Reproduction for sustainable GIs

The fourth phase of the quality circle, reproduction, consists of ensuring that both natural and human resources used in the GI system are reproduced, improved and preserved, in order to have long-term economic, social and environmental sustainability of the system. Reproduction encompasses both social and economic reproduction (redistribution of value and remuneration), as well as preservation of natural and cultural resources over time.

For this reason, it is important to evaluate carefully the impacts of GI implementation on local resources, beginning with the setting up of the CoP and over time to account for the evolution of impacts during the reproduction phase. This should allow for enhancing positive effects and avoiding negative economic, social and environmental outcomes. It may then be important to reinforce or extend the collective strategy and/ or to consider possible changes to the rules themselves to be able to bring about benefits to the entire territory.

Within the reproduction phase it is therefore favourable to assess the impact of the GI system and to develop it within a sustainable development perspective (chapter 4.1). Various reasons and events may justify the need to make the rules evolve at some point in the process (chapter 4.2). One strategy to increase sustainability is to extend the benefits outside the GI production system to all the territory: Local stakeholders may use the reputation of the GI product to attract people in the GI territory and sell other products and services (chapter 4.3).
4.1 Key factors for sustainability

Introduction

In order to ensure the reproduction of local resources for a sustainable GI system and for all the territory, it is important to assess the impacts of the rules (code of practice) and the collective actions undertaken over time. Expected positive economic, social and environmental impacts are not automatic, and negative effects can appear, depending on the way the system is constructed and managed.

Reproduction of local resources and sustainability

Reproduction encompasses social, economic and environmental sustainability. Regarding the economic component, reproduction is linked essentially to distributive aspects. The value created by means of remuneration activities, should be fairly distributed along the value chain between the local production system and the external one and between different actors involved in production, processing and distribution. Actors should be remunerated according to their contribution to the value creation process.

Regarding the environmental component, reproduction means ensuring the preservation or even the improvement of natural resources, by guaranteeing equilibrium between exploitation and development over time, while maintaining or increasing biodiversity.

Regarding the social and cultural components, reproduction means promoting traditions and the cultural heritage, reinforcing the sense of local identity and self-esteem within the local population and fighting against factors contributing to rural exodus: poverty, lack of information and access to markets.

The impacts of GI products on the local economy, society, culture and environment, vary greatly according to the characteristics of the production system and the modalities of the GI process. The intensity (how much?) and direction (positive vs negative) of the impacts strongly depend on the rules and actions that local and non-local actors undertake on behalf of the GI product (see case study 1).

Being aware of possible negative impacts

The potential of a GI product to encourage sustainable development as part of the quality virtuous circle should not minimize the possibility that the product can generate negative effects if the tool is used improperly. Awareness of this fact is important in order to prevent or minimize negative externalities.

Regarding economic and social aspects, negative impacts may relate to the exclusion of certain local producers because they can’t meet the requirements of the CoP, for example small-scale producers in less favoured production areas. Another risk is related to powerful external actors who may succeed in extracting local resources
from the production area, thus undermining its development. An unbalanced collective organization and the prevention of some producers from actively participating in the decision-making process may worsen social relationships among local producers along the value-chain or potentially exclude some producers from benefiting from the GI product’s reputation.

Regarding the environment, negative impacts can also be the result of the rules established in the CoP. For example, loose rules [low requirement level or unclear boundaries] may lead to the substitution of local specific resources with non-specific and/or external ones in order to simplify the production process. This may increase production and resource productivity or lower production costs, but lead to a loss of biodiversity and of GI specific quality. The intensification of production methods and product specialization [monoculture] may lead to the overexploitation of some specific resources [for example water, land], thus affecting the quality attributes and the specificities of the GI product.

Case study 1: Rural development issues
ROOIBOS HERBAL TEA (South Africa)

Rooibos herbal tea [see also case study 4 in chapter 2.3] is endemic to a part of the country and considered as part of the South African patrimony. The identification and qualification process for the GI highlights a number of conflicting issues related to sustainability. The main motivation of leading producers for developing a GI was to fight product usurpation, risk of delocalization of the activities and to address the rapid increase in demand. However, defining a common strategy was not easy. Some considered that the GI initiative should enhance small-scale producers' integration in a perspective of social sustainability. This vision was not shared by all stakeholders and the GI initiative even created conflicts and modified the relative power positions of different actors. Eventually, stakeholders realized the importance of maintaining a rich living tradition and sustaining local identity, as part of product specificity. Environmental problems linked to the production system also emerged and these will have to be dealt with to ensure long-term sustainability of the production system. In this process, intervention by public actors might contribute to promoting inclusion and resolve other issues relevant to the territory and society.

Key factors for sustainability

Local actors are the key element in determining whether the system yields sustainability because of their role and level of empowerment, their motivations, their social capital and awareness of issues such as social equity and environmental preservation. Undeniably, these factors influence whether the objectives of all three pillars (economic, social and environmental) can be met and which of the three to the greatest degree. The strengthening of the process and collective management are the basis for positive effects. However, networking activities between private and public actors, as well as the strength and the nature of the "common vision", will surely influence strategies surrounding the GI product. These strategies can either be oriented towards the efficiency of the supply chain or broader territorial considerations (see chap. 4.3).

Collective and participative action can support fair distribution of the benefits by setting inclusive rules of representativeness and decision-making, as well as by assisting producers with conflict resolution. Training courses and education, information dissemination and technical and financial assistance are all actions that may lead to a more balanced power distribution and active participation. Information activities and participation in collectively managed marketing initiatives may stimulate producer pride and build knowledge. The GI organization should interact with a wider network composed of other stakeholders (private and public), with the specific goal of managing and guaranteeing local resource reproduction.

The preservation of natural resources, such as water or biodiversity, requires collective management, owing to common and specific rules. This calls for a GI strategy which defines a certain number of rules within the CoP, that are applied by all GI producers that lead to positive impacts on the environment, cultural heritage and traditions. These rules can evolve to take into account necessary adaptations (See chapter 4.2).

Social networks in GI systems represent another important key factor, linking different groups of stakeholders who can be involved at different levels of the GI process, such as research and education institutions, public authorities, consumer associations, non-governmental organizations, etc. The relevance of a social network is not only significant from a social point of view but also from an economic point of view. Keeping these networks alive allows the GI system to be more sustainable and to better identify the need for adjustment at the local level.

Assessing sustainability

It is crucial that local actors set up a monitoring and controlling system in order to evaluate the impact of their strategies and actions on local resources and sustainability, comparing individual and collective aims with outcomes over time. Local actors can consider this evaluation as a learning process conducted over time and throughout the virtuous quality circle. Indeed, the evaluation process results permit an adjustment of the rules and implementation of new initiatives to address issues as they arise.

The implementation and discussion of the evaluation should be a collective activity. The results of the analysis may be useful to activate solutions and remedies that can guarantee long-term sustainability.
The evaluation activity is anything but simple, considering the many actors involved and interested in the GI product, each with different aims and expectations. When evaluating the effects, we must consider at least two different levels:

1. The local production system point of view, which should be counted not simply as a sum of individual positions, but also in terms of collective issues. In fact, the general success of the GI system may come as the result of divergent individual positions: some producers may have improved their economic and social positions while others may have suffered. Therefore, it is important to analyze all of the diverse effects on the different types of producers.

2. A wider “public good” point of view. The positive impact on the economic and social standing of local producers may hide some negative effects “outside” the local production system. Producers who have been excluded from the benefits of the GI reputation (being located outside the delimitated production area or who may not have sufficient technological, financial or information resources to use the GI), may threaten social cohesion at the local level. It is therefore important to analyze impacts beyond the group of GI producers.

Accountability for positive effects from the GI system is a very important issue. Local actors should measure and trace performance of the GI system with regard to collective values (social issues, environment, biodiversity preservation, etc.) and be able to communicate these effects outside the local production system, both to consumers and to other relevant actors (public authorities, environmental associations, etc.).

In order to assess the impacts, a conceptual scheme may be useful to evaluate as a whole [see box 1], as well as the actions individually and collectively undertaken to develop and manage the GI product, taking into account the balance of economic, social and environmental sustainability issues.
Case study 2: Social and environmental sustainability
CHERRY OF LARI (Italy)

Because of renewed consumer interest in environmental and cultural traditions linked to food, producers started to set up and manage a network of actors interested in supporting the GI system for Cherry of Lari. Many local agencies that are not part of the cherry value chain or are outside the territory have been involved in the valorization strategy: the Lari Municipality, the local Cultural and Tourism Associations, the Province of Pisa, the Tuscan Regional Administration, the local Chamber of Commerce and the Slow Food Association. These actors are interested in connecting the image of the cherry to other rural amenities, such as the landscape, environmental quality, art, culture and traditions, in order to promote the area. The involvement of these actors outside the supply chain has increased the awareness of the cherry producers and as well as the economic and cultural value of the cherry, while strengthening the will of producers to improve the quality image of the product. Other actors include some agents external to the local production system who have been undertaking research activities aimed at preserving the many native cherry tree varieties (National Research Council, ARSIA-Tuscan Region, Universities of Florence and Pisa). A growing concern for better preservation of biodiversity stimulated the involvement of these actors. Collective initiatives were promoted for technical, agronomic and marketing. A collective brand and a collective processing plant for producing jams have been established, as well as some educational initiatives with local primary schools regarding the cherry’s history. Riding on the wave of this renewed enthusiasm and producer cohesion, the local municipality was influential in constituting a National Association of Cherry Municipalities, dedicated to reinforcing research and promotional activities for cherries across Italy. Overall, the qualification process has delivered numerous benefits. It has reinforced solidarity and cohesion between farmers by making producers meet when no association was previously active in the area. The producer association represents the interests of producers in their negotiations with agencies and institutions. Finally, the qualification process, by encouraging the defence and promotion of the cherry, acted as a catalyst for the involvement of other local and non-local actors. The qualification process stimulated collective action within the value chain and outside in a wider network.

BOX 1: SOME QUESTIONS FOR SUSTAINABILITY EVALUATION

Economic sustainability
- Did the GI system increase the product’s reputation in the market over time?
- Did the production volume and incomes grow as a result?
- Did it create new marketing opportunities? Did marketing relationships improve?
- To what extent are local actors actually receiving economic benefits from the GI’s reputation? Did local employment increase?
- What are the main obstacles that producers face in marketing their products?
- To what extent is the legal protection of the GI helping producers improve their income?
- What are the main obstacles for respecting the CoP? What are the consequences?
- Did consumer knowledge of and reliance on the GI product improve?
- What is the impact of GI product initiatives on the local economy? Did the acquired reputation of the product benefit other local actors outside the value-chain?

Sociocultural sustainability
- Which producers benefit the most? Which benefit the least?
- How are economic benefits distributed along the value-chain? Are there any bottlenecks preventing fair redistribution?
- To what extent do actors take part in the initiatives set up by the collective organization? Did local actors improve their technical, managerial or relationship skills?
- Are local actors effectively taking part in decisions and actions surrounding the GI product?
- Do we have an equitable distribution of the benefits among GI producers?
- Are there any gender equality issues? Has communication within the GI system improved?
- Are there any conflicts that have emerged following initiatives surrounding the GI product?
- Are the rights of workers sufficiently respected?
- Are local actors aware and proud of their knowledge, traditions and work, as well as their cultural identity and way of living?
- Is local culture and savoir-faire threatened or negatively affected in any way by the functioning of the GI system?

Environmental sustainability
- Have the rules of the CoP and the individual and collective actions implemented preserved or improved local natural resources?
- Do the initiatives surrounding the GI products threaten local natural resources?
- Are there any problems with important natural resources such as water or land (quality, quantity) linked to GI production processes?
- What are the impacts on biodiversity preservation? Do the GI product initiatives threaten local specific plant varieties, local breeds, agro biodiversity or landscapes?
PRACTICE

Think about the issues raised in this chapter in relation to your situation.

Answer the following questions
1) Referring to box 1 of this chapter, answer the questions on social, economic, and environmental sustainability.
2) In which area (social, economic, environmental) could your GI system improve the sustainable approach of the reproduction cycle?
3) How do you think you can improve this area?
4.2 The evolution of rules over time

Introduction

Different factors influence the GI system: the characteristics of producers, the local environment, production techniques, consumer needs, retailer requirements and legislative obligations that evolve over time. From this perspective, the rules defining GI products may also change, as new strategies are adopted in response to new challenges. When local actors determine that changes are necessary, they can agree to modify the code of practice (CoP), provided that the GI product’s specific quality and its link to the territory are maintained.

Living products

Indeed, GI systems are not static: they should evolve to take into account the developments in the market and to ensure the reproduction of local resources in a sustainable perspective. That is why changes and updates to the CoP should always be possible.

It is important to expect that local products are constantly evolving, however, what producers have defined as core specific qualities should always remain the same. Therefore, some elements of the CoP are key characteristics necessary to maintain the unique originality of the product and its image for consumers; others can be considered less significant points of the CoP and may change, provided that the management of the GI and the community of producers ensure a meticulous technical evaluation and reach consensus.

The reasons the rules change

What are the reasons for making changes to the rules? There are several factors and they can affect different components of the CoP (definition of the product, raw materials and processes, delimitation of the area). The following examples are provided to illustrate some of the reasons why the rules may evolve. This list is not exhaustive.

1. The rules agreed on in the CoP no longer fit market demand

- If the initial rules are too strict, they may not allow for a sufficient quantity to be sold on markets:

   This is the case of the GI for Brazilian beef, "Pampa Gaucho da Campanha meridional", that restricts the production capacity to only a few animals per week. As a result, the market impact is low and it is difficult for additional producers to enter the GI group. Some evolution of the rules is possible without changing the overall product (see case study 11 in chapter 1.4).
• If the initial rules are too loose, GI producers may decide to strengthen them in order to enhance product quality, or incorporate additional environmental and social aspects:

For example, the Roquefort cheese made from raw ewes’ milk has an image and reputation for quality and natural tradition. In order to maintain this reputation and the corresponding quality expected by consumers, breeders in the Roquefort GI management council decided to ban the use of silage feed. They decided to write this rule into their CoP.

• Consumer preferences can change, this may create the need for some adaptations in the production process or in the presentation:

In the case of Prisuttu (ham) in Corse (France), as a result of the trend of consumers desiring less-salty products, a discussion about the minimum amount of salt needed for ham curing has been conducted among local producers. The use of salt was originally the only way to preserve the product, but as cooling facilities are now available, using less salt for curing may even allow for an improvement in the quality (aromatic expression) of the final product.

Case study 3: Increasing market demand and resource shortage can lead to the modification of the rules

**TEQUILA (Mexico)**

In the case of Tequila from Mexico, since the establishment of the first official standard (1949), the constraints of production and markets have been eased by different changes in the CoP. Agave production is subject to cycles of surplus and shortage. During periods of shortage the ratio of agave for the distillation process was reduced to 70 percent in 1964 and then to 51 percent in 1970, while in contrast, a high quality segment was created with 100 percent agave-based Tequila. From 1997 to 2000, the blue agave population decreased drastically, by 50 percent, following a fungal infection and an early winter frost. This scarcity of agave was exacerbated by the contemporaneous skyrocketing demand for Tequila in domestic and international markets (particularly in the United States and Europe). In response, in 2000, the companies proposed to reduce the agave sugar content to 30 percent. However, this proposal was not accepted by the government, in order to protect the reputation of the product and avoid conflicts with farmers.

2. Some new scientific information or available technical innovations may facilitate the production process while keeping the basic features of the GI product:
   • New scientific information may permit a better description of local resources and their influence on product quality:
     On the basis of precise qualitative studies, some adjustments were brought to the original delimited area of Champagne French AOC in 2007, after a long local deliberation process.
   • Technical innovations, not originally foreseen but then widely adopted by producers and that do not impact on the specificities of the final GI product may need to be introduced into the CoP.
     For example, mechanization in wine harvesting has been widely adopted in most PDO wine-producing areas in France. It has been shown not to jeopardize the quality and characteristics of the end product and therefore has been accepted.

3. Stakeholders want to enhance the system sustainability.
   • The sustainability assessment in the reproduction phase may lead producers to change or add some rules to better take into account environmental and social issues:
     Beaumes-de-Venise is a famous French protected Denomination of Origin producing a famous white muscatel wine. The GI management body acted to modify the production rules, in order to forbid vineyards on the wood-planted slopes around the village. These areas will be protected and become part of a communal preservation area. In this way, the GI management body ensures soil protection and maintains the beautiful landscape, which is a candidate to become a Unesco “cultural landscape”.

4. General changes in the global environment:
   • Climatic changes may mean that schedules and even some technical activities will need to be adjusted.

How to change the rules
The link between the product and its territory may be continuously reinterpreted in light of changes in the economic, environmental and social conditions at the local and global levels. The producers should act to guarantee that the authenticity of the product is kept over time and that the local specific resources used in the production process are regenerated in order to retain the essence of the product’s characteristics.

The rule-setting mechanism should therefore allow for the evolution of rules over time. However, this possibility should not encourage dispensing with the necessary care in setting the rules in the first place. Changes should not be done hastily and must be subject to careful consideration.
The process for changing the rules should follow the same procedures described in part 2, allowing for local producer participation, discussions and democratic decisions only after evaluating the pros and cons of each change with the help of the external support network.

In the case of a protected GI, changes must be done in accordance with laws that regulate the registration and protection of the GI (See chapter 5.1). Procedures may be more or less complicated according to the countries and over time.

Case study 4: Changing the rules for a GI within a new national legal framework
HAM OF UZICE/ZLATIBOR (Republic of Serbia)

The Zlatiborska/ Užiæka Pršuta (Ham of Uzice/Zlatibor) is a meat product made of smoked beef, produced in the district of Zlatibor, exclusively in the Municipality of Ėajetina; more specifically, in the village of Maëkat. It is a unique product, which has a long tradition in Zlatibor. Traditionally, the smoked meat of Zlatibor was made with beef and the animals (mainly working animals) used to be 4 to 6 years old before being slaughtered so that the smoked meat retained a strong flavour. Only specific parts of the legs, sirloins, tenderloins and the low end of the back are used for Pršuta. One semi-industrial producer of Pršuta registered “Užicka Pršuta” as a PDO in 1995 as a state company and began coordinating the use among Producers. As a way to reduce constraints to the minimum, there was an absence of conditions regarding the meat’s origin and no specific practices differentiating the PDO process from any other process. Consequently, today more traditional producers sell higher quality products on the market compared to the only officially authorized user, the semi-industrial company that has since been privatized. In 2006, a new law established a revised registration process to guarantee minimum quality, extend the authorization to all local users complying with the CoP and make the PDO more sustainable. This new application has the support of the municipality, IDA, a local NGO, which is in contact with the Ministry of Agriculture and the Intellectual Property Office to re-register the PDO under the new law. Since the beginning of 2007, meetings and working groups have been organized to establish a new CoP, supported by most of the Pršuta producers in the area. In the case of the defined area of primary production and inclusion of the breeding practices in the revised CoP, this could improve economic and social sustainability along the food chain as the product would be more linked to the local place and local breeders will have a stronger negotiation position and a right to benefit from the GI channels. Zlatiborska/ Užiæka Pršuta could become one of the first registered products under the new Serbian law on PDO/PGI.

PRACTICE

Think about the issues raised in this chapter in relation to your situation.

Answer the following questions

- Do you need to modify your CoP? Why?
- Which problems could be solved by this modification?
- Does this modification generate a dominant position or increase the bargaining power of certain GI stakeholders?
- Do all producers agree with the modification?
- Will the proposed modification of the CoP change the characteristics of the GI product? Will consumers accept the modification?
4.3 Extended territorial strategies for increasing rural development

Introduction

Rural development is based on the integration of all the activities located in the area of production. Agriculture is only one of the sectors involved in the process of development; the environment and local populations are important players of the process too. GIs, in this perspective, can represent a valid opportunity to enhance local development and generate a sustainable virtuous circle with positive benefits for the whole community.

Geographical indication as a leverage for extended territorial strategies

GI products, as a richness anchored in the territory, allow for the adoption of extended territorial strategies. This means that local stakeholders can use the GI product, the associated specific local resources (local gastronomy, traditions, landscapes, etc.) and its reputation as tools to increase the competitiveness of the entire local social and economic system. Indeed the GI process can strengthen the territory’s capacity to attract consumers and tourists to the production area and can offer a differentiated basket of local products and services based on the use of local resources. As a result, other economic activities can be developed or strengthened both by GI producers and by other local firms.

Within an extended territorial strategy, the GI product can also benefit from the attraction capacity of the territory. Important tourist locations and attractions for example (museums, archaeological sites, particular landscapes, ski resorts, etc.) may benefit the marketing of the GI product.

Such a strategy requires effective collective coordination and synergies between the different activities concerned to avoid competition for the same resources and conflicts between local firms. It is therefore necessary to consider how a global territorial strategy can be coordinated within sectors.

Investing in rural tourism

Local tourism and GI products present clear synergies, the development of one contributing to the other. This interaction is particularly evident in cultural events organized around products representing a region, as it links traditions, culture or gastronomic itineraries (cheese museum, saffron festival, wine and olive-oil celebrations, etc). GI reputation can benefit from local economic and social development. Therefore, actors in the tourism industry can play an important role in supporting the collective promotion of the GI product as an ambassador of the locality, by disseminating information and organizing itineraries for tourists such as a combination of scenic excursions and gastronomic stopovers in restaurants or at a production site (See box 7).
On the other hand, local resources participating in building the specific quality of a product constitute significant resources for tourism as well. Remarkable landscapes shaped by agricultural systems over time, specific native animal breeds, plant varieties, production know-how and traditions can serve as vehicles for attracting tourists.

The development and promotion of a GI product can serve as a starting point for the development and promotion of the entire geographical and cultural heritage, as well as for a related number of other products. In addition to encouraging the economic development of other local activities, adding value through tourism can facilitate the collective promotion of a product and the exploration of new marketing channels. Through this perspective, agri-tourism has become a tool for the diversification of farm activities, promoting local products and resources through tasting and direct selling to tourists and consumers.

**Case study 5: Extended territorial strategy: benefiting from the reputation of the GI**

**LARDO DI COLONNATA (Italy)**

Lardo di Colonnata (pig fat) is produced in a very small village (Colonnata) in the Tuscan mountains (Massa-Carrara province), using a very specific production process (in particular, maturing the Lardo in marble tubs placed in caves or in cellars, without conditioning) (see case study 5 in chapter 2.3). The Lardo di Colonnata became famous in Italy in the 1990s. The production area is restricted to the small village of Colonnata which favoured the identification of the product with the village and its population. Lardo became the symbol of the village and the catalyst of a comprehensive local development strategy. Following the growing acquired notoriety and reputation, many other families living in Colonnata became small and artisanal producers of the Lardo, setting up many other economic activities as well, such as restaurants, small shops, guesthouses, etc. The Lardo economy also revitalized tourism activity linked to the visiting of the marble quarries close to the village, in the Alpi Apuane mountains. Therefore, many young people who had emigrated to work elsewhere came back to the village to undertake new economic activities, like opening new restaurants or grocery stores and organizing visits to the marble caves.

Source: Belletti G., Marescotti A. 2006

**Conditions for setting-up extended territorial strategies**

There are some necessary preconditions for activating an extended territorial strategy based on a GI:

1. The GI product must represent an element of identity for all local actors (not only those involved in the production process), and assume the role of catalyst in the planning of a comprehensive integrated rural development strategy.
2. In addition to the reputation of the GI product linked to the territory, the territory should be attractive or have the potential to attract external consumers (tourists), who may enjoy buying typical products (the GI and other local products) and services in the territory itself; in this way, short distribution channels can maximize the positive economic effects inside the territory.

3. Social cohesion is relevant as well, to support the consolidation of the identity based on the product and enhance linkages between different economic sectors and common projects (for example, the organization of a local fair or routes connecting production units, tourism sites, restaurants and hotel accommodations; see case study 6).

4. The local resources, (natural, cultural, historic, etc.), should be very specific and well recognizable by consumers.

Case study 6: GI as a tool for promoting the territory
Linking local wine and tourism activity - (Brazil)

Goethe wine has been produced in the Urussanga region of Brazil for more than a century, and takes its specific identity from the local wine tradition and the vine variety. The producers, in collaboration with the local Government (municipio), agronomic public services, the state government and the Federal University of Santa Catarina, are working for the recognition of their wine through a Geographical Indication. “Vales da Uva Goethe” will be one of the first GIs registered by the national intellectual property office, under Brazilian law. The association “PROGOETHE” is also carrying out some rural tourism activities in a dynamic with local development. They propose oenotouristic tours in the area, networking with different local economic activities such as:

- a visit to a museum presenting the history of wine and the vine culture in the region;
- a church with specific sacred art;
- visits and tastings in Goethe wine cellars and;
- meals in famous restaurants in which they serve the Goethe wine.

Thanks to these kinds of tourist activities, the economy of the whole area is benefiting from the fame and the recognition of the wine.

Source: www.progoethe.com.br/atrativos.php

Involving local stakeholders for extended territorial strategies

In order to develop an extended territorial strategy, it is necessary to involve local stakeholders from other sectors in the process of adding value. It is important to organize meetings within the local community in order to explain the process of developing and promoting the specific quality of the product and to show that it is also an economic opportunity for the territory as a whole through interactions with other economic and social networks.
Therefore, there is a need for the involvement of local public actors to facilitate the integrated development strategy involving different sectors and social groups and providing for an enabling environment. Indeed, public actors should guide their actions to take into account not only economic and business issues, but important social, cultural and natural environmental issues as well. In successful cases, the rural community, private sector and different levels of government can contribute to the reproduction or the improvement of local specific resources and to the generation of other economic and social opportunities and activities by working in close partnerships with common goals.

This interaction between sectors, in particular agriculture and tourism, is relevant at both the local and national levels (see case study 7). Indeed, public and private policies for tourism could highlight the gastronomic heritage and give visibility to local products, for example, by facilitating their emphasis in restaurants inside and outside the territory.

**Case study 7: Linking GIs to rural tourism development (Morocco)**

In Morocco, GI products have recently been used as a starting point for mobilizing a wide range of stakeholders to develop tourism in rural areas. This is the case for products such as saffron and argan oil in the Anti-Atlas mountains. Some tourist routes have been developed around the theme of saffron and argan oil production, with visits to the villages, introduction to the production techniques, tasting sessions and the possibility to buy the products. Some village groups, supported by NGOs, have even developed infrastructures to receive tourists for longer periods, letting them spend a few nights in the villages. This has encouraged investment in the cleanliness and hygiene of the villages. This is part of “sustainable tourism” networking which is promoted through a website [www.tourisme-atlas.com](http://www.tourisme-atlas.com) that allows international and national tourists to choose their destination linked to a typical product’s territory identifying the attractions, accommodations and restaurants. This development project is supported by different actors (Agence de développement social du Maroc; NGO Migrations et développement, French Agency for Development, European commission).

PRACTICE

Think about the issues raised in this chapter in relation to your situation.

Answer the following questions

Engaging in the territory

• Do you know all the resources of your territory?
• What are the other economic activities that use local resources and are located within the territory? How does coordination work between activities?
• Is the reputation of your product linked to the reputation of the territory?
• What plan of action could be developed to coordinate local actors in an extended territorial strategy (communication, training, etc.)?
• What are the challenges and the opportunities of developing such a strategy?

Tourism Potential

• Is your production system attractive for tourists? Why?
• What is the potential for rural tourism/agri-tourism development (attractiveness of the region, sites of interest, restaurants, hotels, etc)? Are there any possibilities for farmers to host tourists at their production sites?
• Are the local public actors aware of the rural development potential of the GI products? Are they informed or involved in the development of the GI scheme?
• Are any external consumers coming to the area? Who are they?
• What are the main advantages and constraints?
• What could we do in order to develop direct sales or promotion of the product in restaurants and hotels (improved packaging, selling point, contracting with hotel and restaurants, etc.)?