

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

Final report

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

Contents

Page

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | The scope of the evaluation | 1 |
| 1.2 | Structure of the report | 1 |
| 1.3 | Contributors to the report | 2 |
| 1.4 | Acknowledgments | 3 |
| 2 | Description of the regulatory framework and intervention logic model | 4 |
| 2.1 | Background | 4 |
| 2.2 | The main features of the current PDO/PGI regulation (Regulation 510/2006) | 5 |
| 2.3 | Main differences with the predecessor regulation (Regulation 2081/92) | 15 |
| 2.4 | Analytical framework for the evaluation of the PDO/PGI scheme | 17 |
| 3 | Methodology | 25 |
| 3.1 | Scope of the evaluation | 25 |
| 3.2 | Our approach to the evaluation | 25 |
| 3.3 | Themes, judgement criteria and indicators | 26 |
| 3.4 | Information sources | 35 |
| 3.5 | Background information on the case studies | 36 |
| 3.6 | Statistical analysis and econometric models used in the evaluation | 49 |
| 3.7 | Typologies of PDO/PGI products | 53 |
| 3.8 | Implementation and administration classification scheme | 62 |
| 4 | Implementation of the scheme | 63 |
| 4.1 | Institutions responsible for PDO/PGI | 63 |
| 4.2 | The national procedures for applying for a registration of a name | 66 |
| 4.3 | Control of compliance | 73 |

Contents

Page

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 4.4 | Enforcement in the market place | 75 |
| 4.5 | Costs of the co-existence rule | 77 |
| 4.6 | Perceived fairness of the regulatory framework and objection procedure | 77 |
| 4.7 | Identification of PDO/PGI products used as ingredients in processed products | 83 |
| 4.8 | Non-information on raw material origin used in PGI products | 86 |
| 4.9 | Monitoring, data sources and limits | 91 |
| 5 | Usage of the PDO/PGI scheme | 93 |
| 5.1 | Part I: The supply side results of the scheme | 94 |
| 5.2 | Part II: The demand side results of the scheme | 150 |
| 5.3 | Part III: Costs and benefits to public authorities | 166 |
| 5.4 | Part IV: Usage of alternative means for protecting and advertising products' names | 168 |
| 5.5 | Data sources and limits | 179 |
| 6 | Effectiveness of the scheme | 181 |
| 6.1 | Effectiveness of the intervention | 181 |
| 6.2 | Ensuring quality products | 182 |
| 6.3 | Increasing the market share in domestic and export markets | 192 |
| 6.4 | Distribution of the returns along the supply chain | 208 |
| 6.5 | Prevention of effects impacting normal market operations of non-PDO/PGI products and absence of a list of generics | 215 |
| 6.6 | Ensuring an increased diversity of products | 224 |
| 6.7 | Increasing or retaining economic activities in rural areas | 232 |
| 6.8 | Establishing cultural value in rural areas | 244 |
| 7 | Conclusions | 254 |
| 7.1 | Regulatory framework and objection procedure | 254 |
| 7.2 | Costs of the co-existence rule | 255 |
| 7.3 | Use of PDO/PGI products as ingredients | 255 |

Contents

Page

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 7.4 | Non-information on origin of raw materials | 256 |
| 7.5 | Uptake of the scheme | 256 |
| 7.6 | Size of the PDO/PGI sector | 257 |
| 7.7 | Reasons for taking up the scheme and effects | 258 |
| 7.8 | Consumer recognition | 259 |
| 7.9 | Costs and benefits to consumers and authorities | 259 |
| 7.10 | Alternative means of name protection | 260 |
| 7.11 | Ensuring quality products | 260 |
| 7.12 | Increasing the market share in domestic and export markets | 260 |
| 7.13 | Contributing to the return along the chain | 261 |
| 7.14 | Prevention of effects impacting normal market operations of non-PDO/PGI products, in particular in the absence of the list of generics | 263 |
| 7.15 | Ensuring an increased diversity of products | 264 |
| 7.16 | Increasing or retaining economic activities in rural areas | 265 |
| 7.17 | Establishing cultural value in rural areas | 265 |
| 8 | Recommendations | 267 |
| 9 | References | 270 |

Tables & Figures

Page

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Table 1: Context, objectives and main features of intervention set out in the preamble to Regulation 510/2006. | 21 |
| Table 2: PDO/PGI products and their comparators covered in the case studies | 37 |
| Table 3: PDO/PGI products by product category: Case study PDO/PGI products vs. the total PDO/PGI population. | 38 |
| Table 4: Number of completed interviews – producers A | 41 |
| Table 5: Number of completed surveys of other stakeholders in the PDO/PGI value chain | 43 |
| Table 6: Number of interviews – farmers and processors | 44 |
| Table 7: Number of completed interviews - Producers B | 45 |
| Table 8: Number of completed surveys of traders and retailers, consumer associations and public authorities | 46 |
| Table 9: Number of completed interviews per country in Omnibus surveys | 48 |
| Table 10: Data used for regression analysis | 52 |
| Table 11: Type of products by development and scale of production | 56 |
| Table 12: Type of products by remote region and distribution channel | 57 |
| Table 13: Type of products by governance structure and concentration | 58 |
| Table 14: PDO/PGI products covered in the case studies | 60 |
| Table 15: Institutions responsible for the administration of PDO/PGI | 66 |
| Table 16: Level of guidance available to PDO/PGI applicants | 69 |
| Table 17: Timescale for objections to new PDO/PGI applications | 71 |
| Table 18: Guidance on objections to new PDO/PGI applications | 73 |
| Table 19: Registered PDO and PGI names by country | 97 |
| Table 20: Evolution of the number of registered PDO and PGI names | 98 |

Tables & Figures

Page

| | |
|--|------------|
| Table 21: Model of the determinants of the variation in the number of PDOs and PGIs across Member States | 105 |
| Table 22: Usage of the PDO/PGI scheme by farmers and processors | 107 |
| Table 23: Production of Feta PDO and other Greek cheeses (2002) | 108 |
| Table 24: Number of PDOs/PGIs and contribution of PDOs/PGIs to the turnover of the agro-food sector | 109 |
| Table 25: Registered PDO and PGI names by food sector | 110 |
| Table 26: Correlation coefficients between Member States' shares of production and PDO/PGI registrations for different product groups | 112 |
| Table 27: Reasons given by producers for taking up and not taking up the scheme | 116 |
| Table 28: Reasons given by traders and retailers for selling PDO/PGI products. | 118 |
| Table 29 Profitability ratings given by producers of different PDO/PGI products (number of responses and average rating) | 129 |
| Table 30: Stability ratings given by producers of different PDO/PGI products (number of responses and average) | 130 |
| Table 31: Reputation ratings given by producers of different PDO/PGI products (number of responses and average) | 131 |
| Table 32: Access ratings given by producers of different PDO/PGI products (number of responses and average) | 132 |
| Table 33: Assessment of profitability by producers and PDO/PGI characteristics | 134 |
| Table 34: Assessment of business stability | 135 |
| Table 35: Assessment of business reputation | 136 |
| Table 36: Assessment of access to new marketing channels | 138 |
| Table 37: Econometric models for ratings | 139 |

Tables & Figures

Page

| | |
|--|------------|
| Table 38: Summary assessment of PDO/PGI scheme by aspect and product classification. Univariate and multivariate analysis (in parenthesis) | 141 |
| Table 39: Analysis of ratings by subgroups | 143 |
| Table 40: Economic cost and benefit to PDO/PGI producers in relation to comparator | 146 |
| Table 41: Perceived impact of the scheme by traders and retailers | 148 |
| Table 42: Reported benefits for traders and retailers | 149 |
| Table 43: Recognition of PDO or PGI symbols and number of registered names | 157 |
| Table 44: Comparison of Trademark Protection, geographical indications and certification and collective marks. | 171 |
| Table 45: PDO/PGI products covered in the case studies and use of trademarks | 174 |
| Table 46: Consumption characteristics which give PDO/PGI products a higher quality than others in its category (stakeholder responses) | 186 |
| Table 47: Production characteristics which give PDO/PGI products a higher quality than others in its category (producers' responses) | 187 |
| Table 48: Evolution of domestic market shares - selected case study products | 202 |
| Table 49: Evolution of export market shares - selected case study products | 205 |
| Table 50: Shares of the final retail price at different stages of the supply chain for PDO/PGI products and their comparator (in parenthesis) | 210 |
| Table 51: Revenues and profits along the supply chain (case study products) | 211 |
| Figure 1: The building blocks of an intervention logic model | 18 |
| Figure 2: Intervention logic model | 24 |
| Figure 3: National PDO/PGI registration processes in Italy, Germany and the United Kingdom | 67 |

Tables & Figures

Page

| | |
|---|------------|
| Figure 4: Evolution of the number of registered names - EU15 Member States | 99 |
| Figure 5: Number of registrations and pending applications at the EC by Member State | 100 |
| Figure 6: Member State shares of value added in the agricultural sector and PDO registrations | 102 |
| Figure 7: Member State shares of value added in the agricultural sector and PGI registrations | 103 |
| Figure 8: The PDO/PGI and other food symbols | 153 |
| Figure 9: Recognition of PDO or PGI symbols (by country) | 155 |
| Figure 10: Recognition of PDO or PGI symbols and number of registered names | 156 |
| Figure 11: Recognition of food symbols | 158 |
| Figure 12: Recognition of PDO/PGI compared with other national food symbols | 159 |
| Figure 13: Degree of Confidence given by PDO/PGI compared with other national food symbols | 160 |
| Figure 14: Understanding of PDO/PGI symbols | 161 |
| Figure 15: Correct recognition of the PDO/PGI symbols and their meaning | 162 |
| Figure 16: PDO/PGI national and export market shares (dried ham and olive oil). | 198 |
| Figure 17: Evolution of imports of Feta* and white cubable cheese by EU15 countries, from other EU15 and non-EU15 countries, by country of origin (volume in 1000kg) | 199 |
| Figure 18: EU15 imports of Feta* and white cubable cheese by country/region of origin | 200 |
| Figure 19: Greek Feta cheese export, | 201 |
| Figure 20: List of generics decision tree | 222 |