

Technical norms for Geographical Indications and their reflexes for the wine sector

Kelly Lissandra Bruch^{1,a}, Adriana Carvalho Pinto Vieira², Ludimila Cesar Moura Gaspar³, Cristiane Francisco da Silva⁴, and Marcos Vinícius Araujo¹

¹ Center for Studies and Research in Agribusiness - Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul – CEPAN/UFRGS, Av. Bento Gonçalves, 7712 Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil

² Universidade do Extremo Sul de Santa Catarina – UNESC - Av. Universitária, 1105 - Bairro Universitário, 88806-000 Criciúma, Brasil

³ Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento – MAPA - Rua Rodrigues Alves 129, 6º andar, sala 601-A, Praça Mauá, 20048-093 Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

⁴ Instituto Federal de Alagoas – IFAL – Rua Mizaél Domingos, 75, Centro, 57020600 Maceió, Brasil

Abstract. Does the establishment of technical standards for a geographical indication (GI) help in its sustainable development for the wine sector? Based on this question the present work aims to analyse the technical norms already published by the Brazilian Association of Technical Norms – ABNT, with the objective of examining if these can help in the structuring, recognition and sustainable development of the GI in Brazil. Two standards have already been published: Brazilian Standard ABNT NBR n. 16.479-2016 – Geographical Indication – Terminology; And the Brazilian Standard ABNT NBR n. 16.536-2016 – Geographical Indication – Guidelines for structuring a Geographical Indication for product. A technical standard dealing with the control of GI and a technical standard dealing with the GI management system are being elaborated. Considering the still recent publication of the standards, it was verified at the first moment the impossibility of investigating what would be the effective impacts of the technical norms in the wine-growing GI, as initially proposed. However, there is a gain that would not initially be considered: it was possible to systematize the best practices of GI available in Brazil through the elaboration of standards already published and those in the publication phase.

1. Introduction

Does the establishment of technical standards for the structuring, control and management of a geographical indication (GI) help in its sustainable development? Based on this question the present work aims to analyze the technical norms already published by the Brazilian Association of Technical Norms – ABNT, body that represents Brazil in the scope of ISO, with the objective of analyzing if these can help in the structuring, recognition and sustainable development of the GI in Brazil, notably in the scope of GI viticulture.

Two standards have already been published: Brazilian Standard ABNT NBR n. 16.479-2016, called Geographical Indication – Terminology [1]; And the Brazilian Standard ABNT NBR n. 16.536-2016, called Geographical Indication – guidelines for structuring a Geographical Indication for product [2]. A technical standard dealing with the control of GIs and a technical standard dealing with the GI management system are being elaborated.

The Special Commission for the Study of Geographical Indications, which has met monthly in the last two

and a half years for the elaboration of these standards, is composed of representatives of the producers of the GIs, associations that manage the GIs, entities that represent related sectors To products with GI, as well as regulatory bodies such as the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply and the National Institute of Industrial Property, among others. The purpose of this work is to verify, within the vitivincultural sector, whether these norms can help in the structuring and recognition of new GIs, as well as in the sustained development of GIs already recognized. As it is a still unsuccessful work, the results are still not conclusive, but they can point to an aid in the structuring of GIs in the recognition phase, as well as in a facilitation in the understanding of the producers on what the GIs would be.

This article is divided into six parts. The first is this introduction. The second is a brief review of the geographical indications in Brazil and the Special Study Commission of Geographical Indications from ABNT (SSC-216). The third part presents the methodology for the construction of technical standards used. The fourth concerns the influence of technical standards in the wine sector. In the fifth part we present the methodology used in the present work. In the sixth and final part, the results and conclusions.

^a e-mail: kellybruch@gmail.com

2. Geographical indications and technical standards

The Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), was adopted as part of the creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Among the regulated legal institutes is the geographical indication.

Geographical indications (GI) are well-known institutions in Europe, still not very noticeable in South America. Although the legal protection is relatively recent in the European continent, dating from 1756 the granting of the first legal protection, the use of geographical names goes back to the antiquity. It was consolidated as a reference for the markets, regardless of the formalization allowed by legal protection, whose initial objective was more to protect the producers to avoid the usurpation of a consecrated name of what effectively fetassegur the identification of a product with differentiated characteristics, to look for competitive advantages and to value the originating place of said good [14, 17, 18, 20].

In the Brazilian context, the legal protected identification of the products by their geographic origin occurs only a few decades ago and, despite the great interest that the theme has aroused, the number of officially recognized geographical indications is reduced – currently 59, as well as knowledge about paper of the GI. The Industrial Property Law [4] in its text does not define what a GI is, but it classifies into two species: indication of origin (*indicação de procedência* – IP, in portuguese) and denomination of origin (*denominação de origem* – DO, in portuguese).

According to art. 177, IPL [4], IP is considered as: “the geographical name of a country, city, region or locality of its territory, which has become known as a center for the extraction, production or manufacture of a particular product or the provision of a particular service” [4]. For Locatelli and Souza [9], the characteristic element is the notoriety of the geographical origin related to the product. However, in Brazil, although there is no legal requirement, the authors point out that IP applications are, as a rule, related to products that involve tradition and are linked to the local culture. Nor is there any normative requirement related to the quality or characteristic of the product linked to the geographical environment of origin, if the geographical name is recognized.

The IPL defines DO as: “the geographical name of a country, city, region or locality of its territory, which designates a product or service whose qualities or characteristics are due exclusively and essentially to the geographical environment, including natural and human factors” [4]. For the proof of this institute there is the requirement of a link with the geographical origin, with the proof of a characteristic or quality linked to it. They are differentiated products, or even unique, distinct from the others due to the geographic environment, including natural and human factors, according to Locatelli and Souza [9].

Therefore, according to Vieira; Watanabe; Bruch [18] the concept of GI is related to products with defined geographical origin. By explaining the origin and adding this value to products of the same origin, it translates the quality value and characteristics of the identity and culture of a geographical area into tangible assets. The producers of a region are organized to value these characteristics, mobilizing an intellectual property right:

the GI. Therefore, the legal institute makes it possible to preserve characteristics of the product, as well as to value them in the face of consumers, making tangible intangible assets such as reputation, specific environmental factors and human skills, adding to them a certain value [19].

In order to recognize a GI, IPL and international agreements (mainly TRIPS) are observed. In addition, IPL provides that INPI will establish the conditions for registration. The current regulations that governing such conditions are Normative Instruction (IN) No. 25/2013 [7]. This IN defines the quality criteria, rights and duties of national producers that require protection. To apply for registration, associations, institutes or legal entities representing the collectivity are legitimized. Thus, in practice, who actually manages the GI are usually the producers linked to them.

According to IN No. 25/2013, in its art. 6, in order to formalize the registration with the competent public agency (INPI), the application must be accompanied by the geographical name and the corresponding official document of delimitation of the geographical area; description of the product; the instrument that prove the legitimacy of the institution representing the producers or providers; the graphical representation; the payment of the amount corresponding to the INPI; and of the Regulation of Use of the geographical name, which describe the rules regarding the use of the GI.

According to Vieira, Buainain & Bruch [20], in recent years, has shown a greater awareness of the importance of social and environmental issues related to the production and commercialization of agrifood products. There is a perception that public policy actions aimed only at increasing production, despite being important, are no longer sufficient for the increasingly globalized and competitive market. Therefore, the competitiveness of Brazilian agribusiness is based, today, on the valorization of the product, for its quality rating.

In view of the growing tendency to value intangible assets linked to territories, the GI can be considered as a tool to promote territorial development, since they allow the differentiation of products in an increasingly competitive market. According to Nierdele [10] the GI registry is an important strategy instrument for the induction of rural territorial development, as well as stimulating social actors to promote “qualification processes”. This occurs, according to the author, by the fact of introducing a new model of food production and consumption, revaluation of traditions, customs, know-how and other immaterial goods associated with a specific territorial identity and geographical origin.

Other benefits also need to be considered. According to Cerdan et al [5] GIs can generate social and cultural benefits represented by the inclusion of producers or disadvantaged regions in the market and environmental benefits related to the preservation of biodiversity and local genetic resources.

In addition, according to Vieira and Pellin [21], complementary activities may emerge after the granting of the GI registration for traditional products. In most cases indications of origin and appellations of origin may establish relationships with other segments that are not directly linked to the product. This consequence can strengthen important activities, generating employment and local income.

Locatelli [8] corroborates Pecqueur's assertions that it is possible to observe the development and strengthening of activities focused on tourism and gastronomy in many regions that have obtained the recognition of GI for their products, such as in *Vale dos Vinhedos*, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil. According to the author, GI by stimulating the tradition and culture of a region attract tourists and enable the exploitation of indirect profitable activities.

In research carried out by Pellin & Vieira [13], the authors highlight three advantages: (i) increase in the production of products not directly linked to the GI, but which end up being benefited; (ii) consumer recognition of the relationship between product and territory; and, (iii) insertion of innovations in the recognized products.

Regarding the first advantage, the research confirms the ability of the GI to stimulate complementary activities in the demarcated region, which often do not have direct relation with the recognized product, however, they benefit. It is what Pecqueur [12] classifies as 'basket of goods and services of the territory'. The consumer, when interested in purchasing products with GI, may also be interested in consuming other products or services from that demarcated region and, thus, stimulating the production and supply of other goods [13].

The second advantage pointed out shows the cultural dimension stimulated by the GI. By linking product with the territory, the consumer ends up strengthening the identity of the demarcated region and the products carry beyond quality – which is one of the requirements of the Regulatory Council of the GI for a product to achieve the sign – a territorial component that differentiates them from other products [13].

Finally, the third advantage suggested proposes a relationship with the production system. From the moment that the rules for production are defined, through the Regulation of Use, the tendency is for the products to have higher quality and innovations to be implemented in the production system, keeping, however, the typicality of the products and their system productive.

According to the research carried out by Pellin & Vieira [13], regarding the contributions of the GI for territorial development, four advantages were highlighted: (i) increase in the flow of tourists; (ii) increased sales of products; and (iii) increase in the number of establishments in the GI region and increase of land and property price in the demarcated region. All the advantages are related to the economic dimension and that sometimes is worrisome. This is an activity that is stimulated in the majority of GI vitiviniculture experiences in Brazil and in the world. An example of the GI contributing to territorial development is observed in the *Vale dos Vinhedos*, given the considerable increase in tourist flow in the demarcated region that received in 2014, according to the Aproveale, 290 thousand tourists. As a comparison, in 2006 the flow of tourists was only 45 thousand. There are 26 wineries of the IG. The profiles are varied: there are family wineries, with limited elaboration and exclusive sale in their retail, as well as big companies with international presence. There are 43 associates related to the business of tourism between 9 hotels, an international SPA, 15 restaurants, two tourist agencies, and a travel operator; cheese industries, jellies, biscuits, art and handicraft workshops, furniture industry showrooms, among others. Therefore, it is important to remember that the tourism

activity produces direct or indirect benefits for several segments generating employment and local income.

However, according to Pellin; Vieira [13], there is a need for a greater effort of approach between the various stakeholders (public sector, private sector and society) so that all involved, as well as the territory, can take advantage of the possible benefits that the IG allows. Partnerships need to be built and strengthened so that they can assist in the strategic development of the GI and receive support from the government sector so that public policies can be developed for further post-grant support of the GI registry [13].

Currently, some GI present quite expressive results, such as the *Vale dos Vinhedos*. But these results can not be 'romanticized' to the point that GI produces positive results automatically. On the contrary, as the *Vale das Uvas Goethe* representant pointed out, it was after three years of recognition of the IP that the work increased (challenges and demands). Maintaining the coherence and adherence of all members, the participation of stakeholders (public power, private sector and society) so that tourism in the region is recognized, is not an easy task [13].

In this sense, an interesting initiative has attracted attention in the scope of the GI. This is the proposal to develop technical standards to systematize good practices for the recognition, management and control of GI. This initiative is being carried out through a partnership signed between the Brazilian Association of Technical Standards – ABNT and the Brazilian Service of Support to Micro and Small Enterprises – SEBRAE, as discussed in the following item. ABNT represents Brazil in the International Organization for Standardization – ISO, internalizing international standardization standards, as well as taking Brazilian initiatives to the international level.

2.1. The Special Commission of Geographical Indication at the Brazilian National Standards Organization

With the motivation to solve problems related to the incorporation of quality, efficiency and best practices, as well as to increase the competitiveness of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), in 2007 ABNT and SEBRAE signed an agreement aimed at promoting the involvement of SMEs with standardization [11]. The success obtained in this partnership resulted in the maintenance of the agreement, which until the moment of this publication is kept in execution.

The scope of this partnership foresees several actions related to the elaboration and implementation of the technical norms by the SME. Among them, actions are taken to collect sectoral demands for the development of technical standards with support to the participation of SMEs in national committee meetings. In addition, training is provided in the application of technical standards, as well as promotion of access to technical standards from subsidized sales.

The technical standards cover the market segments related to products, services, people skills and procedures. The process of elaboration of technical norms is based on the voluntary participation of specialists, being included in this concept the participation of the business owner, entrepreneur, public and private institutions linked to the respective segment, consumers, and others that have

interest in the elaboration and application of the standard.

Within the scope of this partnership, SEBRAE realized the possibility of establishing technical norms in projects aimed at the recognition of Brazilian Geographical Indications. Thus, to confirm the need for elaboration, two workshops were held with producers and entities related to the process, promotion, registration, support and research on GI for the collection of demands. These meetings were held in Bento Gonçalves – RS, on April 10, 2014, with 21 participants, and the second was held in Belo Horizonte – BH, on May 19, 2014, with 23 participants [15].

The result of these workshop was the confirmation of the need to elaborate technical standards for the Brazilian Geographical Indication system and the referral to ABNT for the formation of the Technical Committee. Initially, there was alignment of the participants of the two meetings for the elaboration of norms regarding terminology and for management of governance.

The installation meeting of the Commission for Special Studies for Geographical Indication – ABNT / CEE-216 was held on July 22, 2014 in the city of Rio de Janeiro, with the presence of 25 representatives of producers, consumers and governmental regulatory, development and of research. For the scope of the work it was established the elaboration of four technical norms: Terminology, Structuring of Geographical Indication, Management of Geographical Indication and Control of Geographical Indication.

The purpose of creating technical standards for the Geographical Indication system is to contribute guidelines for the processes aimed at the recognition of Geographical Indications in Brazil, regarding the terminology, structuring, management and control of the Brazilian GI. The technical standards are of voluntary application and act in a complementary character to the existing regulations in the INPI for the recognition of a Geographical Indication. It is worth noting that in Brazil there is no specific regulation for the phase after recognition of the GI, both in the issues related to the extinction or annulment of a recognized GI, and in the scope of its control and management.

Under the ABNT-SEBRAE agreement, the participants and representatives of recognized GI benefit from the participation in the meetings. The democratization of the participation of specialists in multidisciplinary and multi-institutional forms for the elaboration of technical norms allows them to be elaborated in an accessible way to technicians, producers and other interested parties.

It is important to emphasize that of this work that has been proposed to elaborate four technical norms, two are already published, notably the Brazilian Standard n. 16479, published on 09/08/2016, under the name Geographical Indication – Terminology, and Brazilian Standard no. 16536, published on 10/25/2016, under the name Geographical Indication – guidelines for structuring the Geographical Indication for Products. Standards for management and control are still under construction.

3. Methodology of the construction of the norm

The technical standards are essentially built in the context of the creation of a Study Group, named Special Commission for the Study of Geographical

Indications – (SSC-216) of ABNT. For each theme, a specific committee is created with the participation of multi professionals, representatives of the entire productive chain, of consumers and of neutral parts such as: universities, laboratories, institutes, public agency, stakeholders, among others. One of the most important aspects of the construction of the standard is the principle of transparency and free access of the interested parties in the process of construction of the standard.

The process of constructing a standard uses the universal concept based on the PDCA (Plan, Do, Check and Act) cycle, based on this concept, the construction of the standard was performed with the following steps:

3.1. Plan:

This stage was initiated with the installation meeting of the Special Commission for the Study of Geographical Indications – (SSC-216) of ABNT, which took place on July 22, 2014, at the ABNT headquarters in Rio de Janeiro. This stage was of fundamental importance to ensure the other stages of the construction of the standard. The meeting was organized by ABNT, with record in minutes of all the discussions held during the meeting. In summary, the Planning activities for the beginning of the construction of the standard were:

- Publication and sending of invitations to interested parties;
- Opening of the meeting by ABNT representative;
- Presentation the reasons about the importance of the construction of the norm and justification regarding the relevance of the theme to society;
- Presentation of the participants in the meeting and justification of the absent guests;
- Selection of the coordinator (a) of the study committee by the members present at the meeting;
- Preparation of Work Program;
- Definition of the work schedule and deadlines;
- Definition and prioritization of the themes of the standards to be built.

The work program defined the development of four technical standards relating to:

- a) terminology of geographical indication (216: 000.00-001),
- b) guidelines for the structuring of a geographical indication (216: 000.00-002),
- c) management of a geographical indication – good practices (216: 000.00-003)
- d) traceability and control mechanism (216: 000.00-004).

All norms have been defined as norms of orientation and not as directional norms as the goal is to compile best practices.

3.2. Make:

This stage refers to the phase of elaboration of the contents of the technical standard already defined in the planning stage. It is one of the most important steps, which require more time, research and technical discussions with the members of the commission.

In this stage the construction of texts of participative and collaborative form, that are denominated initially like draft standards, that will form in sequence the text of the norm. It is important to emphasize that the norm is not made by a person but by a diverse group of people who vote and validate all text before the process of public consultation and publication. All should and can give their opinion, justifying their suggestions and proposals for changes, and they must be accepted without distinction by weight or other criteria.

The group of participants, called SSC-216, presents, discusses the text, until they reach a consensus on the final text.

The face-to-face meetings of SSC-216 occurred at intervals of 30 to 60 days, according to the schedule elaborated by the commission, validated and published by means of minutes.

The face-to-face meetings are itinerant, allowing stakeholders from different regions to participate in the discussions and construction of the standards texts. At the same time, all members receive the information and referrals from the meetings and can contribute to the elaboration of the rules even if they do not participate in the face-to-face meetings. This can be done either by e-mail or by the system available, called livelink, in which all the minutes are available, as well as all the content discussed in the meeting, each version of the standard projects, as well as complementary materials that help the participants in the construction of the knowledge necessary for the elaboration of the norm.

The membership of the commission usually includes producers of GI, representatives of collective GI groups, representatives of public or private institutions that carry out support and research activities, GI public regulators, GI product consumers.

As a method to expedite the discussions and construction of the texts of the norms concomitantly, the members were invited to divide into subgroups of work, called GT, with each group being responsible for consolidating the texts received to present in person at the meetings. Thus, three (3) WGs were created: WG for Structuring, WG for control and WG for Management. This method facilitated the process of constructing the text in a collaborative way and with greater agility. The terminology standard was developed in conjunction with the large group during all meetings.

Success in this phase occurred systematically and organically, with the participation of an expressive number of suggestions, there was a consensual construction practice with higher productivity in a shorter time.

3.3. Check:

At this stage all construction of text is carried out by the study committee, being submitted to the public appreciation and public statement of every society. It is an important moment, in which the committee expects a significant number of people who can participate with suggestions and refinement of the text of the norm. The proposal is that at the end there is a standard with full and satisfactory application.

The Terminology Standard was submitted to the National Consultation, on February 4, 2016, after 18 face-to-face meetings, attended by 73 people, during the various meetings.

The Structuring rule was submitted to the National Consultation on June 14, 2016, after 19 face-to-face meetings attended by 61 people during the various meetings.

In both cases, the National Consultation was available for 60 days. After that the norm and the comments returned to the commission's analysis.

The national consultation allows interested parties who were not in person in the discussions of the text of the standard to manifest themselves. This way, it is also given the opportunity for everyone to have an opinion and to validate the document before its publication.

3.4. Action:

After the national consultation, all comments and suggestions are consolidated and appreciated by the committee in a face-to-face meeting specifically led by the Commission's coordinator. During the evaluations of the comments received, the committee consents and there may be rejection or acceptance regarding the comments, this is the moment of final decision of the text for publication of the standard.

The publication of the standard is formalized and its access is made available to every company, for payment by the value of the standard, which is calculated based on the number of pages. With this, it is up to the stakeholders to implement the standards in order to qualify their practices. The ABNT has as practice the periodic analysis of the standard. Thus, if there is a need for revision, the process is open so that the commission can carry out the process of continuous improvement.

As a result, after the Terminology standard was submitted to the National Consultation, it returned to the SSC-216, which evaluated all the comments in a total of 22 manifestations and, following several suggestions, recommended the final publication, which occurred on September 8th 2016, under the following name: Brazilian Standard no. 16479, under the name Geographical Indication – Terminology.

The standard of Structuring after being submitted to the National Consultation, returned to the Special Study Commission, which evaluated all the comments, accepting several suggestions, recommended the final publication, which occurred on October 25, 2016, under the following nomenclature Brazilian Standard n. 16536, under the name Geographical Indication – guidelines for structuring the Geographical Indication for Products (Geographical Indication – Guidelines for structuring of Geographical Indications for product).

4. Sustained development of GI for the Brazilian Wine

As in other countries, in Brazil, wine was the first product to have a recognized geographical indication. Brought from European colonization, this ancient culture was established in Brazil and gained specific characteristics of this *terroir*. It developed its own identity and consolidated itself, be it by tradition, landscape, or because it is a product that collaborates and collaborated with the development of producers and regions throughout history in the country.

By recognizing a GI in the wine sector in Brazil, this product is brought to visibility and placed under the eyes of its consumers, so that it knows its processes, its identity and the place where it is produced, as well as the context. These distinctive signs protect local traditional products, the social and economic structure of which they are inserted, thus showing a distinctive origin, with territorial identity and that brings security to the community, in addition to developing markets [6]. The author is still based on three important factors, product, process and place (territory), with intrinsic qualities of place, environmental practices, manufacturing techniques, traditional processes and others.

By establishing in particular places and protecting environmental and cultural resources, it brings with it the notion of *terroir*, the quality of an agricultural product, cultural practices, knowledge of the producers and resources that collaborated for that production [3]. For Brazilian wine, these practices attest to its identity and characteristics of this *terroir*, either because it is a tropical vitiviculture, with specific edafoclimatic identity and characteristics, wines from tropical regions and with landscapes and particular *terroirs*, mountains, valleys and savannas, that expression values of important Brazilian biomes.

These benefits are based on attesting the specificity of the product, a particular *terroir* expressed in the wine, with local identity and tradition, as well as maintaining winemakers in the field, regional and social development, attracting tourists, providing farmers' interaction and giving visibility. For those products on the market. Consumers seek these products recognized by GI traditional characteristics, have quality perception and are willing to pay as a premium product [16], which can provide economic growth for producers and region.

However, there is still much to develop for the recognition of GI in Brazil, mainly because it is relatively recent in some areas and regions.

There are particularly big issues related to the effective and long-term structuring of a GI. The formal recognition procedure is only one of these stages, since the effective construction of a trajectory that includes all the elements necessary for the GI to be recognized and have a healthy continuity after this recognition still constitutes one of the great obstacles to the processes of IG.

Of the 59 applications for recognition already granted in Brazil, 41 are for IP and 18 for DO. Of these, many have not yet effectively reached the market, especially for structural issues, in the implementation of the control and management of the GI. Of these, there is one DO for Brazilian wines – *Vale dos Vinhedos*, and six IP for Brazilian wines: *Vale dos Vinhedos*, *Pinto Bandeira*, *Farroupilha*, *Monte Belo*, *Vales da Uva Goethe* and *Altos Montes*. In the case of wine-growing GI, the percentage of GI that have effectively placed products on the market is much higher, if an analysis proportional to the number of GI recognized is made. Only one of them has not yet presented products already controlled at the market. In this sense, on the one hand, the participation of GI representatives from wine in the SSC-216 has been fundamental for an adequate construction of this norm, based especially on the cases in which an effective success can be verified.

It is in this sense that the SSC-216 of ABNT developed the first two standards, the first on terminologies and the second on structuring a Geographical Indication for product. The objective is precisely to give support to the structuring of the GI from its inception, besides allowing the consolidation of a vocabulary common to all GI.

It should be emphasized that in Brazil the legislation, already mentioned, is very sigela with respect to the regulation of the recognition of a GI, making it necessary to elaborate a support in which the producers can gather information on the best practices related to its structuring.

The two standards address in their framework tools for the recognition of natural and human resources in the region, as well as knowledge, biodiversity and local histories [1]. That is, the norms provide support so that the place can have instruments that enable it to know what the principles are and how to treat them in the request for recognition of the GI, and thus provide socioeconomic gains and the preservation of history and “know-how” [2], thus collaborating for the sustainable development of the GIs, as a support and instrument for the application for recognition.

The rules that are currently under development, notably related to the control and management of GI, aim to allow, once recognized, an effective continuity in the GI process, avoiding that many are born alive.

5. Methodology

The work was developed through an exploratory analysis of the work being done in the elaboration of the technical standards applied to the GI in the scope of the Special Studies Commission of Geographical Indications – (SSC-216) of ABNT. This research was based on a review of the literature on geographical indications, as well as on all material produced to date by EEC-216, available to all participants through the livelink platform.

From this perspective, the literature were read in order to understand if the publications collaborate for the sustainable development of the Brazilian winemaking and its establishment as natural resources, product particularity, *terroir* and maintenance of practices in winemaking.

6. Final Considerations

Considering the still recent publication of the standards, it was verified at the first moment the impossibility of analyzing what would be the effective impacts of the technical norms in the wine-growing GI, as initially proposed.

However, there is a gain that would not initially be considered: it was possible to systematize the best practices of structuring, managing and controlling GI available in Brazil through the elaboration of standards already published and those in the publication phase. In addition to scientific publications, this material, systematized by a large group of experts, was not available to the main stakeholders until now: GI producers.

In the face of the partnership between ABNT and SEBRAE, this confluence of people with a common purpose was possible, with the norms already published

being the most expressive results. Its incorporation and use by those who aim to work for the recognition of delimited regions depends very much on the dissemination of this work.

Currently, three initiatives related to GI viticulture are underway, and has already taken into account the provisions of the technical standards. IP *Campanha Gaúcha* and IP *Vale do São Francisco* are already in an advanced state of structuring. The project for the DO *Altos de Pinto Bandeira* already begins with this perception.

Certainly, after the completion of these processes, it will be possible to verify more effectively the applicability of these standards to the wine sector, a proposal that is intended for future work.

References

- [1] Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas. NBR 16479: Indicação Geográfica – Terminologia. Rio de Janeiro. 5 p. (2016)
- [2] Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas. NBR 16536. Indicação geográfica — Orientações para estruturação de indicação. Rio de Janeiro. 17 p. (2016)
- [3] BOWEN, S. Embedding local places in global spaces: Geographical indications as a territorial development strategy. *Rural Sociology* **75**(2), 209–243 (2010)
- [4] Brasil, “Lei N. 9.279 - de 14 de Maio de 1996. Que Regula direitos e obrigações relativos à propriedade industrial” (1996). [Online]. Available: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L9279.htm [Accessed: 04-Mar-2017]
- [5] Cerdan, C.M.T., Bruch, K.L., Silva, A.L., Copeti, M., Fávero, K.C., Locatelli, L. Indicação Geográfica de produtos agropecuários: importância histórica e atual. In: Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento. Curso de propriedade intelectual & inovação no agronegócio: Módulo II, indicação geográfica / Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento; organização Luiz Otávio Pimentel – **4a ed.** – Florianópolis: MAPA, Florianópolis: FUNJAB (2014)
- [6] Ilbery, B. et al. Product, Process and Place: An Examination of Food Marketing and Labelling Schemes in Europe and North America. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, **12**(2), 116–132 (2005)
- [7] Instituto Nacional de Propriedade Industrial. Instrução Normativa nº25/2013. Estabelece as condições para o registro de Indicações Geográficas. Brasília (2013)
- [8] Locatelli, L. Indicações Geográficas e Desenvolvimento Econômico. In. Barral, Welber; Pimentel, Luiz Otávio (Org). Propriedade intelectual e desenvolvimento. Florianópolis: Fundação Boiteux (2007)
- [9] Locatelli, L., Souza, K. A proteção jurídica e o processo de reconhecimento das indicações geográficas no Brasil: aspectos introdutórios. In: Indicações geográficas: desafios e perspectivas nos 20 anos da Lei de Propriedade Industrial. Org. Locatelli, L. Lumen Juris: Rio de Janeiro, p. 3–16 (2016)
- [10] Niederle, P. A. Indicações geográficas e processos de qualificação nos mercados agroalimentares”. Indicações geográficas: qualidade e origem nos mercados alimentares. Org. Niederle, P. A. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS, p. 23–54 (2013)
- [11] Oliveira, M.C. Normalização e MPE: um caminho sem volta. Boletim ABNT, abril, (2013). [Online]. Available: <http://abnt.org.br/paginampe/biblioteca/files/upload/anexos/pdf/04818c3f3916ca5b8d17e8033febcd47.pdf> [Accessed: 27-dez-2016]
- [12] Pecqueur, B. Qualité e développement territorial: l’hyphotès e dupannier de biens et de services territorialisés. *Economie Rurale*, **261**, Paris (2001)
- [13] Pellin, V., Vieira, A.C.P. Indicações geográficas no Brasil: uma perspectiva pro-registro.. In: Indicações geográficas: desafios e perspectivas nos 20 anos da Lei de Propriedade Industrial. Org. Locatelli, L. Lumen Juris: Rio de Janeiro, p. 89–112 (2016)
- [14] Bruch, K. L. Signos distintivos de origem: entre o velho e novo mundo vitivinícola. **1.** ed. Passo Fundo: Editora IMED. 320p. (2013)
- [15] Sebrae. Parceria ABNT / Sebrae Normalização e Pequenos Negócios. São Paulo. (2015). [Online]. Available: <https://www.google.com.br/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwj2707rweTRAhXDHJAKHcKFAbUQFggvMAI&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.abnt.org.br%2Feventos%2Fapresentacoes%2Fcategory%2F137-workshop-internacional-sobre-normalizacao-e-pequenos-negocios%3Fdownload%3D319%3Aparceria-abnt-sebrae&usq=AFQjCNF1WxqUUFKIW3ToZGwLmZGTBJNMZw&sig2=OLY6svwxnSueC1yfDCYKuA&bvm=bv.145822982,d.Y2I> [Accessed: 26-dez-2016]
- [16] Soam, S. K.; Hussain, M. Commercialization of indigenous health drinks as geographical indications. *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights* **16**(2), 170–175 (2011)
- [17] Vieira, A. C. P.; Pellin, V. O uso do instituto das indicações geográficas como instrumento de promoção do desenvolvimento territorial rural– o caso dos Vales da Uva Goethe – Brasil. 20th APDR Congress, University of Évora (2014)
- [18] Vieira, A. C. P.; Watanabe, M.; Bruch, K. L. Perspectivas de desenvolvimento da vitivinicultura em face do reconhecimento da Indicação de Procedência dos Vales da Uva Goethe. *Revista Geintec* **2**, 327–343 (2012)
- [19] Vieira, A.C.P., Zilli, J. C., Bruch, K. L. As políticas públicas como instrumento para o desenvolvimento das indicações geográficas: o caso dos Vales da Uva Goethe em Urussanga, Santa Catarina In: Anais VII Seminário Internacional de Desenvolvimento Regional. Santa Cruz do Sul – RS: UNISC **1** (2015)
- [20] Vieira, A.C.P.; Buainain, A.M.; Bruch, K.L. A indicação geográfica como estratégia para minimizar a assimetria de informação In: Propriedade intelectual e inovações na agricultura. Org. Buainain, A.M., Castro, A.C.,

- Bonacelli, M.B.M. Rio de Janeiro: **Ideia 1** (2015)
- [21] Vieira, A.C.P.; Pellin, V. Indicações geográficas como políticas públicas de desenvolvimento territorial – o caso dos Vales da Uva Goethe. In: Valdir Roque Dallabrida. (Org.). *Indicação geográfica e o desenvolvimento territorial: reflexões sobre o tema e potencialidades no Estado de Santa Catarina*. **1a**, ed. São Paulo: Editora LiberArs, p. 273–288 (2015)