International Scholars Journals

Global Journal of Business Management ISSN 6731-4538 Vol. 5 (12), pp. 001-010, December, 2011. Available online at www.internationalscholarsjournals.org © International Scholars Journals

Full Length Research Paper

Implementations of geographical indications at brand management of traditional foods in the European Union

Mevhibe Albayrak* and Erdo an Gunes

Department of Agricultural Economics, Faculty of Agriculture, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.

Accepted 17 September, 2011

Due to the increasing competition in the world market, it has become more difficult for firms to continue to exist in the market. Relatively larger firms enjoy a greater pool of advantages, such as cost minimization, use of modern technology, qualified personnel as well as customer oriented marketing strategies. Geographical indications are used worldwide as an instrument for brand management and diversifying products. In the EU (European Union), too, efforts continue to protect products through registration of geographical origin and traditional indication. The main aim of this study is to illustrate the practices of EU countries with respect to geographical indication of traditional foods, which is of importance especially to future members of the expanding EU while adapting their own registration systems. To this purpose, the GI system and practices in the EU are analyzed. Of the products with PDO and PGI protection, 24% are in the fruit-vegetable/grain products group, 20% in the cheese group, 26% in the fresh meat group and oil group. The database and the classification of geographical indications in the EU are determined and are found to be rather different from those of other countries, such as Turkey.

Key words: Traditional food, local, geographical indication, brand management.

INTRODUCTION

Amongst traditional products, food item is one of the most important elements of the cultural heritage (Alam et al., 2009). The rapid change of consumers' life style and consumer behavior has resulted in the loss of interest in traditional food. In fact, since women increasingly join with the labor force, the consumption behavior of families changes, and especially in cities, the consumption of fast-food and ready-made food continues to increase (Alam, 2009). At the same time, some problems arising from food safety in different countries hint that traditional foods are perceived to be more healthy products (Gallagher, 2003; Maage et al., 2008). However, the practices of hygiene and sanitation which prevail during preparation and marketing of traditional foods provide ample opportunities for contamination with foodborne pathogenic bacteria (Shivalingsarj et al., 2009). In some countries these are not of concern to producers and the public (Parawira et al., 2008). Therefore, food security in the production of traditional foods, gains importance. More-over, local institutions need to inform producers on new advances and technological developments for healthy traditional food production to continue (Ukpabi, 2009; Alam et al., 2009).

The common traditional foods in the world are Vidalia onions (USA), the Morton pumpkin (USA), and the Colombian coffee (Colombia) (MM, 2009; NFCGC, 2009; TVOC, 2009).

As traditional food products contribute to the local and national economy and to biodiversity (Oli, 2009), social, and sustainable effects on rural development (Bowen, 2008; Larson, 2007; Williams and Penker, 2009; Fasoyiro et al., 2010), they play an important role in the protection of trademarked foods and in the transfer of these foods to future generations. Moreover, traditional foods make it possible for the local community to meet with world markets, create alternative consumption styles, and address different taste. Furthermore, it is determined by Suh and Macpherson (2007) that Geographical Indication (GI) helps to protect traditional foods from imitation

*Corresponding author. E-mail: albayrak@agri.ankara.edu.tr. Tel: +90-312- 5961480. Fax: +90-312- 3185360.

(Ittersum et al., 2007) and to increase their level of recognition in the global market, which contributes to the local economy with the high revenue resulting from an increased demand for these products. Furthermore, as is the case with GMO labelling (Viljoen et al., 2006), registration with geographical indication (GI) can protect against imitations and genetically modified products (GMO) as well as products obtained from these. In fact, this study aimed to report that aftffer the introduction of geographical indication on Boseong green tea in Korea 1999, production doubled and related industries prolix-ferated, and that the number of tourists visiting the region tripled. Quality Swabian Hall Pork Meat,'s production costs are 12% higher than those for standard pork but the cost is compensated by a 20 - 30% price premium in Germany (Larson, 2007). The economic profitability of dairy farms in the Comté zone has regularly increased since 1990, and these farms are 32% more profitable than similar farms outside the GI region (Bowen, 2008). According to Origenandino (2008), producers of Italian Tuscano olive oil have managed to increase prices for their olive oil by 20% since it was registered as a GI in 1998 (Grote, 2009).

Brand management of traditional foods is a tool of marketing techniques to a specific product, product line, or brand. It seeks to increase the product's perceived value to the customer and increase brand equity. It may be thought that GIs are sample strategies of brand management. Although geographical indication has costs, GI to affects the quality of the product (Moschini et al., 2008). GI represents a sample of the characteristics of the product that includes the image of quality and related characteristics depending on the history and the tradition of a region (Agarwal and Barone, 2005). As traditional foods are used as instruments to create differences in the global markets, the trademarking and marketing strategies aimed at these products, gain increasing importance (Menapace et al., 2009).

In this study, the current state and development of traditional foods is examined. The geographical indication practices followed for traditional foods in the EU, as well as their role in creating differences in brand management is evaluated. The study aims at summarizing the traditional food related GI practices in the EU since Turkey needs to adapt to EU regulations as a candidate for EU membership. The GI data related to agricultural and food products listed in the EU DOOR database were selected and classified.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study is exploratory in nature and based on literature review (Churchill, 1995; Alam and Hoque, 2010) . Exploratory research often relies on secondary research such as the review of available literature and/or data. The study was initiated because no sufficient scientific studies exist on GI systems in Turkey. To this purpose, the EU laws, classification systems in registration and logo applications for traditional foods are discussed in detail. This study is also important in that the results shed light on the differences between GI registration of traditional foods in the EU and Turkey.

The study is based on GI related data of the EU. Therefore, only the traditional food GI data from the "DOOR" data web in the EU were determined. The selected products were classified according to whether they were PGI, PDO or TSG registered, published and applied. The classification was made according to country and product. The research results of related studies, reports and publications were used as secondary data sources.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRADITIONAL FOODS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

DEFINITION OF GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATION

Promotion is important to protect traditional foods, which are produced and marketed according to geographical and cultural features from unfair competition and plays an important role in the transfer of these products to future generations. Since they are important instrument in rural development at the local level, laws and regulations have come into force aimed at traditional foods in different countries. In fact, in the "Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights" (TRIPS) administered by the World Trade Organization (WTO) geographical indication is defined. In the European Union, in order to protect and improve the diversity and characteristics of traditional foods, geographical indication and the traditional speciality guaranteed indication is treated within quality policies.

Implementations and regulation of geographical indications in the EU

The European Union follows important practices related to the protection of traditional foods and geographical indication. Appel-lation d'origine contrôlée (AOC), which translates as "controlled designation of origin" is the French certification granted to certain French geographical indications for wines, cheeses, butters, and other agricultural products, all under the auspices of the govern-ment bureau Institut National des Appellations d'Origine (INAO) (Barjolle and Sylvander, 2000). In 1925, Roquefort became the first cheese to be awarded an AOC label. Many other countries have based their controlled place name systems on the French AOC classification. Italy's Denominazione di Origine Controllata and Denominazione di Origine Controllata e Garantita, followed the model set by the French AOC. AOC influenced the development of the European Union's Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) system (Barjolle and Sylvander, 2000).

In the EU, several regulations exist related to Place of Origin (PO), Geographical Indication (GI) and the protection of traditional foods and agricultural products (EU, 2009). The first regulations introduced to protect traditional foods were EC 2081/91 and EC 2082/92 and then in 2006, Acts number EC 509/2006 and EC 510/2006, and Regulation/By-law 1898/2006 came into force. The aim of these regulations is to ensure continuity in production and quality of traditional food products, to protect abuse and imitation of product marks, and to protect the consumer against deception. According to Act 510/2006 of the EU, to obtain geographical indication protection, first application to the local authorities is required. This is followed by examination by the authorities and an announcement -objection period (6 months). Approved applications are referred to the European Union Commission. According to this act, third countries have the right to apply for a trademark as well as object to announced trademark applications (EC, 2009a). The articles related to control mechanisms state that before a geo-graphically marked product is introduced on the market, it has to be controlled by independent and objective institutions that are accredited according to the standards contained in EN 45011 or

Table 1. Classification of products for the purposes of council regulation (EC) No 510/2006.

Agricultural products intended for the human consumption listed in annex I of the treaty
— Class 1.1. Fresh meat (and offal)
— Class 1.2. Meat products (cooked, salted, smoked, etc.)
— Class 1.3. Cheeses
— Class 1.4. Other products of animal origin (eggs, honey, various dairy products except butter, etc.)
— Class 1.5. Oils and fats (butter, margarine, oil, etc.)
— Class 1.6. Fruit, vegetables and cereals fresh or processed
— Class 1.7. Fresh fish, molluscs, and crustaceans and products derived there from
— Class 1.8. Other products of Annex I of the Treaty (spices etc.)
Foodstuffs referred to in annex I of the regulation
— Class 2.1. Beers
— Class 2.2. Natural mineral waters and spring waters (discontinued) (1)
— Class 2.3. Beverages made from plant extracts
— Class 2.4. Bread, pastry, cakes, confectionery, biscuits and other baker's wares
— Class 2.5. Natural gums and resins
— Class 2.6. Mustard paste
— Class 2.7. Pasta
Agricultural products referred to in annex II of the regulation
— Class 3.1. Hay
— Class 3.2. Essential oils
— Class 3.3. Cork
— Class 3.4. Cochineal (raw product of animal origin)
— Class 3.5. Flowers and ornamental plants
— Class 3.6. Wool
— Class 3.7. Wicker
— Class 3.8. Scutched flax
(1) Only used for registrations and applications before 31 March 2006

Source: TPI, 2009b.

standard number 65 of the ISO/IEC Guide. This obligation will be valid for both EU member and non-member countries as of May 1, 2010 (TPI, 2009a).

While you are writing your findings, you need some subheading that must be divided into your research questions which you need to outline at your introductory section. You can make a discussion when you are presenting your findings, or you can have a separate section for discussion to make a coherent paper. This part is very incoherent. Moreover, your discussion should have your own standpoint which is needed to be supplemented through secondary literature.

EU Regulation number 510/2006 classifies products under protection into three categories. The first category comprises of agricultural products (ANNEX I), the second food products (ANNEX I) and the third other agricultural products (ANNEX II) as shown in Table 1. The first category includes meat and meat products, cheese and other dairy products, fruit, vegetables, grains and grain products, fresh fish and fish products. The second category includes drinks made from beer and plant extracts, pasta, and bread, pastry, cake, confectionaries, and other bakery products. The third group includes products such as hay, mushrooms, flowers and plants, wool, and linen fiber. In this study, product categories 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.7 in Table 1 are examined as these categories match with the general food classification system in Turkey. In this part, the GI applications in the EU, to which Turkey's membership is negotiated, is presented in detail. In addition, due to the differences in GI classification and logo use in The EU (Albayrak and Gunes, 2010), an exploratory study was prepared, which could function as a for future applications in Turkey. EU compatible legislative preparations initiated by the Turkish Patent Institute are also an important item on the agenda of Turkey.

As can be seen, according to EU Regulation number 510/2006, the classification of products is different. In general, the scope of traditional foods in the EU is perceived differently in Turkey. Therefore, the Turkish food classification system needs to be adapted to the EU.

PRODUCT PROTECTION SYSTEMS AND IMPLEMENTATIONS RELATED TO TRADITIONAL FOODS IN THE EU

In the EU, Protected Geographical Indication (PGI), Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) and Traditional Speciality Guaranteed (TSG) seals are used to encourage and protect the reputation for quality of agricultural products and food. Parrott et al. (2002), WHO

Table 2. Geographical indications and traditional speciality guaranteed in the EU.

	Registered	Published	Applied	Total
Protected designation of Origin-PDO	461	35	191	687
Protection of geographical Indications-PGI	389	36	139	564
Traditional speciality Guaranteed-TSG	22	8	14	44
Total	872	79	344	1295

Source: EC, 2009b.

Figure 1. PDO, PGI and TSG logos in the EU (EC, 2009b).

studied the difference in the use of PDO and PGI seals on traditional products in northern and southern country cultures in the EU, found that of all the registered products in the EU, 72% belong to either France, Italy, Greece, Portugal and Spain. A study conducted by Barjolle and Slyvander (2000) reports similar results.

In the EU, 461 origin-protected, 389 geographically marked, and only 22 traditional speciality guaranteed foods have been registered (Table 2). While in total there are 872 registered and 79 published protected products, there are applications pending for 344 products. Among the published registrations and applications the demand for PDO and PGI protection is higher than for TSG. The logos of the protection types in the EU are presented in Figure 1. In the relevant EU database products that are guaranteed PGI, PDO, and TSG protection are labelled “Registered”, those that are in the 6- month objection period are labelled “Published” and those that have applied for protection are labelled “Applied”. The products that fall within these process categories are designed and presented below:

The GI and TSG registration systems and related logos are different in the EU. Hence, different alternatives are created in registration practices. In addition, through the database it is possible to access information on registration procedures (registered, published and applied) that different interest groups can use.

Registered

According to the 2009 data, in which 389 products are guaranteed PGI, 69% are of French, Italian, Spanish or Portuguese origin. The group of products receiving the most GI in this category are fruit, vegetables and cereals fresh or processed (Table 3).

Examples of the products in this category are “Scotch Beef” from the UK, “Ciauscolo” from Italy in the meat products group, “Danablu” cheese from Denmark, “Toscano” from Italy in the vegetable oil and animal fat group, “Pimiento Riojano” from Spain in the fruit, vegetables and grain group, “Cabalia de Andalucia” from Spain in the fresh fish products group, “Kulmbacher Bier” from Germany in the beer group, and “Kainnuun Rönttönen” from Finland in the bread, pastry and bakery products group.

Of the 455 PDO guaranteed and registered products 90% are from either Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, Greece, and Germany (Table 4). Examples from this group are products such as the mineral water “Ensinger Mineralquelle” registered in Germany, the bakery product “Pane di Altamura” from Italy, the meat product “Presunto de Barrancos” from Portugal, “Chaource” cheese from France, and the other animal product “Mel da Terra Quente” from Portugal. The group of products to be most often guaranteed PDO is cheese.

The largest share of registered PGI and PDO protected traditional foods are from the EU countries; France and Italy. Among the registered products, fruit, vegetables and cereals fresh or processed are the most important, and among the published products different cheeses form an important share.

Published

This category includes the products in the 6- month publication period and the 32 PGI-registered products, most of which are from Italy and of the fruit-vegetables and grains and grain products groups (Table 5). In this category, we find “Prosciutto di Norcia” from Italy, and “Edam Holland” cheese from Holland, and also in the fruit, vegetable and grains group we find “Farine de Petit Epeautre de Haute Provence” from France, as typical examples.

In this group, Italy holds a considerable share of fruit and vegetable products waiting for PGI registration, which indicates the importance Italy attaches to PGI registration.

The number of PDO-registered products is 35, and mainly consists of Italian products in the cheese and the fruit, vegetables, and grain products groups (Table 6) . The meat product “Crudo di Cunea” and Colline Pontine” from Italy we find in the vegetable oil and animal fat group, along with “Picodon” from France, as typical examples.

The number of TSG Registered Products is four (4), three (3) of which are from Poland and 1 of which is from Lithuania (Table 7). The products of Poland are in the meat products group, for example, “Kielbasa Jalowcowa” and that of Lithuania is in the fresh meat group (“Skilandis”).

The number of products waiting for TSG registration is low and limited to meat products. The activity of new EU member countries is noteworthy. It is observed that in these countries especially PGI and PDO registration is preferred.

Applied

According to 2009 data, of the 139 products for which PGI applications were submitted, 67% are from either France, Italy, Spain, or Germany. In this category, the group of products obtaining the most GI is the fruit, vegetables, grains and grain product group (Table 8). Examples of the last group in this category are “Schrobenhausener Spargel” from Germany, and “Pimiento Fresno Benavente” from Spain; while “Tarta de Santiago” from Spain is in the bread, pastry and bakery products group; and “Hessischer Apfelwein” from Germany in the category of drinks from plant extracts.

Table 3. PGI Protected Products in the EU–registered.

Countries	Class											Total
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4.	1.5.	1.6	1.7	1.8	2.1	2.4	2.7	
Italy	4	10			1	45	1	1		3		65
Poland			1	1						2		4
Slovakia			3							1		4
Denmark			2			1						3
Spain	14	6	1	1		21	2			9		54
Portugal	12	34	1			10				1		58
UK	4	1	3				3	3	2			16
Sweden			1							1		2
France	49	4	4	4		20	3	3		2	2	91
Greece					11	11				1		23
Germany	1	8			1	7	3		12	4	1	37
Austria		2			1	2						5
Ireland	1	1					1					3
Luxemburg	1	1										2
Hungary		1										1
Belgium		1				1		1		1		4
Holland						1						1
Tchek Rep.							1		7	6		14
Rep. of South Cyprus										1		1
Finland										1		1
Total	86	69	16	6	14	119	14	8	21	33	3	389

Source: EC, 2009c.

Table 4. PDO protected products in the EU-registered.

Countries	Class										Total
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.8	2.2	2.4	
Italy		20	35	1	37	15	2	4		2	116
Poland			2								2
Spain		4	22	2	22	14	1	5			70
Portugal	15	2	10	10	7	14					58
UK	4		9	1		1					15
France	4		41	3	9	13		4			74
Greece			20		15	22	1	2			60
Germany	2		4						24		30
Austria			6			2					8
Ireland			1								1
Luxemburg				1	1						2
Hungary		1				1					2
Belgium			1		1	1					3
Holland			4			1					5
Tchek Rep.						2	1	3			6
Slovenia					1						1
Finland	1					1					2
Total	26	27	155	18	93	87	5	18	24	2	455

Source: EC, 2009c None of the registered products in this category have TSG protection.

Table 5. PGI Protected Products in the EU-published.

Countries	Class								Total
	1.1	1.2	1.3.	1.5	1.6	1.8.	2.1	2.4	
Italy		2			7			1	10
Poland					1				1
Slovenia				1					1
Spain	1	1			2			1	5
France			1		2				3
Germany							1	1	2
Holland			2						2
Tchek Rep.			3				2	2	7
India						1			1
Total	1	3	6	1	12	1	3	5	32

Source: EC, 2009d.

Table 6. PDO Protected Products in the EU-published.

Countries	Class						Total
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.6	1.7	
Italy		2	7	3	8		20
Poland			1		1		2
UK					1	1	2
Spain		1	2	1	2		6
France	1		2		1		4
Hungary					1		1
Total	1	3	12	4	14	1	35

Source: EC, 2009d.

Table 7. TSG Protected Products in the EU- published.

Countries	Class		Total
	1.1	1.2	
Poland		3	3
Lithuania	1		1
Total	1	**3**	4

Source: EC, 2009d.

Of the 189 products for which a PDO application was submitted, 74% originate from either Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, or Greece (Table 9), cheese being the group of products for which PDO protection was given most. “Beaufort” cheese from France and Montasio cheese from Italy, were the fruit vegetable and grain and grain products group, and “Arancia di Ribera” from Italy is another example. PGI registration applications reveal that countries producing important fruit, vegetables and cereals forms the majority. With an increase in new member countries and the increasing interest of non member countries in GI registration, the number of applications is expected to increase.

PDO registration applications reveal that Italy and Spain form an important share as producers of important cheese, fruit, vegetables and cereals. As new member countries, other countries attach importance to PDO registration, the number of applications is expected to increase. It is worth noting that the applications for PDO registration are higher in number than those for PGI registration. Of the 14 products for which TSG applications were submitted, 71% are of Slovakian or UK origin (Table 10). In this category, meat products, meat, and cheese groups form the largest share. Examples in this category are “Špeka ky” meat from Slovakia, and “Boerenkaas” from Holland. Applications for GI are also submitted to the EU by non-member countries, such as China, Columbia, India, the Korean Republic, Switzerland, and Turkey. To illustrate, for the traditional Turkish product “Antep Baklavası”, an application for PGI protection was submitted on 10/07/2009.

The number of applications for TSG registration is low. Half of these are from new EU member Slovakia and comprises of meat

Table 8. Products for which PGI Protection applications are submitted in the EU (applied).

Countries	Class										Total
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.7	1.8	2.3	2.4	2.7	
Italy	2	6	1	1	20	1			1		32
Romania					1						1
Poland		1		1	4				3		9
Slovakia			3								3
Denmark	2										2
Spain	4	4	1		7				2		18
UK	6	1							1		8
Sweden					1						1
France	10	6			2				1		19
Greece					3						3
Germany	1	9	2		2	2	2	1	4	1	24
Austria							1				1
Ireland	1										1
Hungary	1										1
Slovenia		7									7
Bulgaria		1									1
Lithuania			2								2
Turkey									1		1
Thailand					1						1
China					1	1	1				3
India							1				1
Total	27	35	9	2	42	4	5	1	13	1	139

Source: EC, 2009e

Table 9. Products for which PDO applications are submitted in the EU (applied).

Countries	Class								Total
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.8	
Italy	3	11	16	2	12	20	2	2	68
Poland				3		3	1		7
Denmark						1			1
Spain	1	1	5		12	8		3	30
Portugal	1		1		1				3
UK			1						1
Sweden							1		1
France	3		29	1		7	1		41
Greece	2		1		2	3			8
Hungary		2				1	1	2	6
Holland			2						2
Tchek Rep.						1			1
Slovenia		1	3	3					7
Finland		3							3
Switzerland			1						1
Rep.of South Cyprus			1						1
China						6		1	7
Korea								1	1
Total	10	18	60	9	27	50	6	9	189

Source: EC, 2009e.

Table 10. Products for which TSG applications are submitted in the EU (applied).

Countries	Class						Total
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.6	1.7	2.4	
Slovakia		4	2			1	7
Spain						1	1
UK	2			1			3
Sweden		1					1
France					1		1
Holland			1				1
Total	2	5	3	1	1	2	14

Source: EC, 2009e.

products. In TSG registration, number of applications is higher than that of published ones. Yet, the demand for TSG registration has always been lower than the demand for PGI and PDO registration.

By 2009 PGI and PDO protection was obtained for 844 (Tables 3 and 4) products, the majority of which originate from Mediterranean countries. Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal together hold a 69% share of the total PGI/PDO registered products in the EU. The product groups receiving the most protection are fruit-vegetables and grains and grain products constituting 24.0% with 206 products (class 1.6). This group is followed by 171 products in the cheese group (20.2%); 112 products in the fresh meat group (13.3%); and 107 products in the oil group (12.7%). In terms of the spread of products with GI over countries, it is observed that Italy holds an important share in the fruit-vegetable/grain, oil, cheese, and meat groups; France in the meat, cheese, and fruit-vegetable/grain groups; Spain in the fruit-vegetable/grain and cheese groups; Portugal in the meat and fruit-vegetable/grain groups; and Greece in the fruit-vegetable/grain, oil, and cheese groups. No substantial protection is observed in other non-Mediterranean EU countries. Among these countries, Germany stands out with its GI for both beer and spring water, and the UK with its cheese and fresh meat. In the EU, the number of traditional products with protection is far below that of GI and by the end of 2009 a total of 22 products were registered as such. Half of these products are in the beer group. For example, Beaujolais Nouveau is a traditional wine which is produced from Gamay grapes in the Beaujolais Region in France. Every year, half of the 49 million liters of Beaujolais Nouveau wine is exported to Japan, Germany, the USA and South Korea (INTOWINE, 2009).

In the EU, attempts are made to protect especially PGI and PDO registered products and make these world brands. This leads to legislation and detailed regulations for registration applications. In Mediterranean EU countries with developed agriculture and a diversity in products, GI applications are more preferred than the others. This may be due to the richness of products and food production systems in these countries, which resemble Turkey in terms of climate.

Consumers in the EU base their decisions to purchase a product on the information they collect related to the quality, features, and value of the product. In recent years, this information has become more important due to the increasing concerns with regard to food safety.

Traditional food producers should be aware of the economic benefits and the opportunities that GI can provide when introducing products to the international market. However, producers lack this awareness. In fact, this is confirmed by a study conducted at the producer level on products with GI in Lithuania. It was found that Lithuanian producers believe that GI procedures are long, complicated, and time consuming; that these producers are more concerned with the local market; that they do not sufficiently understand the economic benefits of GI; that they consider GI-related subsidies for producers inadequate; and that they are not aware of the fact that their products and trademarks can be imitated (Zobena, 2007). Hence, the need for building awareness regarding GI issues is apparent.

Some studies state that for the benefits of GI registration to be long-term in the EU, producer demand needs to be developed. GI registration needs to be considered not only as a factor increasing income at the local level, but also as a factor contributing to standard and secure food production and the promotion of local culture.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In many countries in the world, trade marking through geographical indication, and creating reliable and well-known brands is of importance. Among registered traditional foods that are guaranteed protection, those with geographical indication constitute the largest share.

Because of the protection of traditional foods and agricultural products from the EU on the international markets, as well as the increase in demand for these products and their contribution to rural economies, important developments have taken place in the field of traditional product registration and relevant legislation and regulation. It is important to identify consumers' attitudes toward GI-registered traditional foods in terms of target consumer group profiles. In fact, consumers' socio- economic status may influence consumer behavior and result in different evaluations of a product. Cultural differences also reflect the consumption of foods and determine whether they become traditional. In fact, in a study examining different Slovakian consumer groups' perceptions on four Slovakian food products with PGI, it was revealed that there were considerable differences among different groups, and that women considered obtaining PGI more important than men; that they believed these products to be of better quality; and that they attached more importance to registered food products (Supeková et al., 2008, 2009).

In fact, the importance of and increase in the consumption of traditional foods is observed, and consumers are prepared to pay higher prices (Darby et al., 2008;

Grote, 2009; Ilbery et al., 2000). In the EU, there is an increase in the demand for traditional food and consumers are even prepared to pay higher prices for such products. It is stated that in France, consumers are prepared to pay 2 € more for cheese with a GI (Grote, 2009). In a study conducted in Ohio, the USA, Darby et al. (2008) found that consumers are willing to pay 30% more for local products, and that they consider local origin of more importance than freshness and firm scale (Giovannucci et al., 2009). When global production and consumption models are on the increase worldwide, the demand for traditional foods is also on the increase (Ilbery et al., 2000).

The WTO is in force within the EU. In this regard, registration practices and procedures related to geographical indications, indication of origin protection, and guarantee of traditional speciality of agricultural products and traditional foods, continue. One important practice in registration of trademarks in the EU is the formation of a sound database of registered products. The database and the classification of geographical indications in the EU are detailed and rather different from those of other countries, such as Turkey. Moreover, the difference in the classification of products as an agricultural or food product also affects the evaluations. It is essential that Turkey develop strategies to increase the number of registered traditional food products that comply with EU regulations of GI. The fact that there is adequate data network on traditional food, shows the need for empirical studies on the effects of GI registration on income, cost, and marketing systems. Future studies employing methods such as differences-in-differences to analyze these issues need to be conducted.

In the EU, Spain, Italy, France, Portugal, and Greece have a considerable number of traditional food products under protection. Of the products with PDO and PGI protection, 24% are in the fruit-vegetable/grain products group, 20% in the cheese group, 13% in the fresh meat group, and 13% in the oil group. To ensure food safety standards and protection of traditional features, registration applications continue. Furthermore, it is seen that in the EU, traditional foods are used as instruments to spread within both domestic and foreign markets, to prevent unfair competition, and to develop rural economies.

REFERENCES

Alam GM, Hoque KE (2010). Who gains from “Brain and Body Drain” Business -Developing/developed world or individuals: A comparative study between skilled and semi/unskilled emigrants, Afri. J. Bus. Manage., 4(4): 534-548

Alam GM (2009). The role of science and technology education at network age population for sustainable development of Bangladesh through human resource advancement, Sci. Res. Essays, 4(1): 1260-1270.

Alam GM, Hoque KE, Khalifa MTB, Siraj S, Ghani MFA (2009). The role of agriculture education and training on agriculture economics and national development of Bangladesh, Afr. J. Agric. Res., 4(12): 1334-1350.

Albayrak M, Gunes E (2010)Traditional foods: Interaction between local and global foods in Turkey, Afri. J. Bus. Manage., 4(4): 555-561.

Agarwal S, Barone MJ (2005). Emerging issues for geographical indication branding strategies. MATRIC Research Paper 05-MRP 9, Midwest Agribusiness Trade Research and Information Centre, Iowa State University. http://www. card.iastate.edu/ publications/DBS/ PDFFiles/05mrp9.pdf

Barjolle D, Sylvander B (2000).PDO and PGI products: market, supply chains and institutions, FAIR CT95-0306 Final Report. 2000. http://www.origin-food.org/pdf/pdo-pgi.pdf, received: 28(12): 2009.

Bowen SK (2008). Geographical indications: promoting local products in a global. mark. http://www.worldcat.org/search?q=au%3A%22Bowen%2C+Sarah+Katherine%22&qt=hot_author

Churchill GA (1995). Marketing Research Methodological Foundations. Sixth Ed. The Dryden Press, USA. pp. 1115-1118.

Darby K, Batte MT, Ernst S, Roe BE (2008). Decomposing local: a conjoint analysis of locally produced foods. Am. J. Agric. Econ., 90(2): 476-486.

EC (2009a). Fact Sheet European Policy for Quality Agricultural Products January 2007, p:18,http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/publi/fact/quality/2007_en.pdf,received. 21(12): 2009-2010.

EC (2009b). http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/schemes/index_en.htm,received. 18(12); 2009-2010.

EC(2009c).http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/door/list.html?recordStart=0&recordPerPage=10&recordEnd=10&filter.status=registered&sort.milestone=desc, received. 18(12): 2009-2010.

EC(2009d).http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/door/list.html?recordStart=0&recordPerPage=10&recordEnd=10&filter.status=published&sort.milestone=desc, received.18(12);2009-2010.

EC (2009e). http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/door/list.html?recordStart=0&recordPerPage=10&recordEnd=10&filter.status=applied&sort.milestone=desc, received:18(12);2009-2010.

EU (2009). Eurpoean Union database. http://www.europa.eu.int,(2009). received: 18(12):2009-2010.

Fasoyiro SB, Akande SR, Arowora KA, Sodeko OO, Sulaiman PO,Olapade CO, Odiri CE (2010). Physico-chemical and sensory properties of pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*) flours, Afri. J. Food. Sci., 4(3): 120-126.

Gallagher P (2003). Geographical indications and international trade-industry perspectives. Worldwide Symposium on Geographical Indications July 9-11, 2003, San Francisco, California.http://www.kipo.ke.wipo.net/edocs/mdocs/geoind/en/wipo_geo_sfo_03/ wipo geo_sfo_03_17 .doc,received: 28. (12);2009-2010.

Giovannucci D, Barham E, Pirog R (2009). Defining and marketing ‘local’ foods: geographical indications for U.S. products. J. world intellectual property. http://www.vermontagriculture.com/buylocal/marketing/taste/documents/Defining.Mark.Local.Foods.pdf, received:28(12);2009-2010.

Grote U (2009). Environmental Labeling, Protected Geographical Indications and the Interests of Developing Countries. The Estey Centre J. Int. Law and Trade Pol., 10(1): 94-110. Retrieved [date] from the World Wide Web: http://www.estey j.com, http://www.esteycentre.com/journal/jhtml/viewer. php?FILE=grote10-1&ABSTRACT=NO & ARCHIVE=NO

Ilbery B, Kneafsey M, Bamford M (2000). Agriculture, March 2000 , http://www. ingentaconnect. com/content/ip /ooa /2000/00000029/000 00001/art00005. 29(1): 31-31.

INTOWINE, 2009.INTOWINE website.10 Fascinating Facts About Beaujolais Nouveau.Http://www.intowine.com/beaujolaisnouveaufacts.html,received: 5(12): 2009-2010.

Ittersum KV, Meulenberg MTG, Trijp HCM and Math JJM, Candel,MJJJM (2007). Consumers’ Appreciation of Regional Certification Labels: A Pan-European Study. J. Agric. Econ., 58(1): 1-23.

Larson J (2007). Relevance of geographical indications and designations of origin for the sustainable use of genetic resources.Global Facilitation Unit for Underutilized Species Via dei Tre Denari, 472/a, 00057 Maccarese Rome, Italy.

Maage A, Toppe J, Asiedu MS, Berko EA, Lied E (2008).Inclusion of marine fish in traditional meals improved iodine status of children inan iodine deficient area. Afr. J. Food. Sci., 2: 045-053.

Menapace L, Colson G, Grebitus C, Facendola M (2009). Consumer preferences for country of origin, geographical indication and protected designation of origin labels. Working Paper No.09021 November 2009,http://www.econ.iastate.edu/research/ webpapers/paper,13122-09021.pdf

MM (2009). Morton Magnet IL. http://www.mortonmagnet.com/pfest.php,received: 15.12.2009

Moschini GC, Menapace L, Pick D (2008). Geographical indications and the competitive provision of quality in agricultural markets. http://www.econ.iastate.edu/research/webpapers/paper -12858. pdf Am. J. Agric. Econ., 90: 794-812.

NFCGC (2009). National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia website http://juanvaldez.com/ menu /history/federation.html,2009

Oli KP (2009). Access and benefit sharing from biological resources and associated traditional knowledge in the HKH region - protecting community interests. Int. J. Biodiversity. Conserv., 1(5):105-118.

Origenandino (2008). Geographical indications in the European Union. http://www. origenandino.com/eng/e_indicaciones_comunidad_europea.htm,received:05.02. 2008.

Parrott N, Wilson N, Murdoch J (2002). Spatializing quality: regional protection and the alternative geography of food. http://eur.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/9/3/241, received:31(12);2009-2010. Eur. Urb. Regional Stud., 9(3): 241-261,

Parawira W, Muchuweti M (2008). An overview of the trend and status of food science and technology research in Zimbabwe over a period of 30 years. Sci. Res. Essay, 3 (12): 599-612.

Shivalingsarj V, Desai, Mandyam C, Varadaraj (2009).Prevalence of toxigenic traits in native food isolates of *Bacillus cereus* in the city of Mysore, Southern India. J. Microbiol. Antimicrob., 1(2): 27-34.

Supeková S, Honza M, Ka enová D (2008). Perception of Slovak foodstuffs designated by protected geographical indication by Slovak consumers. Bratislava. J. Food. Nut. Res., 47(4): 205-208.

Supeková S, Suhaj JM, Pasıar V (2009). Slovak Foodstuffs designated by protected geographical indication by Slovak consumers-comparison of customer types´ attitude by multivariate statistics ,http://www.icabr.com/fullpapers/Supekova%20So%F2a, %20Milan%20Suhaj,%20Vladim%EDr%20Pasiar.pdf,received: 28(12): 2009-2010.

Suh J, MacPherson A (2007). The impact of geographical indication on the revitalization of a regional economy: a case study of 'Boseong' green tea. Area, 39(4): 518-527.

TPI (2009a). Turkish Patent Institute datas, http://www.tpe.gov.tr, 2009

TPI (2009b). Turkish Patent Institute. http://www.tpe.gov.tr/dosyalar/ABcografi/ 1898_2006_Sayili_AB _Yonetmeligi.pdf, received:24(12): 2009-2010.

TVOC (2009). The Vidalia Onion Committee.http://www.vidaliaonion.org/,received:15.12.

Ukpabi UJ (2009).Potential of protected local institutional innovations in catalyzing Nigerian Agro-Industrial Development. J. Agric. Biotechnol. Sust. Develop. 1(3): 062 - 068.

Viljoen_CD,Dajee BK, Botha GM (2006). Detection of GMO in food products in South Africa: Implications of GMO labelling. Afri. J. Biotechnol., 5(2): 73-82.

Williams R, Penker M (2009). Do geographical ındications promote sustainable rural development?,Erschienen 2009 im Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Gesellschaft fürAgrarökonomie, http://oega.boku.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Tagung/2008/Band_18/ 18_3_Williams_Penker.pdf2009. Band, 18(3): 147-156.

Zobena A (2007). In search of new marketing initiatives: geographical indication products in Latvia. ESRS Conference WG17: Collective Farmers Marketing Initiatives 20-24 August 2007,Wageningen.http://www.cofami.org/documents/4-2Zobena_000.pdf, received: 28. (12): 2009-2010.