

Evaluation of Geographical Indications and Traditional Specialities Guaranteed

Protected in the EU

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The European Union protects more than 3000 names of specific products - foodstuffs, agricultural products, wines, spirit drinks and aromatised wine products - under one of its EU quality schemes. You may already be familiar with famous sparkling wines, cheeses, hams, beers, fruits, spirit drinks and all kinds of foods whose names indicate they come from particular places, traditions and regions.

Champagne PDO



Gorgonzola PDO



Jabugo PDO



Kriek TSG



Münchener Bier PGI



Elia Kalamatas PDO



Polska Wódka GI



Among them, Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) and Protected Geographical Indication (PGI) confer intellectual property rights*, granting the right to producers in a defined geographical area to use the name if they comply with a product specification. Traditional Specialities Guaranteed (TSG) attest traditional production methods and can be produced anywhere as long as the producers comply with a product specification. The aim of the open public consultation is to get feedback on your understanding of the EU quality schemes i.e. geographical indications of GI, PDO, PGI, as well as TSG.

* [What are intellectual property rights?](#)

About you

* Language of my contribution

- ☐ Bulgarian
- ☐ Croatian
- ☐ Czech
- ☐ Danish
- ☐ Dutch
- ☒ English
- ☐ Estonian
- ☐ Finnish
- ☐ French
- ☐ Gaelic
- ☐ German
- ☐ Greek
- ☐ Hungarian
- ☐ 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

Giulia

* Surname

SCAGLIONI

* Email (this won't be published)

policyofficer@arepoquality.eu

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Association of European Regions for Products of Origin (AREPO)

* 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.

3265773534-15

* 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 checked="" 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
<input type="radio"/> Bahrain	<input type="radio"/> French Polynesia	<input type="radio"/> Micronesia	<input type="radio"/> South Africa
<input type="radio"/> Bangladesh	<input type="radio"/> French Southern and Antarctic Lands	<input type="radio"/> Moldova	<input type="radio"/> South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
<input type="radio"/> Barbados	<input type="radio"/> Gabon	<input type="radio"/> Monaco	<input type="radio"/> South Korea
<input type="radio"/> Belarus	<input type="radio"/> Georgia	<input type="radio"/> Mongolia	<input type="radio"/> South Sudan
<input type="radio"/> Belgium	<input type="radio"/> Germany	<input type="radio"/> Montenegro	<input type="radio"/> Spain
<input type="radio"/> Belize	<input type="radio"/> Ghana	<input type="radio"/> Montserrat	<input type="radio"/> Sri Lanka
<input type="radio"/> Benin	<input type="radio"/> Gibraltar	<input type="radio"/> Morocco	<input type="radio"/> Sudan
<input type="radio"/> Bermuda	<input type="radio"/> Greece	<input type="radio"/> Mozambique	<input type="radio"/> Suriname
<input type="radio"/> Bhutan	<input type="radio"/> Greenland	<input type="radio"/> Myanmar /Burma	<input type="radio"/> Svalbard and Jan Mayen
<input type="radio"/> Bolivia	<input type="radio"/> Grenada	<input type="radio"/> Namibia	<input type="radio"/> Sweden
<input type="radio"/> Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	<input type="radio"/> Guadeloupe	<input type="radio"/> Nauru	<input type="radio"/> Switzerland
<input type="radio"/> Bosnia and Herzegovina	<input type="radio"/> Guam	<input type="radio"/> Nepal	<input type="radio"/> Syria
<input type="radio"/> Botswana	<input type="radio"/> Guatemala	<input type="radio"/> Netherlands	<input type="radio"/> Taiwan
<input type="radio"/> Bouvet Island	<input type="radio"/> Guernsey	<input type="radio"/> New Caledonia	<input type="radio"/> Tajikistan
<input type="radio"/> Brazil	<input type="radio"/> Guinea	<input type="radio"/> New Zealand	<input type="radio"/> Tanzania
<input type="radio"/> British Indian Ocean Territory	<input type="radio"/> Guinea-Bissau	<input type="radio"/> Nicaragua	<input type="radio"/> Thailand
<input type="radio"/> British Virgin Islands	<input type="radio"/> Guyana	<input type="radio"/> Niger	<input type="radio"/> The Gambia
<input type="radio"/> Brunei	<input type="radio"/> Haiti	<input type="radio"/> Nigeria	<input type="radio"/> Timor-Leste
<input type="radio"/> Bulgaria	<input type="radio"/> Heard Island and McDonald Islands	<input type="radio"/> Niue	<input type="radio"/> Togo
<input type="radio"/> Burkina Faso	<input type="radio"/> Honduras	<input type="radio"/> Norfolk Island	<input type="radio"/> Tokelau
<input type="radio"/> Burundi	<input type="radio"/> Hong Kong	<input type="radio"/> Northern Mariana Islands	<input type="radio"/> Tonga
<input type="radio"/> Cambodia	<input type="radio"/> Hungary	<input type="radio"/> North Korea	<input type="radio"/> Trinidad and Tobago
<input type="radio"/> Cameroon	<input type="radio"/> Iceland	<input type="radio"/> North Macedonia	<input type="radio"/> Tunisia
<input type="radio"/> Canada	<input type="radio"/> India	<input type="radio"/> Norway	<input type="radio"/> Turkey
<input type="radio"/> Cape Verde	<input type="radio"/> Indonesia	<input type="radio"/> Oman	<input type="radio"/> Turkmenistan
<input type="radio"/> Cayman Islands	<input type="radio"/> Iran	<input type="radio"/> Pakistan	<input type="radio"/> Turks and Caicos Islands
<input type="radio"/> Central African Republic	<input type="radio"/> Iraq	<input type="radio"/> Palau	<input type="radio"/> Tuvalu
<input type="radio"/> Chad	<input type="radio"/> Ireland	<input type="radio"/> Palestine	<input type="radio"/> Uganda

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Chile | <input type="radio"/> Isle of Man | <input type="radio"/> Panama | <input type="radio"/> Ukraine |
| <input type="radio"/> China | <input type="radio"/> Israel | <input type="radio"/> Papua New Guinea | <input type="radio"/> United Arab Emirates |
| <input type="radio"/> Christmas Island | <input type="radio"/> Italy | <input type="radio"/> Paraguay | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom |
| <input type="radio"/> Clipperton | <input type="radio"/> Jamaica | <input type="radio"/> Peru | <input type="radio"/> United States |
| <input type="radio"/> Cocos (Keeling) Islands | <input type="radio"/> Japan | <input type="radio"/> Philippines | <input type="radio"/> United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Colombia | <input type="radio"/> Jersey | <input type="radio"/> Pitcairn Islands | <input type="radio"/> Uruguay |
| <input type="radio"/> Comoros | <input type="radio"/> Jordan | <input type="radio"/> Poland | <input type="radio"/> US Virgin Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Congo | <input type="radio"/> Kazakhstan | <input type="radio"/> Portugal | <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan |
| <input type="radio"/> Cook Islands | <input type="radio"/> Kenya | <input type="radio"/> Puerto Rico | <input type="radio"/> Vanuatu |
| <input type="radio"/> Costa Rica | <input type="radio"/> Kiribati | <input type="radio"/> Qatar | <input type="radio"/> Vatican City |
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo | <input type="radio"/> Réunion | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait | <input type="radio"/> Romania | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan | <input type="radio"/> Russia | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao | <input type="radio"/> Laos | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus | <input type="radio"/> Latvia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy | <input type="radio"/> Yemen |
| <input type="radio"/> Czechia | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Zambia |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark | <input type="radio"/> Liberia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Lucia | |

* 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 your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

☒ **Public**

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

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

=====

=====

Evaluation of Geographical Indications and Traditional Specialities Guaranteed Protected in the European Union

Introductory questions

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

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

* Please specify:

2. In your opinion, are the aims* of EU quality schemes clear and understandable? (**one answer per row possible**)

** EU quality schemes aims at protecting the names of specific products to promote their unique characteristics, linked to their geographical origin as well as traditional know-how.*

** **GIs, PDOs and PGIs protect the name of a product**, which is from a specific region and follow a particular traditional production process. However, there are differences between the three, linked primarily to how much of the raw materials come from the area or how much of the production process has to take place in the specific region.*

- ***Agricultural product, foodstuff and wine names registered as PDO*** are those that have the strongest links to the place – the product has characteristics that are due to the environmental features and skills of local producers – in which they are made.
- ***PGI (also for agricultural product, foodstuff and wine names)*** emphasises the relationship between the specific geographical region and

the name of the product, where a particular quality, reputation or other characteristic is essentially attributable to its geographical origin.

- ***The GI protects the name of a spirit drink or aromatised wine originating in a country, region or locality where the product's particular quality, reputation or other characteristic is essentially attributable to its geographical origin.***

**** TSG highlights the traditional aspects such as the way the food and agricultural products are made or their composition, without being linked to a specific geographical area. The name of a product being registered as a TSG protects it against falsification and misuse.***

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How effective has EU policy been ?

3. In your opinion, do EU quality schemes (one answer per row possible for statements a-g)

a) provide useful information to consumers about the geographical origin and specific characteristics of products

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

b) promote the authenticity of registered products and consumer confidence in registered products

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

c) protect and enforce the producers' rights (including on internet)

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

d) help strengthening the position of producers in the value chain

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

e) preserve and develop rural areas (i.e. their socio-economic sustainability, as well as cultural and gastronomic heritage)

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

PGI (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

f) contribute to protecting the natural resources or landscape

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

g) contribute to improving the welfare of farm animals

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. In your opinion, what have been the incentives to participate in EU quality schemes? (multiple answers per row and column possible)

	GI (spirit)	PDO (food and wine)	PGI (food and wine)	TSG (food)
Exclusive use of the protected name and enforcement of producers (including combatting misuse of protected names and internet fraud)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Strengthen the position of producer groups in the value chain	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Keep business economically viable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Useful marketing tool	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Quality assurance signal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Differentiation of product	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Traceability tool	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Increase own firm's reputation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Access to new markets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Credibility of product	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Higher price premium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Increase/secure market share	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Affinity with the region	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Protection of traditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Regional development and tourism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No opinion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

* Please specify

Access to public funding for promotion, information and certification

5. In your opinion, what have been the disincentives to participate in EU quality schemes? (multiple answers per row and column possible)

	GI (spirit)	PDO (food and wine)	PGI (food and wine)	TSG (food)
Higher production costs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Higher marketing costs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Higher costs related to the application, certification, inspection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Stricter inspections	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Not sure that good quality control could be enforced along the supply chain	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uncertainty of market demand or low demand	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Missing regional roots (lack of local identity)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No added value	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No need because have own trademark	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No need because strong market position already	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not enough public support	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Other *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No opinion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

* Please specify

Among the main disincentives are the complexity and long duration of the registration process and the amendment procedure to product specifications which require a high bureaucratic effort.

The lack of consumer awareness and understanding of the GIs protection label.

Conflicting interests with owners of individual brands.

Adverse interpretations on GIs protection in cases where international trademark rules conflict with GI rules leave a level of uncertainty and therefore does not encourage participation in quality schemes.

6. Are you aware that the names of regional products from non-EU countries can be protected under EU quality schemes? (one answer possible)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Additional comment/possible examples

7. Are you confident of receiving the authentic product when buying EU quality schemes' products* on the internet? Please give your opinion on the two cases presented below (one answer per case possible)

* i.e. geographical indications of GI, PDO, PGI products, as well as TSG products.

Case 1: EU quality schemes' products bought on the internet from a sales platform

- ☐ Totally agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Totally disagree
- ☐ No opinion

Case 2: EU quality schemes' products bought on the internet directly from the producer

- ☐ Totally agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Totally disagree
- ☐ No opinion

Additional comment/possible examples

Fraud and misunderstanding are possible online

How efficient has EU policy been ?

8. In your opinion, do EU quality schemes provide good value for money for producers and consumers? Please give your opinion on the two cases presented below (one answer per row possible in each case)

Case 1: Producers

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Case 2: Consumers

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Additional comment

9. In your opinion, what are the costs and benefits of EU registration under EU quality schemes? Please give your opinion, if any, separately for the Geographical Indications (GI, PDO, PGI) and on TSG, from the perspective of the three groups of stakeholders mentioned below.

Should you have no opinion, please leave this space empty.

The European legal framework provides for rules on free of charge and not time limited registration of names under EU quality schemes. For details see the Commission's website (that has explanations and links to legal texts):

https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/food-safety-and-quality/certification/quality-labels/quality-schemes-explained_en

Costs and benefits of EU registration under geographical indications (GI, PDO, PGI)

a) Producers

Costs: production of GIs brings an increase in costs and administrative burden, due to the implementation of new control or traceability systems and the establishment of rigorous quality assurance and certification plans.

Benefits: At the same time, GI valorisation process gives the product quality assurance and an added value that makes it more appealing to the consumer and, therefore, more competitive. GIs are an effective marketing instrument capable to help producers securing sales markets. Thus, the consequent price premium compensates for the additional costs.

The costs are also compensated by the protection against misappropriations and imitation. Furthermore, the collective organisation behind GIs strengthen producer networks, mutual support and collective promotion actions.

However, it is true that not all quality systems reach this ideal situation. The cost/benefit ratio can be very different depending on the type of product and the sector. GI managing costs (producer groups, certification, promotion, etc.) are often high and difficult for producers to bear, especially in the case of small PDO/PGI (small both in terms of production volume and number of operators).

b) Consumers

Costs: increase in the price of the product, in relation to those products that are not protected by a GI.

Benefits: the increase in the price is more than offset by the benefit in terms of information and certainty on product origin as well as of assurance on strict compliance with a series of quality requirements.

c) Member States and regions

Costs: MS and Regions have reduced costs. The administrative work derived from the management and enforcement of the system is an initial cost. However it may be reduced by the possibility to charge a fee, provided for in Article 47 of Regulation 1151/2012. Furthermore, the knowledge of specific cases acquired through experience helps developing management capacity with a reduction in the overall administrative costs. Finally a further cost for States or Regions may consist in public financial support for these products.

Benefits: The benefits for Member States and Regions far outweigh the costs. The added value of the products allows to support producers and securing workplaces, with a positive socio-economic impact for the territory in general. Furthermore, GIs are an important tool of regional marketing. Products reputation is naturally reflected on their territories with an evident gain in terms of visibility and cultural and touristic attractiveness for the region. Concerning regional food policies, GIs are a pillar of agro-food quality policies. Finally, GIs often contribute to the creation of public goods such as protection of landscapes, natural resources and cultural heritage that enhance rural areas and are highly important for regional and national administrations. All described elements strengthen the regional economy as a whole.

Costs and benefits of EU registration under TSG

a) Producers

In principle the costs would be lower than GIs, but it is also true that the benefits may be more discreet due to the consumer lack of awareness and knowledge of TSG logo, among other things.

b) Consumers

The cost from the consumer's point of view is that of a slight increase in the price of the product in relation to those which are not protected. Nevertheless, the cost is offset by the benefit of knowing how to use a traditional production method and meeting quality requirements. However, this benefit is not always clearly recognized by the consumer due to lack of awareness and knowledge of TSG logo.

c) Member States and regions

They should not entail a cost for Regions and MS. Nevertheless, the benefit is almost insignificant, as these products are not linked to a specific territory.

10. In your opinion, is it necessary to have all current EU quality schemes? (i.e. geographical indications of GI, PDO, PGI, as well as TSG) **(one answer per row possible)**

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Additional comment

At least from a theoretical point of view, each one of the EU quality schemes has its own peculiarities, which are able to adapt to different cases and needs of the producers.

Nevertheless, in its current form TSG could be improved. Due to the missing delimitation of the region of origin TSG provides limited benefits to member states, regions, producers and consumers. In particular, producer groups do not see an interest in promoting the recognition of a product if every producer outside their territory can use it. Furthermore, the visual differences between TSG and PGI logos could be delimited more clearly. It should be clear that TSG are protected traditional manufacturing processes, without reference to the region of origin.

Finally, it might also be appropriate to better define the optional quality terms "mountain product", for example by identifying criteria to extend its use to all products listed in Annex I to Regulation 1151/2012, and by ensuring a higher level of protection for such terms.

11. In your opinion, would unified registration, amendment and cancellation procedures for EU quality schemes bring greater efficiency? **(one answer possible)**

- ☐ Totally agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Totally disagree
- ☐ No opinion

12. Do you have any other suggestions on how to simplify the legal framework for EU quality schemes and their practical implementation?

Simplification and harmonisation of the administrative procedure for GIs registration and amendment should help to speed up and reduce the cost of the whole process.

AREPO recognizes the work that has already been done by EC concerning the simplification of the GI system. In particular, we welcome the harmonisation process concerning registration, modification and cancellation procedures in different quality systems. While there is a *raison d'être* due to the differences between the different sectors (food, wine, spirits), greater harmonisation is desirable.

Furthermore, in the framework of CAP revision, we welcome the EC proposal to simplify the procedure concerning the amendments to products' specifications. In this regard we would like to call the attention of the Commission to the need to preserve the EU character of the GI system. While we support the proposal to leave MS manage standard amendments in order to speed up the procedure, an increased subsidiarity should not undermine the European nature of the GI system.

At the moment the process of GI registration is highly different from MS to MS. Although the different approaches to the procedure at national level are attributable to MS competences in the field of their administrative activities, they are not known and can be assumed to be significant.

The recent popularity of GIs raises a number of risks and dangers due to this lack of harmonisation and to the presence of different strategies at national level. Some GIs are registered too quickly, sometimes with a top-down approach. Therefore, the supply chains are inadequately prepared, the specifications are not consensual and the control systems are non-operational.

Thus, there is a need for greater coherence and clarity of procedures. Ensuring the implementation of a unified registration, amendment and cancellation procedure at national level would bring greater efficiency. The less bureaucratic and uniform is the process, the more successful it will be, not only for producers, but also for those involved at all stages of product transformation.

AREPO firmly believes that the concept of GI is stronger when it is applied consistently throughout the Union and that a level playing field is ensured between the different Member States.

In this regard, AREPO recommends the EC to:

- Implement as soon as possible the simplification concerning the amendments to products' specifications;
- Redact clear guidelines for the competent national administrations which will be given additional responsibility in the management of GIs amendment;
- Publish and keep up to date Commission guidelines on the interpretation of Regulation concerning internal evaluation criteria for GIs registration and amendments;
- Clarify labelling rules for processed products using a GI as an ingredient;
- Provide for trainings addressed to the professionals involved in the process of GIs registration at national level, in order to overcome the differences and lack of harmonisation.

AREPO welcomes the prominent place given to GIs by President von derLeyen in the mission letter for the new Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development, Janusz Wojciechowski. We appreciate the Commission will to strengthen the system of GIs and we would like to suggest to the European Commission to:

- Improve enforcement and harmonise controls in the MS would be key to assure the credibility of the system and consumer trust;
- Strengthen protection to cover more effectively attempts by third parties to abuse the GIs reputation: registered names shall be protected against exploitation, but also against the weakening and dilution of their reputation;
- Strengthen protection to cover Internet domain names registrations: registered GI names shall be protected against any bad faith registration in second-level domain names, i.e. website names;
- Request Member States to regulate the relations between trademarks and geographical indications in

order to extend the protection of the latter, defining within the national registration procedure the moment in which the registration of a trademark is refused on the grounds that the protected name or GI is being registered;

- Guarantee the same level of protection to GIs containing, in part or in whole, names of breeds or varieties (Art. 42, Reg. 1151/2012 seems to introduce distinctions);
- Clearly determine who owns the intellectual property of the GIs referred to in Article 1.1.c Reg. 1151/2012;
- Strengthen the role of GIs producer groups concerning in particular supply regulation that should be extended to all PDO/PGI products;
- Create an online tool in order to assure consumers more transparency and easier access to readable information concerning product specifications and characteristics.

Has EU action been relevant ?

13. In your opinion, are the aims* of EU quality schemes consistent with the needs of the supply chain operators (i.e. producers, processors, traders, wholesalers, retailers)? **(one answer per row possible)**

* See explanation provided for Question 2

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Additional comment/Please explain why

Concerning the needs of the supply chain operators, the EU quality schemes give the opportunity of creating a strong supply chain able to share strategies, assume responsibilities and reciprocal duties of fairness and balance. Nevertheless, the distribution of added value is not always proportional to the effort of the different supply chain operators. In fact, the producers who provide the raw materials in some cases are not sufficiently compensated.

14. In your opinion, have the aims* of EU quality schemes met the expectations of consumers? **(one answer per row possible)**

* See explanation provided for Question 2

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

PDO (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Additional comment/Please explain why

GIs show a clear reference to the region of origin. As a result, consumers establish solidarity links with the cultural identity of the territories that express these products. Furthermore, the product specifications prescribe explicit criteria in terms of food quality, safety, traceability, sustainability, providing orientation for consumers to buy products that measure up to their expectations. Strict controls on production, processing, packaging and labelling contribute decisively to ensuring the quality and authenticity of qualified products. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the message and meaning of EU quality schemes have not reached the majority of consumers. In particular, the average consumer has difficulties in identifying and differentiating the logos of different EU quality schemes and the values associated with them. With regard to the TSG, the lack of awareness and knowledge is almost absolute.

Has EU policy been coherent ?

15. In your opinion, have EU quality schemes contributed and complemented other instruments and measures of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)?* **(one answer possible)**

** Market and income support policies of the CAP, as well as the sustainable development of rural economy goes hand in hand with the production of GIs and TSGs. In particular, EU quality schemes aim at contributing to areas in which the farming sector is of greater economic importance or to disadvantaged areas, where the farming sector accounts for a significant part of the economy. Consequently, a number of measures under the rural development programmes can support beneficiaries, for example: a) measure on knowledge transfer, b) investment measure in modernization of assets and c) LEADER approach.*

- ☐ Totally agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Totally disagree
- ☐ No opinion

Additional comment

In our view, the CAP and quality schemes complement each other, as both contribute to strengthening the rural economy, to keeping people in rural areas and, consequently, to improving the profitability and sustainability of these territories and their economies.

Furthermore, EU quality schemes can contribute significantly to sustainable development and the green and circular economy, as they are often based on the production of raw materials on an extensive or semi-extensive basis, with appropriate respect for ecosystems and the environment.

Nevertheless, these positive elements have not been sufficiently taken into account in the CAP. There is an imbalance between the potential of quality schemes in terms of creation of public goods, and their presence in the CAP. The new CAP deals with them in a marginal way, and does not seem to consider them a strategic priority.

For these reasons, as regards Common Agricultural Policy and Rural Development AREPO recommends to maintain support for certification costs and promotion, reducing current administrative burdens which are not justified for the relatively small amount of aid dedicated:

- the support should be open to all producers participating in an EU quality scheme, not just for the new ones;
- the administrative checks in all Member States and Regions should be done only on a sample basis, in order to reduce the administrative burden and costs both for managing authorities and for beneficiaries;
- certification and promotion measures shouldn't be coupled, but should be implemented independently.

Furthermore, support for GIs producer groups is fundamental. For this reason, rural development measures should provide support for:

- Carrying out ex-ante evaluations of the impact of registering a new GIs, as well as strategic diagnostics concerning the application process and GI products characterisation;
- Operating costs of producers groups;
- Activities related to the surveillance of the enforcement of the protection of the registered names, especially for small and new PDO/PGI, concerning in particular support for legal protection costs;
- Ex-post evaluation of the impact of a registered GI in order to update product specifications to address eventual sustainability issues, consumers expectations, developments in scientific/technical knowledge, evolution in market, climate change adaptation and risk management.
- Specific programmes to support coordinated and collective activities in order to strengthen the supply chain.

16. In your opinion, have EU quality schemes for different types of products* been consistent with national and regional schemes**? (one answer per row possible)

* *i.e. agricultural products, foodstuffs, wines, spirit drinks and aromatised wine products.*

** *i.e. official government initiatives.*

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

TSG (food)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Additional comment

The situation concerning the relation between EU quality schemes and national/regional schemes varies greatly between MS. A more specific analysis should be done to understand the situation in each MS and, possibly, to try to harmonise.

17. In your opinion, have EU quality schemes for different types of products* been consistent with private labels and certification schemes? **(one answer per row possible)**

* *i.e. agricultural products, foodstuffs, wines, spirit drinks and aromatised wine products.*

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No opinion
GI (spirit)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PDO (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI (food and wine)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG (food)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Additional comment

Has EU policy provided added-value ?

18. In your opinion, what are the most essential benefits of EU quality schemes of GI, PDO, PGI and TSG, that national and regional quality schemes could not provide?

The most essential benefits of EU quality schemes are the international recognition and the protection against imitation, both in the internal market and worldwide through free trade agreements. This cannot be achieved through national or regional quality schemes.

Furthermore, the reference to the region of origin is clearly the added-value provided by the EU policy, since it is not possible to create national or regional schemes based on origin.

All these elements contribute to create and strengthen GIs special reputation and generate opportunities to position products in international markets, beyond the local and regional levels. The markets covered by EU schemes offer to GIs producers enormous business opportunities compared to national and/or regional schemes. This naturally contributes not only to product valorisation, but also to the improvement of producers income and strengthening of rural economy.

Additional questions on quality food products - Use of the symbols

19. In your opinion, are the visual differences between EU quality schemes' symbols clear enough to differentiate between them? Please give your opinion on the two cases presented below



One answer per row possible

	Yes	No	No opinion
Case 1: Comparison between PDO and PGI/GI symbols	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Case 2: Comparison between PGI/GI and TSG symbols	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Additional comment

The visual differences between TSG and PGI logos could be delimited more clearly. It should be clear that TSG are protected traditional manufacturing processes, without reference to the region of origin.

20. What do EU quality schemes' symbols mean to you? (multiple answers per row & column possible)

	PDO	PGI /GI	TSG
The product is entirely produced in one specific geographical area.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The quality of the product is related to the area in which it is produced.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The quality of the product is related to its traditional methods of production of and/or its recipes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The product meets specific conditions set by the specification regarding protecting the natural resources or landscape.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The product is produced according to an established specification.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The quality of the product is certified by a controlling body.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The consumer is confident about the authenticity of the product.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The producers of the product get a fair price for their product.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The product is recognised and protected as intellectual property right.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The product has value-adding/quality attributes for consumers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The consumer is able to correctly identify the product.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The protection and enforcement of farmers' and producers' rights (including on the internet).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other *	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No opinion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

* Please specify

21. How do EU quality schemes' symbols compare with any national and regional food quality schemes logos that you may know? Please give your opinion on the two cases presented below (one answer per row possible in each case)

Case 1: To what extent are EU quality schemes' symbols recognisable in comparison to national and regional food quality schemes' logos that you know?

	more recognisable	just as much recognisable	less recognisable	No opinion
PDO symbol is	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI/GI symbol is	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG symbol is	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Case 2: To what extent do EU quality schemes' symbols displayed on a product give you confidence about the quality of that product in comparison to national and regional food quality schemes' logos that you know?

	more confidence	just as much confidence	less confidence	No opinion
PDO symbol gives me	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PGI/GI symbol gives me	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG symbol gives me	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Document upload and final comments

Please feel free to upload a concise document, such as a position paper.

Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire, which is the essential input to this public consultation. The document is optional and serves as additional background reading to better understand your position.

Please upload your file

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

f32260d4-8bab-4375-8986-f8d3eefc3c48

/AREPO_Position_paper_EC_consultation_EU_quality_schemes_FINAL.pdf

Contact

AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu