However, established case law clearly underlines the fact that any list of generics would be indicative only. A national judge would still need to decide on a case-by-case basis the generic character of a given designation if there were disputes about the generic character of such a designation. Moreover, the validity of any such list of generics can be challenged at any time under Article 234 of the Treaty by a Member State or a legal or physical person directly and individually concerned. Therefore, the existence of a list would be unlikely to reduce uncertainty.

3.14 Ensuring an increased diversity of products

While the PDO/PGI scheme has helped preserve the production of products which otherwise may have been stopped, it has contributed little to fostering the introduction of new products and promoting innovations in the industry.

According to the interviewed producers in the case studies, the scheme has had little overall impact on diversification for producers. Diversification by producers arose in only a limited number of cases when they were able to introduce new products as a result of a higher reputation achieved by the scheme.

3.15 Increasing or retaining economic activities in rural areas

Many different economic, social and environmental factors affect the development of the economic tissue of rural areas. Among these many factors, the PDO/PGI scheme is only one such driver. As a result, its influence is difficult to isolate from other factors.

In practice, the limited evidence from the case studies suggest that there is a small positive and varied impact across PDOs/PGIs, a finding consistent with the fact that the scheme is only one of many, often more important, factors driving economic development in rural areas.

3.16 Establishing cultural value in rural areas

There exist strong links in the majority of the case studies between the product whose name is protected under the PDO/PGI scheme and the heritage and culture (in terms of tradition, events, associations, etc) of the area in which the PDO/PGI is produced but it is difficult to ascertain to what extent the PDO/PGI scheme is responsible for such cultural value. In many cases, the link between the product and the socio-cultural dimensions of the region predates the introduction of the scheme or the socio-cultural activities associated with a product are not specific to the PDO/PGI. Nevertheless, the case studies suggest that the existence of the PDOs/PGIs seems, at the very least, to reinforce the cultural heritage and value of the region of production of the PDOs/PGIs.

4. Recommendations

The following recommendations are made on the basis of the findings reported above.

The first fact to note is that there is a dearth of administrative and statistical data on the PDO/PGI scheme and the PDO/PGI products. As a result, the present evaluation had to rely on findings from a limited number of case studies rather than being able to draw on data covering the whole population of PDOs and PGIs.

While this reduces to some extent the general applicability of the evaluation's findings, it also points to a lacuna which would need to be addressed to

allow for a good monitoring of the scheme and its implementation, and build up a solid evidence base which could be used to inform future policy regarding PDOs and PGIs.

- **Recommendation 1: Increase the availability of administrative and statistical data on the PDO/PGI scheme.** This recommendation is addressed to both the European Commission and Member States. The lack of comprehensive data at the Member State level on the administration of the scheme (such as, for example, number of controls, etc) and statistical data on the PDO/PGI products (such as, for example, number of PDO/PGI producers, size of the agricultural areas devoted to the production of PDOs/PGIs and their key inputs (such as milk in the case of cheese production), value and volume of production, value and volume of sales of PDO and PGI products in the home market, in other EU Member States and outside the EU, etc) is a serious constraint to the monitoring and evaluation of the scheme at national and EU level.

Consideration should be given by the European Commission to developing with Member States a collection system of administrative and economic data on PDOs/PGIs to be able to monitor this segment and inform future policy-making. Of interest is information at the level of a PDO or PGI and not at the level of the individual PDO or PGI producer. However, the data will need to be collected at the producer level and, therefore, will involve the gathering of commercially sensitive data. The national institutions responsible for agricultural statistics would therefore be well-placed to undertake such a data gathering exercise.

According to the most recent information (as of June 2008), 779 names have been registered as PDO or PGI (446 PDOs and 333 PGIs). However, there is a large disparity in the number of registered names across the Member States.

The evidence in this report suggests that a higher level of information and support tends to result in more registration for protected names.

To the extent that producers of PDOs/PGIs benefit from the scheme relative to producers of similar products with no geographical indication, it could be worth investing some resources in increasing producer awareness of the scheme and its benefits, especially in Member States in which the actual take-up rate of the PDO/PGI scheme appears lower than what one would expect on the basis of the size of their agricultural sector.

- **Recommendation 2: Actively promote the scheme and stronger provision support for the applicant.** This recommendation is

primarily addressed to Member States but there is also scope for the European Commission to engage in such promotional activities.

The results of a pan-European consumer survey of awareness and understanding of the PDO/PGI symbols show that the level of recognition and understanding of the PDO and PGI symbols is very low in the EU27. This suggests that the PDO/PGI scheme's expected output of "awareness and knowledge of PDO/PGI indications and symbols by consumers" is not being achieved.

- **Recommendation 3: undertake an active communication campaign to raise consumer knowledge of the PDO/PGI scheme and the PDO/PGI symbols.** This recommendation is addressed to both Member States and the European Commission. For such a campaign to be most efficient in raising consumer awareness throughout the EU and, thus, benefiting all producers of PDO and PGI products, it would be preferable if such a campaign was run simultaneously or almost simultaneously in all Member States. The actual information campaign could be undertaken by Member States or the European Commission.

The non-information on origin of raw materials in the case of PGIs, at times, may cause consumer confusion about the true origin of the ingredients used in some PGIs.

- **Recommendation 4: Consider ways to increase information about raw material ingredients in PGIs by, for example, providing detailed origin information on at least the main ingredients on the PGI package.** This recommendation is addressed to the European Commission. This would address consumers concerns about traceability and sourcing of ingredients and eliminate any potential confusion about the geographical source of ingredients in PGIs. At the present time, the issue of lack of information on raw material provenance used in PGIs does not appear to be a wide-spread issue, in part because consumer understanding of the PDO/PGI scheme is low. However, if consumer awareness and recognition of the PDO and PGI logos and indications increase in the future, the lack of information on the origin of raw materials used in PGIs may become a more sensitive issue.



London Economics

11-15 Betterton Street
London WC2H 9BP
Tel: +44 20 7866 8185
Fax: +44 20 7866 8186
Email: info@londecon.co.uk

London | Brussels | Dublin | Paris | Budapest | Valletta