Brussels Development Briefing no.31

Geography of food: reconnecting with origin in the food system

15th May 2013, ACP Secretariat, 451 Avenue Georges Henri, 1200 Brussels
http://brusselsbriefings.net

Organised by CTA, DG DEVCO and DG AGRI, European Commission, ACP Secretariat and Concord

1. Linking places, local stakeholders and their products

Tequila, Parmigiano-Reggiano, Darjeeling and Champagne are only a few of the many thousands of examples of agricultural and food products that display specific characteristics inherent to the place where they are produced and which give the product a reputation. .

There is a growing interest among consumers in developed and developing countries to purchase agricultural products and foodstuffs that are linked to their origin – some are associated by reputation with their place of production, others are deeply rooted in the various traditional cultures and intrinsically linked to the production environment in a specific place of origin. For small and medium-sized farmers and producers, this trend could imply new opportunities and niche markets – complementing efforts to improve standards and meet customers' evolving demands. Origin-linked products have the potential to be part of a sustainable quality cycle. By better valorizing local resources and production, they can stimulate the investment and aid rural development. This potential is based upon a farm products' essential attribute – its origin:

- At one end of the spectrum, a product may exhibit specific characteristics that result from a unique combination of natural resources (climatic conditions, soil characteristics, local plant varieties, breeds, etc.), local skills and savoir faire. Historical and cultural practices, as well as traditional knowledge in producing and processing the products can also add value. The first step for local actors is to be aware of this potential by identifying the links between product quality and local environment and the market opportunities.

- Equally important is the potential for marketing products that have a reputation by reason of their origin, whether or not there is a specific physical or organoleptic characteristic imbued by the place of production. Some consumers are skeptical of anonymous production chains, switching sources and supply according to market fluctuations. They are looking for guarantees about the origin and production method – a market demand that producers need to exploit.

Strengthening the ties among local stakeholders, places and agricultural and food products is a major step towards sustainable rural development and meeting the triple-challenge challenge facing agriculture: (a) increasing production to meet market demand, (b) raising incomes of farmers, especially smallholders and women farmers, and (c) to do so while conserving the environment and its natural resources needed to produce in the future. Success depends on local capacities to create value within a global market while remaining anchored in a specific place. Origin-linked products have attributes that are inseparably linked to the places where they are produced and so can build up a reputation over time. The specific geographical indication (GI) is used to identify the quality product, protect the intangible rights of producers in their product names, and foster rural development. GIs are highly differentiated in the marketplace and can thus meet a specific and remunerative demand.

A segment of consumers are increasingly concerned with the specific attributes of agricultural and food products, particularly in terms of their culture, identity and means of sustainable production. Moreover, such products can contribute to biodiversity preservation, cultural heritage protection, sociocultural development and rural poverty reduction.

"Quality", defined as "meeting the buyer's expectations", is also a driving force for ensuring consumer confidence in products and in maintaining standards. Quality assurance schemes and traceability systems throughout the process are becoming basic requirements for regional and international purchasers. Many examples of best practice exist throughout the ACP of commodities sold and marketed through chains that preserve the identity including the origin of product. This enables the final product to display its origin and give that guarantee to the consumer.

Through the effective marketing of these products, rural activities can be maintained and – with the right investment – even diversified. As long as the product is origin-linked, the added value and related activities, such as tourism and processing, are secured to that rural zone. This helps prevent outward migration. Indeed, specific local resources involved in the production system, such as unique plant varieties, animal breeds or traditional landscapes, food traditions and culture are also valuable for tourism and securing environmental public goods.

A people-centered approach

As a result of its heritage dimension, the specificity and reputation of an origin-based product, belong to the local people who share a collective right to benefit from it. Therefore, a collective approach is required to secure the quality, to promote and preserve the product, and to sustain local resources. The potential for engaging the value creation process depends on the will, motivation (through incentives) and capacity of the local community, and especially of the local production system, to coordinate their actions and promote the product collectively.

Many stakeholders are involved in the production and value creation process of a specific-quality product linked to its geographical origin, and many different actors in the supply chain have an interest. Often, the role played by women, elderly people and families, and smallholders is of particular importance – and are important assets within traditional protection systems. Community members can see the product as an element of their local culture and at the core of local activities. In this way, local institutions, public authorities, consumers, traders and retailers, researchers, and non-governmental organizations inside and outside the territory have an interest in the promotion of the origin-linked product.

2. Legal frameworks for protecting traditional knowledge and traditional agrifood products

Although GIs have been around since time immemorial, a key date was 1994, when the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on “Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights” (the TRIPS Agreement) took up and defined geographical indications. Since then, there has been a proliferation of interest in developing and transitional countries. Up to now, in practice, geographical indications as a legal concept are still not particularly widespread in ACP countries. However, it is widespread in Asia and in Europe. Increasingly, ACP governments, private institutions and economic operators’ organizations are showing an interest in promoting traditional products of regional origin. They are focusing on the products’ commercial potential to bring value to local rural areas.

Earlier efforts can be traced to the period following the conclusion of the Paris Convention, 1883, which saw numerous efforts aimed at increasing the level of multilateral protection afforded to indications of source and appellations of origin. This led, among other things, to the adoption under WIPO of the Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and their International Registration of 1958 (Lisbon Agreement).[1]
The southern countries of the European Union (EU) quickly recognized the commercial potential of traditional products of regional origin[2]. This recognition led them to be among the first to introduce a legal system for their protection.

[1] Geographical Indications. An Introduction. WIPO.
[2] About 90% of GIs come from the 30 OECD countries while in most of the more than 160 other countries, very few have been developed. GIs are now increasingly perceived as an opportunity in many countries that have unique physical and cultural attributes that can be translated into product differentiation.

The TRIPS Agreement obliges member countries to provide the legal means to prevent unfair competition and passing off of geographical indications but does not specify the protection systems to be implemented. In fact, a wide variety of national legal frameworks exist and even significant differences between the legal systems of the major export destinations.

Many countries rely on trade marks, some on consumer labeling rules, and others have specific GI registration systems in place. Most countries, such as in the EU, the US, China and so on, provide for a variety of instruments. It is common for one valuable origin-linked product to give rise to three protection instruments: the GI for the fundamental name; a collective trade mark of the producer group; and figurative word mark projecting the individual identity of the producer. There are also countries that rely mainly on consumer protection laws or unfair competition and passing-off laws to protect traditional products of regional origin. These legal regimes are important complements in any protection architecture, addressing different aspects of consumer, producer and public interests.

The specific form of protection in a given country must be in accordance with the country's international undertakings and treaties, such as the TRIPS Agreement and possibly the Lisbon Agreement. At the national level, many options exist to protect origin-based traditional products. These can include: specific or sui generis laws protecting GIs; trade mark laws, particularly, but not exclusively, in the form of certification marks or collective marks; laws against unfair competition; consumer fraud protection laws for example, those for truth in labeling; and specific laws or decrees that recognize individual GIs.

Geographical Indications of Origin (GI), like other origin-based labeling, enables market differentiation in regional and global trade, as a means of fostering and valuing local identity, and as a means to biodiversity conservation. In addition, specific Geographical indication (GI) registration gives guarantees to buyers and consumers about the authenticity of the product and legal protection to the producers over their asset.[3] Products registered as geographical indications often consist of place names or designations for generic products combined with the name of a country, region or specific place, such as Roquefort, Habanos or Café de Colombia. Sometimes traditional names, though not specifically geographic, can also be protected as geographical indications provided that the link with a territory is clear: Feta cheese from Greece is a well- known example of this.

Nothing prevents registration of high-tech industrially manufactured goods under a geographical indication, such as “Swiss” for watches. However, most certified products belong to the agricultural product, foodstuff, alcoholic beverages, traditional product, and handicraft sectors[4]. In practice, products which have achieved recognition of their uniqueness usually have a seal of authenticity, which enables consumers to identify them as having a geographical indication. This helps to position the products in a higher market segment than that of cheaper and less sophisticated substitutes which do not carry the label. In addition, registering the product as a geographical indication protects it from fraudulent imitations and copies.

There are currently more than 10 000 protected Geographical Indications or GIs in the world with an estimated trade value of more than US$ 50 billion. Many are well-known names, yet many more are less known and often unprotected. These physical and cultural assets form the basic value-giving characteristics upon which GIs are built. A GI signals a link not only between a product and its specific place of origin but also with its unique production methods and distinguishing qualities.

GIs are collectively owned with a strong inherent *origin*-base, namely the geographical origin to which they refer. The reference to geographical origin – most regularly for agricultural products – combined with the use of traditional extraction and processing methods, presents an interesting marketing potential in terms of product branding. However, the use of geographical origin brands also presents a number of challenges. Owing to their collective nature, those who produce and market GIs must engage in collective

[3] Giovannucci, Daniele and Josling, Timothy and Kerr, William and O'Connor, Bernard and Yeung, May T. (2009): *Guide to Geographical Indications: Linking Products and Their Origins (Summary).* 2009. http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/27955/
[4] Anders and Caswell 2009;O’Connor and Co. 2007; Eidgenössisches Institut für Geistiges Eigentum 2003

action with regard to production methods, quality standards and control, as well as product distribution and marketing. Success stories from the world of GIs demonstrate that GIs, if well managed, are intangible assets with interesting potential for product differentiation, the creation of added value, as well as spin-off effects in areas related to the primary product for which the GI is known.[5]

3. The EU-ACP context

The EU experience

EU policy has tried to keep European agricultural products competitive on the world market by emphasizing their local identity and capitalizing on the reputation that these products have acquired over generations of high-quality production. The authenticity and local identity of European local produce is being communicated by making transparent the linkage that exists between the quality of local products, the locality or territory of production (terroir) and the traditional production methods, thus valuing elements of agrobiodiversity as well as traditional practices and know-how involved in the production process.[6] The European Commission recently published a study[7] analysing the value of the EU name protection scheme for all food and agricultural products (GIs), including wines and spirits. 60% of sales of European GI products took place in the products' country of origin, while 20% took place in other EU countries and a further 20% were exported outside of the EU. Extra-EU exports represented some € 11.5 billion, mainly destined to the US (30%), Switzerland and Singapore (7% each), Canada, China, Japan and Hong-Kong (6% each). EU GIs are worth €54.3 billion worldwide and they represent 15 % of EU total food and drinks exports. GIs are key to generating local added-value and employment whilst increasing the viability of farming in rural areas.

Over the period 2005-2010, wines accounted for 56% of all sales of food and agricultural products with a protected name produced in the European Union (€30.4 billion), agricultural products and foodstuffs for 29% (€15.8 billion), spirit drinks for 15% (€8.1 billion) and aromatised wines for 0.1% (€31.3 million). The study also analysed the value premium of products bearing a GI, i.e. the premium that a GI can expect on the market, compared to similar non-GI products. In average GI products were estimated to be sold 2.23 times as high as compared to non-GI products.

The ACP experience

Farmers in the ACP countries, as anywhere in the world, produce many products that have special characteristics or reputation due to their origin, the local environment or savoir faire of the producers. The potential for development of geographical indications in ACP countries is well illustrated by the increasing global marketing of specialty coffees designated by origin. While recognizing the early stage of development in many countries and limitations in terms of capacity, the EU is encouraging the development of GI systems of protection.

At the moment there are no GIs registered in the **Pacific**.

In the **Caribbean**, Blue Mountain coffee from Jamaica is protected as a GI[8]. This product is a renowned origin that has built its way back from notoriety as a low-quality producer to one of the most remunerative GIs with strong state support. As the origin becomes fully established, the controls have become more private-sector oriented with the government playing more of a regulatory than commercial role. Cuba has 19 protected GIs for tobacco and cigars, placing it as one of the countries in the region with the largest number of protected GIs[9]. The Dominican Republic registered 6 GIs for tobacco and bananas.

[5] Geographical Indications. An Introduction. WIPO.
[6] Kiene T. 2006. Needs and opportunities for the EU in the TK debates: The agricultural dimension. Iddri – Idées pour le débat N° 03/2006. http://www.iddri.org/Publications/Collections/Idees-pour-le-debat/id_0603_kiene_needstk.pdf
[7] AND-International. EC. Tanguy Chever, Christian Renault, Séverine Renault, Violaine Romieu (AND-International). Value of production of agricultural products and foodstuffs, wines, aromatised wines and spirits protected by a geographical indication (GI). October 2012. http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/newsroom/106_en.htm
[8] ITC's Guide to Geographical Indications: Linking Products and their Origins (2009). http://www.intracen.org/policy/geographical-indications/
[9] Ibid.

In **Africa**, 174 GIs exist in South Africa for the protection of wines (169) and spirits (5). In addition Zambia registered a GI for handicraft. For foodstuffs, Penja pepper, Oku honey and Ziama-Macenta coffee are the first to be in the process of getting awarded Protected Geographic Indications by the OAPI. In 2013, some sixteen African countries are to recognize these three products as PGIs. Penja pepper (Cameroon) is highly sought after by the greatest chefs and gourmets. Its quality stems from the specificities of the terroir in Penja, in terms of both soil and climate, and the particular skills of small-scale producers in the region. Oku honey (Cameroon) is a rare honey recognisable by its white colour and naturally creamy texture. The bees live on the slopes of Mount Oku, at heights of up to 2000 m above sea level or thereabouts, in the protected forest of Kilum-Ijim, a biodiversity hotspot covering an area of some 20 000 ha. The beekeepers install hives colonized beforehand in grassland areas. Finally, Ziama-Macenta coffee (Guinea) has characteristics similar to those of an arabica: a slightly acid taste with little bitterness, high aromatic intensity and a persistent strong, fine aroma. These characteristics, which are remarkable for a robusta, stem from the soil and microclimate around Mount Ziama in Forest Guinea.[10] In addition both Kenyan coffee and Kenyan tea are registered in Kenya through certification marks. Argan oil from the Souss Massa Dra region in Morocco is also registered. Two African GIs are registered in third countries: Rwandan coffee is registered as US trademark whilst Ethiopian coffee regional names, Yirgacheffe, Harrar and Sidamo are registered in 28 countries including the EU[11].

The EU has proposed to cover intellectual property and geographical indications in the Economic Partnership Agreements that have been concluded or are under negotiation with 7 ACP regions. In the EPA concluded the CARIFORUM (Caribbean), the EU is assisting the partner countries to establish systems of protection by 2014. In the Southern African Development Community (SADC) EPA negotiation, the EU is in discussions with South Africa to protect a short list of GIs focused on South Africa – the latter has formally asked the EU to protect the names of infusions Rooibos and Honeybush and karoo for lamb meat in this context. In the case of the EPAs under negotiation with the East African Community, West Africa and the Pacific, cooperation on GIs has been proposed with a view to assisting the partner countries develop GI systems in future. For Central Africa, Eastern and Southern Africa, however, no specific undertaking regarding GIs is proposed.

In parallel to the EPA discussions in sub-Saharan Africa, the EU has joined with the African Union Commission to promote GIs as a development tool that can protect the identity of local and indigenous products throughout Africa.

At regional level, 16 countries in West and Central Africa are members of the Organisation Africaine de la Propriété Intellectuelle (OAPI) based in Cameroon, which has in place a system for GI protection. As mentioned above, the first African GIs under this system were registered in 2013. A further 18 countries across sub-Saharan Africa are members of the African Regional intellectual property Office (ARIPO) based in Zimbabwe. In December 2011 ARIPO decided to develop a GI system, and EU is in the process of providing technical assistance to this project.[12] On 26.11.2012, the European Commission (DG Agriculture and Rural Development) signed the Stone Town administrative Memorandum of Understanding for cooperation with the African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO) to improve the protection geographical indications in Africa.

4. No panacea but strategic choices and trade-offs…

Given such a varied and disparate global legal landscape, when it comes to deciding whether or not to promote a traditional product of regional origin it is important to identify clearly the origin-linked attributes and the commercial potential of the product. Origin branding and labeling might successfully rest on traceability and transparency in the value chain for much product. Where product has good prospects of obtaining a geographical indication in the domestic and export markets, the producers can create and

[10] CIRAD. The first African "Protected Geographic Indications". Press release 22/02/2013
http://www.cirad.fr/en/news/all-news-items/press-releases/2013/geographic-indications
[11] Sisule F. Musungu. The protection of geographical indications and the Doha Round: strategic ad policy considerations for Africa. QUNO IP Issue paper No. 8, December 2008.
[12] 25/06/12. DG AGRI working document on international protection of EU Geographical Indications: objectives, outcome and challenges

adhere to a specification for the product, and the costs of controls and certification can be supported, then registration as a GI offers a good option. The decision to obtain a geographical indication, or any other type of trade mark that endorses both the name and the characteristics of the product, often proves to be more tactical than strategic. Many producers use both instruments to protect and promote different attributes – a figurative trade mark is ideal form to project a designed image for a product, for example. Trade marks can be an excellent way of protecting a product name and controlling a marketing campaign at the same time.[13]

Sustainability factors are key. Potential benefits of GIs[14] and origin-based marketing tools have been shown to include market access increase, price premium and value added retained in the region; local employment, empowerment of producers and preservation of cultural values and traditions. In addition, linking market development of a product to traditional and low-intensity farming practices may promote biodiversity conservation directly through the use of a specific genetic resource (an autochthonous breed or plant variety) or indirectly through production and management practices that include landscape and ecosystem considerations. Direct benefits in terms of sustainability in rural landscapes derive from the fact that governance and market success contribute to the viability of rural livelihoods which depend on the sustainable use of specific biological and genetic resources.

Some potential problems include exclusion of actors, potential conflicts within the supply chain (monopoly in favour of the most powerful actor in the GI system or unfair exclusion of certain actors), need for external support, the role in the global regional strategy and the synergies with other regional products. These can translate into considerable challenges for developing countries are the lack of specific skills in the public institutions and support organisations, especially where a formal GI registration system is under consideration (e.g. delimitation of the region of origin, determination of core elements of the specificity to be put in the code of practices; and capacity of the farmers to adhere to a specification and quality standard, year-on-year, and irrespective of climate events and other natural variables.). These factors argue for close attention to feasibility in designing the specification and selecting the instrument.

To achieve political goals regarding sustainable agriculture and rural development (SARD), there is a necessity to have a comprehensive policy combining origin marketing tools like GIs with other support policies.[15]
While GIs do have some private characteristics, they are intrinsically a collective right. They broadly affect a group of people and the resources of a region. It is critical that GI governance and legal protection are both structured to serve the greatest number.

Without care and attention to these factors, GI protection can require capacity and resources, which are largely absent in developing countries and least developed countries. These countries need to ensure the mechanisms promoted to farmers match the legal and financial resources available. If the intellectual property (IP) route is chosen, capacity is needed for IP asset identification, protection, exploitation and management. It is important to make sure that stakeholders own the whole process. There is a need to make impact assessments and document best practices.

In the future, it is likely that the use of origin marketing tools and number of registered GIs in ACP countries will increase. The ratification of EPAs by CARIFORUM and other countries, the increasing interest demonstrated at local and international level on the subject of GI, and protection of traditional agricultural products, as well as the registration of the first 3 GIs by OAPI and the recent MoA between

[13] Ethiopian coffee is a good example of this. As part of a national public-private initiative led by the Ethiopian Intellectual Property Office, it was discussed what type of legal protection would be the most appropriate for successfully marketing the famous coffees produced in certain areas of the country. The conclusion was that common trademarks would provide good guarantees. The Ethiopian government applied for the registration in 34 countries of three coffee brands, “Harrar/Harar”, “Sidamo” and “Yirgacheffe”, from homonymous geographical areas. The three brands now already have protection in the EU, while in Japan and the United States only two out of the three have been registered to date. Schüßler, Lennart (2009). “Protecting ‘Single-Origin Coffee’ within the Global Coffee Market: The Role of Geographical Indications and Trademarks,” *The Estey Centre Journal of International Law and Trade Policy*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 149–185.
[14] WIPO. Dr Dominique Barjolle / ETH Zurich. Impacts of Geographical Indications. Review of Methods and Empirical Evidences. 2011. http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=189862
[15] Ibid.

ARIPO and EU are indicators of the growing interest in developing countries. The variety of products originating from ACP countries, together with studies showing evidence of consumer interest in GIs both in developed and developing countries' consumers[16], demonstrate that the approach has the potential to become an opportunity for sustainable development in ACP countries. In this context, it is critical to have solid data on the impact of GIs and other origin marketing tools in the context of ACP countries.

Lessons from the case studies and the literature review suggest that, for origin marketing, and particularly for a GI, to be successful, four components are essential[17]: (i) Strong organizational and institutional structures to maintain, market, and monitor the GI; (ii) Equitable participation among the producers and enterprises in a GI region; (iii) Strong market partners committed to promote and commercialize over the long term; (iv) Effective legal protection including a strong domestic GI system. Those factors require a substantial financial, technical and human resources which should be done on the basis of a careful analysis of opportunities.

Objectives of the Briefing

To improve information sharing and promote networking, CTA, DG AGRI and DG DEVCO from the European Commission, the ACP Secretariat, and Concord organize bimonthly briefings on key issues and challenges for rural development in the context of ACP-EU cooperation. The Briefing on 15th May 2013 will address issues related to the protection of traditional agri-food products and in particular, it will: (i) raise awareness on the key challenges posed to origin-based marketing and protecting traditional knowledge and practices; (ii) increase exchange of information and expertise on proven successes on protecting and promoting the intangible assets of farmers linked to the origin and traditional practices; and (iii) facilitate networking among development partners.

Target group

Around 150 ACP-EU policy-makers and representatives of EU Member States, civil society groups, research networks and development practitioners, and international organizations based in Brussels.

Available material

Input and comments before, during and after the meetings will be included in the Briefings blog: http://brusselsbriefings.net. A short report and a Reader in printed and electronic format will be produced shortly after the meeting.

[16] Bramley, C. A review of the socio-economic impact of geographical indications: considerations for the developing world. WIPO Worldwide Symposium on Geographical Indications. June 22 – 24 2011, Lima, Peru. 2009. http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/geoind/en/wipo_geo_lim_11/wipo_geo_lim_11_9.pdf

[17] Giovannucci, Daniele and Josling, Timothy and Kerr, William and O'Connor, Bernard and Yeung, May T. (2009): *Guide to Geographical Indications: Linking Products and Their Origins (Summary).* 2009. http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/27955/

Brussels Development Briefing no.31

Geography of food: reconnecting with origin in the food system

15th May 2013, ACP Secretariat, 451 Avenue Georges Henri, 1200 Brussels
http://brusselsbriefings.net

Organised by CTA, DG AGRI and DG DEVCO, European Commission, ACP Secretariat and Concord

8h00-9h00 Registration and welcome coffee
9h00-9h15 Introduction and Opening of the Briefing : *Isolina Boto, Manager, CTA Brussels Office*

Introductory remarks: *Alhaji Muhammad Mumuni, Secretary-General of the ACP Secretariat, Loretta Dormal-Marino, Deputy Director-General for International Affairs, DG Agriculture and Rural Development, European Commission, Michael Hailu, Director of CTA*

9h15-10h45 Panel 1: Protecting value by marketing tradition and origin
This session will discuss the various frameworks and tools to secure value for producers by protecting and preserving the attributes of origin and tradition of agricultural and food products. How can origin add value in terms of quality, tradition, reputation, competitiveness, profitability and public environmental goods?
Chair: *Ambassador ACP*
Panellists:

- Overview of origin-linked agricultural products and initiatives of interest to ACP countries
  Johann Kirsten, Head, Dept of Agricultural Economics, University of Pretoria
- Existing global and regional legal frameworks for origin-branding, and protecting geographical indications and traditional products
  Marie-Paule Rizo, Head, Industrial Design and Geographical Indications Law Section, WIPO
- GIs and other instruments for protecting producers' assets in the origin and tradition of their products: factors of success in ACP countries
  Bernard O'Connor, O'Connor European Lawyers
- Evaluation and feedback mechanisms on impact of geographical indications
  Astrid Gerz, GI Expert, REDD

10h45-11h00 Coffee Break

11h00-12h45 Panel 2: Proven successes on origin-linked agrifood products
This panel will review the potential of origin-linked tools for ACP producers based on successes, including looking at sustainability factors.
Chair: *Ambassador ACP*
Panellists:

- Successes in GIs and other forms of protection in Africa and lessons learned
  Getachew Mengistie Alemu, Intellectual Property Consultant & Attorney, Ethiopia
- The Caribbean experience in protecting agricultural and agrifood products
  John Malcolm Spence, Senior Coordinator, Intellectual Property Issues, CARICOM Secretariat
- Promoting agrobiodiversity: leveraging GI potentials in the use of underutilized species
  Stefano Padulosi, Senior Scientist, Marketing Diversity, Bioversity International
- Lessons learned from the process of registering a GI in coffee from Mont Ziama, Guinée
  Marie Antoinette Haba, Head of cooperation and development, Ministry of Agriculture and focal point on GIs of OAPI
- Linking food traditions and education: the experience of Slow Food and Terra Madre Network
  Anselme Bakudila Mbuta, Slow Food Studies Centre, Italy

12h45-13h15 Panel 3: The way forward
This short session will complement the discussions of the morning and will identify the promising avenues for futures actions, especially in support of ACP countries.
Chair: *Fernando Dos Santos, Director General of the African Regional Intellectual Property Organization*
Panellists: *WIPO, UNIDO, UNCTAD, FAO, ARIPO, OAPI, OriGIn.*

Concluding remarks

Networking lunch