

# Geographical Indication As A Tool For Revitalizing Endangered Traditions And Sustaining Livelihoods

Anjali Yadav<sup>1\*</sup>, Rajender Singh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Department of Geography, Swami Shraddhanand College, University of Delhi

<sup>2</sup>Department of Geography, Shivaji College, University of Delhi

**Citation:** Anjali Yadav et al., (2024), Geographical Indication As A Tool For Revitalizing Endangered Traditions And Sustaining Livelihoods *Educational Administration: Theory And Practice*, 30(2), 1071-1081, Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i2.4408

---

## ARTICLE INFO

Article Submission  
25 January 2024

Revised Submission  
8 February 2024

Article Accepted  
27 February 2024

## ABSTRACT

Geographical indications (GIs) allude to items with explicit attributes, features or notorieties coming about because of their geological beginning. This separates items in light of remarkable neighborhood elements, history or particular qualities connected to normal and human variables, like soil, environment, nearby ability, and customs. GIs are perceived as intellectual property rights (IPRs) as well as thusly provide both a supportive promoting device and insurance of the name. GIs can be utilized to encourage sustainable food systems and sustainable development (SD) by subsequent Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) practice of the virtuous ring of origin-linked quality. On the off chance that they live up to their capability to advance financial turn of events and food security, they could give a promising regional way to deal with accomplishment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In this perspective, assuring economic feasibility is crucial, although there is scant empirical validation of the advantages of GIs, particularly in nations where GI processes are relatively new. Commencement with the authorized acknowledgement of a GI as well as the stages that follow, this research aims to offer empirical validation on the economic effects produced by the GI procedure. It examines nine cases with a focus on the food industry and provides a range of local value chains and national contexts. The strategy takes into account "operational" GI procedures: such where a training code (or determinations) is characterized and the GI is utilized as well as overseen by an aggregate association.

**Keywords:** Geographical Indication, Sustainable Development, WHO, FAO, Food tagging, SDG

---

## 1. Introduction

This research manages the job of GIs in developing cycles of endogenous country improvement in non-industrial nations. We hypothesize that GIs might be able to propel resilient confined agro food systems or more general procedures of rural progress forward. The foundation of Topographical Signs frameworks in Africa is bit by bit turning into an effective issue in the agro food writing with trustworthy establishments, like in United Nations (UN), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) is checking out it. The European GI framework's success is partly to blame for this development. The conversation is focused on how the European framework can be embraced in Africa to improve farming productivity and to help rustic turn of events.

Despite this, the dangers of establishing and managing GIs that haven't been chosen well have been broadly discussed in the previous studies [1]. In point of fact, researchers [2-3] highlight significant differences between nations regarding institutionalization of GI. On the opposite side, late examinations have shown that a sound and thorough GI framework might achieve great monetary, social, and natural effects in non-industrial nations [3]. GIs allude to items with explicit attributes, characteristics or notorieties coming about because of their geological beginning. This separates items in light of remarkable neighborhood elements, history or particular qualities connected to normal and human variables, like soil, environment, nearby ability, and customs. GIs are perceived as licensed innovation privileges (IPRs) as well as thusly provide both a supportive promoting device and name insurance.

This research examines the future scopes as well as challenges related with the utilization of GIs to advance biocultural items on the lookout. Biocultural items are delivered utilizing traditional knowledge (TK). They are ordinarily one of a kind to a geological region and are gotten from the specific natural assets, conventional information and social qualities and polices related with the scene that can build the 'biocultural legacy' of native people groups and neighborhood networks [4].

India is a country with ten biogeographic zones that is biologically and culturally diverse. It is also home to a wealth of products that are produced by utilizing the biocultural understanding of tribal individuals as well as native societies. Such products have the capability to reduce poverty, boost indigenous economies, defend biodiversity, preserve TK and values, as well as improve community cohesiveness at the same time. The World Trade Organization (WTO) reported the Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property that provides GIs. These are a type of IPR [5]. India had to pass the GIs of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act in 2003 because it is an integral participant of the WTO [5]. The economic, ecological and social effects of such GI registrations are examined in this paper, along with the present status of GIs in India. Through case studies, the paper demonstrates some of the restrictions of the GI certification tool as well as the GI Act. Case studies and in-depth deliberations with a variety of investors, involving representatives from the legal experts, GI Registry as well as recipients of GI-registered goods, are used to develop recommendations for ensuring the tool's success in promoting and protecting TK and biological resources.

The public authority of India, as well as givers and NGO s, ought to offer specific help to empower nearby affiliations addressing customary makers to enlist GIs for their biocultural items straightforwardly with the goal that they can catch the full advantages. This incorporates specialized and monetary help to help unfortunate networks survey and upgrade the market capability for their items, figure out the GI prerequisites, lay out as well as enroll neighborhood associations, complete the Administrative work and application cycle, and screen as well as uphold the GI once conceded. A few state legislatures in India are putting forth attempts to guarantee that the craftsman and ranchers who have gotten GIs on their items can receive rewards from the creation and offer of their items. The public authority of Karnataka has made unique assembling parks and gave craftsman space to work and create and sell their products. Exceptional biocultural products associated to specific landscapes/geographical regions and cultural practices can be protected with GIs. Instead of waiting for the potential of mutual advantage from their economic utilize by others, they could assist conventional makers in capturing the complete economic profits from their products. Be that as it may, GI enlistment and requirement presents critical monetary and regulatory difficulties for limited scope makers. As a result, it may be in your greatest interest to primary create a market for such products as well as then only look for GIs for traditional products that are most probably to advantage.

## 2. Legislative Background

India was required to abide by the terms of the WTO Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) when it became a member of the WTO on January 1, 1995. This understanding requires WTO individuals to sanction a set-up of licensed innovation regulations, including for the security of plant assortment freedoms and to accommodate the counteraction of the deceptive utilization of geological signs. India passed the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act (PPVFR Act) and the GIs Act to fulfill these TRIPS obligations [6]. The rights of farmers and conventional societies in locating biological resources from which the different plantation breeds can be developed are acknowledged by the PPVFR Act. In this regard, it differs from the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) Convention, to which approximately seventy-five nations have signed<sup>1</sup>. In contrast to the PPVFR Act, which makes no discussion on agriculturalists' constitutional rights as well as offers for larger duration of protection for plant diversities than the Indian legislation, the most current version of the UPOV Convention that was sanctioned in 1961 as well as upgraded in 1978 and further 1991, restricts farmers' ability to protect germs for future yields. In a new report to the Association Horticulture Clergyman as well as PPRFR Authority Executive, concern has been communicated by rural researchers, activists and rancher pioneers about "a bothersome endeavor to adjust the PPVFR Act and UPOV by broadening the extent of security for enlisted assortments" [6].

long with the appreciation of agriculturalists' rights, the acknowledgement of the likelihood of agriculturalists' diversities being registered is the PPVFR Act's most significant feature [6]. This has prompted a level of pressure among the supporting of ranchers as well as the consolation of the Indian seed rearing business. "A facilitative environment for the development of a localized as well as competitive seed trade" was the goal of the 2002 National Seeds Policy. According to Clause 2.11 of the 2002 Policy, "seed exchange between seed manufacturers as well as agriculturalists will be fortified to promote non-conventional and new diversities" and "seeds of freshly made varieties must be accessible to agriculturalists with least gap of time" are two of the provisions that were mandated. To execute the novel strategy a Seeds Bill was presented in the Rajya Sabha on 9 December, 2004. Farmers, who were worried about losing their customary rights to seeds, and members of civil culture as well as politicians who were worried about the effect of international cosmopolitan seed enterprises and the potential damage of biodiversity from monocultures, opposed the Bill. Answering this analysis, the Seeds Bill 2004 has gone through three corrections. The latest version, which was created in 2011, is still awaiting as well as might be offered at the upcoming Parliament session.

### 3. An Overview on GI Act of India

Before the GIs of Goods (Registration and Protection Act) of 1999 (as earlier mentioned to as the GI Act), which governed the use of GIs, India had no separate legislation [6]. The GIs of Goods (Registration and Protection) Rules, 2002 (as earlier referred to as the GI Rules) followed the GI Act. Before this, GIs were administrated by general commandment principles. The GIs Registry, which has authority over the entirety of India and is located in Chennai, was established by the Central Government in accordance with the GI Act that took effect on September 15, 2003. Here, producers can submit applications to register their corresponding GIs. The GI is regulated by the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks— who is the Registrar of GIs. The following is how the GI Act's Section 2(3) defines geographical indications:

*When it comes to goods, a "Geographical Indication" refers to a sign that detects these products as manufactured products, natural products or agronomic products, as instigating in the terrain of a nation, or a vicinity/area in that terrain, where a agreed quality, status, or other feature of these products is necessarily attributable to its topographical origin. In the case of developed goods, one of the events of either the manufacture, processing, or formation of the products in question occurs in these terrain.*

The Indian Act's definition of GI above allows non-geographic names like "Alphonso" and "Basmati" to be taken into account GIs if the foundation can be proven. In addition, the delineation likewise considers various phases in the creation action — from handling to assembling as well as underscores on human variables to guarantee the security of different GIs in the domain of workmanship as well as hand woven material business of India. Additionally, despite the fact that Article 23's TRIPS provision only applies to spirits/wines; underneath the Indian Demonstration, the Focal Government has been provided the watchfulness to agree comparable security to different classes of products likewise, by telling these merchandise in the Authority Gazette. The Public authority of India vide its notice dated October 01, 2010 has stretched out extra assurance to spirits/wines. This warning principally appears to work with the enrollments of a few applications from unfamiliar nations, under Show Applications, of which roughly 3/4th represent spirits/wines. Manufacturing products, natural goods, agricultural products, handicraft goods, as well as food are all included in the Act's definition of "goods." This order isn't comprehensive and the Timetable IV of the GI Principles records the Global Arrangement of Products for the motivations behind enrollment of topographical sign [6].

The GI Act stipulates that process is carried out in two stages: Part A is about registering GI, and Part B is about registering authorized users and property owners with their names, addresses, and descriptions. The registration procedures for GI in India are depicted in Figure 1. The Demonstration specifies that the application for enrollment can be stimulated by "any relationship of people or makers or any association or expert laid out by or under any regulation for time being in power addressing the curiosity of the makers of the concerned merchandise, who are burning of enlisting a GI" as well as needs to apply recorded as a hard copy in the endorsed structure in three-fold alongside the recommended expense. For each class of goods, the application fee is Rs. 5,000. According to the GI Act and Rules, the complete registration application procedure takes a long time and requires legal counsel. If there are no objections or objections, the registration deadline is nine months (three months for promoting from the date of the investigation report, three months for advertising from the date of promotion for conflict), based on the duration. However, neither the Rules nor the Act identify the least duration frame for the board's establishment from the date of application receipt. Additionally, in the event of a protest throughout assessment, there is no notice of as far as possible to illuminate the candidate about the insights about the complaint while as far as possible for the candidate to solution the questions is plainly referenced. If there is conflict to the advertised application, the correspondence for the registration of the application becomes cumbersome, and the prescribed time frame may extend significantly beyond twenty four months. In addition, the registration must be reintroduced annually for 10 years.

The GI or authorized user must submit a renewal application no later than six months prior to the expiration of their previous registration. It must be filed by the listed owner, or by any of the sanctioned workers listed on the record if that fails. The Registrar has the right to immediately eliminate a GI or sanctioned operator from the record and publish an announcement in the Journal if the renewal charges have not been compensated by the time, the GI or approved worker's previous registration has expired.

### 4. States Role in GI Implications

In the beginning, GI owners who were not straightly included in the manufacture of the products were increasingly government departments, statutory boards, or businesses. A speedy look at the owners of the enlisted GIs demonstrate that Administration Divisions, Sheets, Scholarly Establishments, and elements upheld by Government comprise the greater part of the all out owners for enrolled products (barring fabricated and staple) from India subsequent by social orders (associations as well as makers) (17%), affiliations (12%), NGOs/Trust/Establishment (5%), rancher maker associations and Colleges (10%), as well as blends thereof

among such different sorts of (6%) [7]. This brings up the relevant issue concerning whether the State is able to be an owner of GI merchandise. As a communal right, the owner's primary accountability is to represent the producers' interests. In addition, being recognized as an official worker under Part B of the GI Act requires the administrator's approval. In this way, the owner holds the ability to incorporate and reject clients. In this context, Noteworthy that the GI Act requires that the aspirant be a "relation of manufacturers/people or any authority/association built by or under any commandment" that signifies the manufacturers' interests as well as that the declaration of case must include information about the producers for whom the application is being moved. The Act defines the term "producer" as any individual who:

- (i) In the event that such products are farming merchandise, makers' the merchandise and incorporates the individual who cycles or bundles such merchandise;
- (ii) Assuming such merchandise are normal products, takes advantage of the merchandise;
- (iii) On the off chance that such merchandise are painstaking work or modern merchandise, makes or fabricates the products then integrates any person who preparations/exchanges in these formation, double-dealing, accumulating/making, by and large, of the goods.

**Table 1: Some Significant State Tagging Food as GI Products**

State	Product	Category
Assam	Darjeeling Tea	Tea
Andhra Pradesh	Tirupati Laddu,	Sweet
Goa	Cashew Feni	country liquor status
Odissa	Odissa Rasgulla	Sweet
Karnataka	Monsoonal Malabar Coffee,	Coffee beverage
Telangana	Hyderabad Haleem	Dish
Madhya Pradesh	Ratlami Sev MP	Salty
Maharashtra	Mahabaleshwar Strawberry	Fruit
Maharashtra	Nashik Valley Wine	Beverage
Bengal	Bardhaman Sitabhog (Food)	Sweet
Rajasthan	Bikaneri Bhujia	Salty
Madhya Pradesh	J Kadaknath Black Chicken Meat	Chicken meat
Bengal	Joynagar Moa (Food)	Sweet
Karnataka	Dharwad Pedha (Food)	Sweet
Andhra Pradesh	Bandar Laddu	Sweet
Bengal	Bardhaman Mihidana (Food)	Sweet
Bengal	Banglar Rasgulla	Sweet
Bengal	Bardhaman Sitabhog (Food)	Sweet

As a result, though the Act is clear about relations of people or manufacturers, more research is needed to see if a government agency, constitutional body, or section can become a legitimate candidate and if they can actually signify the producers' interests even if they are trading, producing, packaging, processing goods or products. The case of Toda Embroidery is interesting in this context. In September 2008, Toda Nalavaazhvu Sangam and the Keystone Foundation (KF) submitted a GI application for Toda Embroidery. The previous TNS is a general public legitimately settled under Enlistment center of Udgamandalam, the Nilgiris, Tamil Nadu by the individuals from the Toda clan local area to function for their advancement while KF is a Public Magnanimous Trust by and by engaged with advancing and creating Toda Weaving among craftswomen. After thorough consultations, the application was accepted and published in GI Journal No. 29, published on March 19, 2009. Based on the notice, resistance was documented by Tamil Nadu Crafted works Advancement Company (Poompuhar) expressing that as a zenith body responsible for the improvement of handiworks area in Tamil Nadu, they were the "legitimately comprised structure to that advocate the reason as well as government assistance of craftsman in the State" and subsequently the legitimate owners or candidates.

Toda communal associates were also beneficiaries of a number of progress assistance programs as well as support networks that were expanded to the handicrafts worker. Further, they brought up that Poompuhar has been the Commissionerate of Handiworks beginning around 2006-07 under the state government that centers on the improvement of craftsman in painstaking work area in a comprehensive way. They claimed that the application had been filed "with the mala as well as sole fide purpose" of dominating a right that was lawfully theirs, and that they were "stunned and concerned to know about the Candidate's change vide the application to the GI on Toda Embroidery." They also conflict the application on the grounds that the candidates did not signify the manufacturers' benefits but rather those of craftsperson and genuine manufacturers. In the counterstatement, the two KF as well as TNS explained their situation and expressed that while they to be sure addressed the welfares of the makers, they had no issue with Poompuhar being an approved client since they too addressed the interest of the makers.

Following this, the November 30, 2012 Order from the Registrar of GI stated that the aspirants had been capable to validate that they are authorized entities that signify the manufacturers' interests, making their

request valid. In addition, the Order made it clear that the rival, Poompuhar, also signified the producers' interests. In similar circumstances, the Intellectual Property Appellate Board had stated in its order OA/2/2010/GI/CH that interested parties may be approved co-applicant status. The ultimate goal of petitioners in these cases is to defend the manufacturers' interests. Given the individuality of the parties in this case, the court approved the applicant the status of registered proprietor as well as the opposition Poompuhar the status of co-applicant. In addition, it was stipulated that minimum twenty sanctioned product workers should register within six months of the order date.

In Toda embroidery case, the State agency objected, arguing that it was the rightful owner because it represented everyone's interests and had been given the position of co-applicant. Comparative commitment by the State in different limits – Government Offices, Endeavors, Sheets, Summit Agreeable Associations, Patent Data Communities – should be visible across enrolled products as well as applications forthcoming enlistments. Nilgiri Tea, Assam Tea and Darjeeling Tea (Tea Board of India) are examples of registered GIs owned by or supported by the government. Monsooned Malabar Robusta Coffee (Coffee Board), Monsooned Malabar Arabica Coffee Mango Malihabadi Dusseheri (Public Agriculture Board); Byadagi Chilli, Guntur Sanam Chilli, Alleppey/Coorg Green Cardamom, Malabar Pepper and Appemidi Mango (Karnataka), Udupi Brinjal, Mysore Jasmine, and so on.

However, the assumption that the government represents the interests of entire manufacturers may not always be accurate. Such can particularly true when they are a part of the marketing as well as manufacturing process (via organizations made up of non-agricultural as well as farming product producers). This may result in favoring government-affiliated producers and eliminating others. Investigators refer to the case of Kancheepuram Saree as well as Mysore Silk GI in which the enrolled owners (Karnataka State Silk Enterprises Partnership in the event of the previous as well as Division of Handlooms and Materials, Legislature of Tamil Nadu if there should be an occurrence of last option) can't guarantee eliteness. Because there were multiple producers working on such products external the reach of the registered owners, they were unable to assert their ownership rights. When the government is not a direct manufacturer, producers might also feel excluded. This could be the case in the case of a several agronomic goods that are submitted by universities or departments of state government (such as Horticulture) (such as Kerala Agricultural University for Pokkali, Jeerakasala, Wayanad, Navra, as well as Wayanad Gandhakasala Rice varieties, for example).

From the above discussion, it is clear that the State of India actively participates in the registering of GIs in India through its various agencies. This is very in opposition to the legitimate structure in activity in different regions of the planet, like the French lawful system, impacted generally by the EU lawful structure, wherein there has been a consistent removal of the state including bigger job for the maker gatherings.

## 5. Literature on GI

The conservation of natural as well as cultural resources as a component of native assets is mentioned in the previous studies on GIs, which demonstrates how GIs subsidize to several aspects of sustainability, particularly in association with social and economic sustainability. One more method for visualizing their optimistic commitment to manageability is to think about the arrangement of public products, as featured in the unique subject named "GIs, Public Merchandise, and Supportable Turn of events" [8-9]. In point of fact, GIs serve as a foundation for a broad variety of native public goods as well as resources, such as the status of the territory, local culture, food heritage, nature, the landscape and expertise, as well as the social/economic impacts on the terrain (such as the development of jobs, revenue, and social cohesion). Even though we are prompted that GI safety cannot be take into account an ecological tool, it can play a constructive part in the ecological preservation. Ecological features have also received improved interest. In addition, the GI studies has emphasized that GIs are not a magical instrument as well as that the native situations that can affect their formation and administration are essential to the GI's effectiveness and indigenous sustainability [10]. These essential circumstances can be summed up as follows:

- (i) The definite quality associated with origin, which is clearly stated in the provisions (to validate intellectual property rights as well as guarantee robust market diversity);
- (ii) The aggregate activity as well as regional administration;
- (iii) The successful promotion efforts (the GI is successfully utilized in product marketing); what's more
- (iv) The legitimate system and job of the public area, essentially relating to the powerful insurance of GIs.

Under such circumstances, the GI cycles have the ability to help an endogenous methodology, as the neighborhood native area of makers can become essential entertainers in characterizing norms. Relationships along value chains have the potential to be reshaped, particularly in global business, where market companies typically enforce their needs on agronomists. In such manner, GI procedures effectively upgrade nearby administration, which is perceived as an essential component in supportability, with the eventual result of being characterized as the fourth mainstay of manageability in the FAO structure "Maintainability Evaluation for Food and Horticulture Frameworks" [12].

**Table 2** Previous Work Review on GIs

Reference	Region	Issues Reviewed	Key Outcomes
Sharma and Pradhan (2023) [29]	India	TK about Himalayan states	The ABS procedure for creating a general architecture has been facilitated by the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) in the Hindu-Kush Himalayan area.
Rajasekharan, Nair, Navas, James and Murugan (2023) [30]	India	Sustainable utilization of traditional knowledge	Area wise subtleties of Customary information, wellsprings of TK, TK, and Wellbeing Customs in India, Approach embraced for the methodical records of TK, Earlier Educated assent was created by the Division of Ethno medication and ethnopharmacology, JNTBGRI, Kerala province of India, chose not many contextual analyses in the Oral Wellbeing Custom, therapy techniques winning among the ancestral as well as society networks to battle different medical problems, visa Content Information of information supplier, ethnomedicine and its extension in creating novel home grown drugs and nutraceuticals.
Prathap and Sreelaksmi (2022) [31]	India	Traditional handloom apparels with GI between Indian customers	Due to the lack of data indications that would allow them to evaluate the product's quality, traditional handloom apparel consumers frequently face a dilemma when making purchasing decisions. Information asymmetry is exacerbated by the proliferation of counterfeit goods on the market. The review plans to inspect factors affecting buy aim of conventional handloom attire that have GI confirmation followed by WIPO*.
Török, Jantyk, Maró and Moir (2020) [32]	EU	Real-World Influence of GIs	A few nations have striking GI marketplace size, and a few GI items play a formative part in both homegrown and send out business sectors; Nonetheless, it is not universal. Again, certain GI goods from certain regions may see significant price increases, but this may not outcome in greater manufacturer revenues because of the greater production costs and uneven dispersal of the value chain. The empirical results regarding how GIs can contribute to local prosperity were found to be the most contradictory, as were evidences of their negative effects on rural development.
Yang and Lee (2019) [33]	South Korea	Customer Studies to Examine Traditional and Authentic Foods	Sensory evocative investigation should be performed concurrently to define product features when cross-cultural customer studies is performed to support product growth and placement. This enables improved estimate of descriptors that effect customer suitability, resulting in the suitable product change and effective launch.
Cei et al. (2018) [34]	EU	Impacts of GIs on native economic progress	GIs can develop esteem integrated, particularly at shopper as well as merchant levels; Though, manufacturers are not evidently affected.
Albuquerque, Oliveira and Costa, (2018) [35]	EU	Meta-assessment on GI label impacts	There is a substantial and constructive borderline willingness to remuneration for GIs among consumers. Nevertheless, the individual GI standards' borderline willingness to remuneration varies meaningfully, indicating a wide range of secured goods.
Caputo et al. (2018) [36]	EU	Customers' attitude towards customary food yields	The EU's food quality labels are unfamiliar to European consumers. When purchasing traditional food products, origin is not the most important factor, but it is frequently viewed as an added value.
Dias and Mendes (2018) [37]	Several, EU and extra EU	Bibliometric assessment of the several research studies associated to GI	The 501 articles of theoretical research in the domain of food quality tags that were subjected to bibliometric analysis can be divided into four collections, signifying the most pertinent investigation subjects.
Mirna de Lima et al. (2016) [38]	Brazil	Summarizing the answers of GI-connected papers in the database of Brazilian CAPES journal	The common conclusion is that GIs can be considered to protect consumers and producers, aid in product differentiation through marketing, support rural development by maintaining native employment and individuality, and preserve ethos and components.

Grunert and Aachmann (2016) [39]	EU	Customer responses to the utilization of EU quality labels	The outcomes are clashing; by and large ends can't be made. Low awareness across a wide range of nations. GI names can assume a part, however this may be more modest than the job of other quality credits.
Feldmann and Hamm (2015) [40]	Europe and USA	Choices and perspectives for native food	Local food is not seen as more exclusive than organic food. Local food attracts a premium from consumers.
Bienenfeld and Roe (2014) [41]	Various, EU and extra EU	Meta-assessment of willingness to pay, particularly for organic diets	In light of 132 perceptions got from 29 papers, for natural items, a greater cost best is acknowledged by leafy foods items. From a methodological perspective, studies with more representative samples and contingent valuation demonstrate higher price premiums.

\*WIPO: World Intellectual Property Organization

Further issues emerge from an examination of the role that GIs play in sustainability. To begin with, most makers are either not mindful of the limit of GI cycles to add to maintainability or they come up short on abilities to incorporate all supportability components into the administration of their GI framework [13-15]. Second, GI procedures may have destructive externalities on their terrains, particularly once native manufacturers' perspectives are not taken into account. In this manner, drawing in GI makers in a maintainability system could aid decreasing destructive externalities, when they happen, and boost the commitment of the GI plan to economical turn of events. Mindful of both the possibilities and the difficulties with respect to the commitments GI procedures make to maintainability, both FAO and Beginning have teamed up starting around 2016 to help GI makers, characterized here as all worth chain entertainers associated with the creation of the last GI item, to foster their own base up GI manageability methodology. Since 2017, origin members have supported the Sustainability Strategy for GIs (SSGI), which aims to encourage manufacturers to participate in a policy that will lead to sustainability by crossing the subsequent phases [16]: Prioritize, Evaluate, and Enhance, with a Communication-specific cross-section. From this perspective, it is significant to give the fitting apparatuses to GI makers to allow them to become mindful of the issues connected with maintainability and to settle on needs (Focus on), from where they can evaluate what is happening (Survey) and characterize their activity intend to resolve the issues and increment their supportability execution (Move along). All through this way, correspondence is critical for both inner administration and remotely for public data. The capability to method the GIs sustainability in an inclusive way is a major challenge for this process because the literature on GIs typically focuses only on specific sustainability aspects. Albeit some examination has started to think about a complete way to deal with the evaluation of the manageability of GIs, specifically the Strenght2Food project (S2F), very few sources give a comprehensive perspective [17].

Manageability appraisals are perplexing cycles and call for investment and limits. As part of the endogenous growth as well as location dependent methodology, which are at the core of the GI procedures that subsidize to sustainability, the question in the framework of the SSGI is whether GI producers can access an inclusive method to GI sustainability (i.e., prioritizing concerns and analyzing with the progress in GI sustainability) [18].

The evaluation of GIs is the subject of significant research, most of which focuses on economic outcomes. Financial effects are especially vital to guarantee the suitability of GIs and to give intrigued administrators, contributors, or advancement offices proof that will animate them to put resources into this driver of rustic improvement. Even though the effects on ecological as well as social dimensions are also taken into account as portion of the "territorial effect," producers still primarily engage in the GI procedure because of the economic effects. Analyses of the effects of GI use using either a diachronic (after and before of GI registration) or synchronic (comparing two alike goods with and without GI) approach. The choice of method is frequently influenced by the scarcity of necessary data (particularly in developing nations).

Quantitative strategies are many times liked in these methodologies to give exact information that can be examined by utilizing factual techniques and utilized for correlations [19-20]. Subjective strategies are utilized in complementarity to give a top to bottom comprehension of perspectives and ways of behaving, and will generally be more participatory and intelligent. By and by, showing of the net advantages of GIs is generally scanty. Again, it becomes hard to simplify the outcomes because the contexts in which they were established, the power of native institutions, and, particularly, the dedication and efforts of the entire stakeholders in the GI value chain differ greatly from one case to the next. The trouble in forming a precise "chain of causality" that associates the GI to the restrained impact and separating the influence of the GI from other aspects like scientific advancements, policy dynamics, advertising and quality control is a common limitation revealed by the evaluations, regardless of their focus.

For sure, many elements, occasions, methodologies and human experiences are interlinked with GI advancement, from the primary thought talked about inside the nearby local area to GI enlistment and continuous administration. As a matter of fact, surveying manageability overall is considerably more complicated as it requires a comprehensive methodology connecting with wide multi-rules evaluation in order to cover the many elements of maintainability, while remembering that any enormous arrangement of pointers will in any case be an improvement of the real world (on the off chance that not a prognosis of the evaluator's

outlook) [21]. To consider the right harmony among a sensible number of markers as well as rearrangements, the decision of significant pointers is vital, contingent upon the concentration and general goal. From one viewpoint, the goal could be to assist a framework with checking progress by characterizing incorporated pointers that are explicitly adjusted to the specific framework (for instance, while surveying the quality and maintainability of limited scope frameworks). Building a generic grid with a variety of indicator sets that can be used in distinct systems in a similar way to permit for evaluation is an alternative strategy.

This is the case with the Strength2Food project (S2F) that uses 23 shared indicators to evaluate the sustainability of several quality systems like GI and organic [22]. The process of creating and implementing such a framework exemplifies the significance of selecting indicators that are both meaningful and feasible (in terms of data availability, resources, time and the ability to deduce the data quantity). The progression of the system as soon as it is considered as another challenge in sustainability assessment because the system's influence reveals its values as well as constituents. All of such factors support the SSGI's inclination for focusing on a sustainable path that develops and can be observed independently in its own grid of indicators instead of being linked to various circumstances [23]. A specific grid also makes it easier to understand the trade-offs that come with making complicated decisions. An important part of sustainability assessments is explicitly considering a trade-off at the commencement of the procedure, where there are clear suitability standards.

## 6. Effect of GI on Price and Production Volume

The implementation of a GI results in a significant increase in the value of the concluding GI good or its primary raw component. The significant positive effects of GIs on price are shown to exist. The country of origin (America, Africa or Europe) as well as whether or not the GI has been in place for a while or was just registered in recent times. The optimistic impact that a GI procedure has on value is due to a number of different mechanisms. By giving data on the association to origin, GIs can lessen the asymmetry of data among customers and manufacturers and, as a result, enhance customers' willingness to pay greater costs. This is especially true in cases like Tête de Moine cheese, Manchego cheese, Futog cabbage and Darjeeling tea, where an official symbol is utilized a lot, the merchandise is certified, as well as there is a system in place to make sure the name doesn't get used wrong [24].

However, even in these instances, the logo's ability to reduce information asymmetry depends on consumers' awareness, and even in European nations, there is frequently a gap that needs to be filled. The second mechanism involves producers' collective ability to alter market institute as well as affect cost, either by supply control (limiting volumes when demand declines as well as maintaining the level of cost as great as possible) or concluded an agreement between stakeholders in the value chain to fee producers a least cost. In the case of Colombian coffee, Fedecafé sets a minimum price for producers; in the case of Penja pepper, the inter-professional association, which includes nursery associations, vendors, and manufacturers, sets a minimum price for producers [24]. In our cases, there is no proof of a clear judgement to govern supply in order to raise prices (such as managing certified production volumes via quotas, storage, or categorizing).

Nevertheless, the decision to set greater quality standards occasionally results in a reduction in manufacture. By the way, the instance of Vale dos Vinhedos wine is a fascinating illustration of how the much greater quality desires in the novel provisions might have been deliberately chosen to raise the cost of licensed wine, although they might also have an optimistic effect on the cost of any wine manufactured in the valley. The question then arises as to whether the cost waged to agriculturalists also improved or whether the value of processed goods was redistributed upstream. The two cheddar instances depict an impact on the milk value waged to dairy ranchers. An examination of the price of Manchego cheese prior to and following registration reveals a 45% increase across all value chain links (milk cost, wholesale cost, retail cost) [25]. The milk cost for Tête de Moine cheese is greater than that of other types of milk (till CHF 0.10 greater than the milk cost for the non-GMO substitute Tilsiter). On account of Colombian espresso, examination illustrates that the portion of the cost communicated to makers expanded after enrollment of the PGI (68-85% of every dollar funded by roasters to Fedecafé). Although, data were unfortunately unavailable, so more methodical examines of the other instances would be required before this constructive influence on value redistribution could be widespread.

Concerning pay, when examination has been conceivable (in three cases), it shows an increment, in spite of expanded creation costs now and again. On account of Vale dos Vinhedos wine, the entire PDO wine-producers earn profit from a greater pay; The Penja pepper instance, producers earn more because of the increased productivity brought about by the GI process; In addition, between 1991 and 2008, Kona coffee's earnings increased by fivefold [26]. Money saving advantage examination in these three cases illustrates that GI makers are in an ideal situation as far as benefits or edges contrasted and non-GI makers, suggesting that a GI enhances offset the greater expenses.

In every one of the cases contemplated, with the exception of that of Darjeeling tea, the GI cycle has impacted creation volumes, albeit the impact contrasts in the long as well as short terms. "Mature" GIs, which exhibit long-term effects, demonstrate that market success and increased demand in the long run result in an increase in production from a GI process. Kona coffee that observed a 250% upsurge among 1995 and 2015 as well as 36% more manufacturers among 1991 and 2012, Manchego cheese, which saw an 83% upsurge in volume among 2001 and 2013, and Tête de Moine cheese, which saw a 300% upsurge in volume among 1986 and 2014,



are outstanding examples in this regard. For the time being (promptly subsequent enlistment), GIs can, nonetheless, incite an underlying reduction because of particulars that straightforwardly influence creation (explicit necessities and restriction of the creation region). This is found for the situation for Vale dos Vinhedos wine, with a decrease of 78% underway somewhere in the range of 2012 and 2014, subsequent PDO enlistment [27]. It can likewise be the aftereffect of a decrease in the quantity of makers involving the GI as an outcome of the booking of the term to the "valid" GI item, as on account of Futog cabbage, where the sum delivered under the GI reduced by 76% somewhere in the range of 2010 and 2014. However, the GI can prompt an instant upsurge in manufacture in some instances, as with the Penja pepper, which saw an increase of 324% among 2010 and 2015 as a result of provisions that enable larger production.

The implementation of novel production technique concentrating on quality rather than cost lessening results in a short-term reduction in supply due to an increase in quality. This involves a time of change in accordance with reception of the novel practices and complete consistence with the details (for instance, the necessity of establishing new espresso shrubberies or plants that require time to become useful). The transient decrease in supply can likewise be made sense of by defective consistence with the details, for certain ranchers not being engaged with the GI cycle, in spite of the fact that they are situated in the divided regions. In fact, few agriculturalists may be geologically qualified because they are in the designated regions, although they may not be willing to participate in the GI strategy or comply with the requirements. Additionally, farmers outside of the designated areas are unable to supply the product anymore. As a result, production decreases after the GI process is implemented, as with Futog cabbage.

### 7. Protection of traditions by allocating GI

The traditional knowledge that is a part of a given culture often makes it simpler for individuals of diverse ethnic groups to identify with one another and to hold the individuality of their ethos. Additionally, this is a local manifestation. The deficiency of this feeling of public character of their own way of life will ultimately prompt corruption of customs [14], loss of culture and stop of public turn of events. Because of this, indigenous peoples' food cultures must be safeguarded over the exclusive rights of the GI defense system. Native Indians, for example, are examples of indigenous peoples whose traditional cultures have been under threat. However, this does not imply that only non-mainstream values need TK to form cultural identities. Standard societies additionally bear special information and articulations; however, mainstream cultures face fewer existential threats. In this manner, the overall government doesn't want to concede restrictive freedoms to the conventional information on standard culture to save that culture.

Furthermore, contrasted and the substance of other licensed innovation insurance frameworks, topographical signs contain a rich local social soul [15]. Indigenous individuals have their own unique way of life, range of actions, and food culture. They also have a strong regional character because they came from the original ecology. Kimchi from Korea, Japanese cuisine, Tibetan barley wine from China, etc. When a GI is removed, it frequently leads to the disappearance of definite traditional cultures that have coexisted with it. According to researcher, the substance of the insurance of geological signs is to safeguard a sort of asset and safeguard a sort of regular and social legacy" [16].

At long last, the security of topographical signs will assist native people groups with making their own public food brand, foster their way of life, the travel industry, and environment while bringing monetary advantages. For instance, the somewhat intriguing and extraordinary native "stone cooking strategy" and its related autonomous cooking techniques and dietary patterns have turned into the special food culture of the Ami public. Besides, the consistent ascent of the travel industry has likewise drawn in a rising number of individuals to seek after a sort of "earth taste". The utilization of native people groups' food ethos assets to acquire monetary pay is more critical to advance the legacy and improvement of conventional food culture, advance insurance as well as improvement, and offer play to the financial benefits behind food ethos assets.

Additionally, this is to aid the indigenous peoples' own survival and growth. More money can only be used to protect and develop the native societies' food culture by converting the provisional resources into ethnic productivity and carrying about benign economic profits. As a result, it is critical to investigate the utilization of GIs to safeguard the dietary intangible traditional heritage of native individuals [28].

### 8. Conclusions

One example of the cultural diversity that exists between nations is the intangible cultural heritage of indigenous food. While we engage and safeguard the privileges and interests of native people groups in different types of social articulation, we can't overlook the significance of food immaterial social legacy in native culture. It is essential to: First, actively promote the use of geographical indications by indigenous peoples; besides, reinforce the administration, assessment and management of the nature of topographical sign rural items; thirdly, guarantee the viable transmission of the quality signs of topographical sign farming items, further develop the data revelation instrument, take action against falsifying ways of behaving, and resolve data irregularities; ultimately, give full play to the capability of GIs for the financial improvement of native people groups, make great circumstances for the expansion in pay of native people groups and the practical

advancement of native people groups' dietary immaterial social legacy. It will also offer a better legal safety atmosphere for the legacy, dispersion and novelty of dietary intangible cultural inheritance from the viewpoint of GIs. In addition, it will better secure the rights of indigenous folks' nutritional practices (mostly) to develop societies. One can analyze the assurance levels of the different dietary immaterial social legacy GIs inside the ethnic gathering as well as the level of insurance of the ethnic gathering's nutritional elusive social legacy GIs with that of other ethnic gatherings by consolidating the self-assessment table for the gamble coefficient of native people groups' nutritional immaterial social legacy GIs. Both the SD of food-connected intangible cultural heritage as well as the preservation of GIs of that heritage are extremely important. We anticipate an ongoing deepening of our comprehension of the safety strategies of GIs with the aim of the nutritional intangible tradition of indigenous individuals can brightly resurface.

## REFERENCES

1. Bernard-Mongin, C.; Balouzat, J.; Chau, E.; Garnier, A.; Lequin, S.; Lerin, F.; Veliji, A. Geographical Indication Building Process for Sharr Cheese (Kosovo): "Inside Insights" on Sustainability. *Sustainability* 2021, 13, 5696.
2. Zhao, G. "Ningxia intangible cultural heritage" geographical indication protection. *Reg. Gov.* 2019, 31, 248–250+253.
3. Li, Z.; Zheng, S. The impact of the use of geographical indications of agricultural products on the income of kiwi fruit growers. *J. Northwest AF Univ. (Soc. Sci. Ed.)* 2021, 21, 119–129.
4. Chilla, T.; Fink, B.; Balling, R.; Reitmeier, S.; Schober, K. The EU Food Label 'Protected Geographical Indication': Economic Implications and Their Spatial Dimension. *Sustainability* 2020, 12, 5503.
5. Vinayan, S. (2013). Socio-economics of geographical indications in the Indian handloomsector: A case study of Pochampally Ikat, unpublished report submitted to the *Indian Council for Social Science Research (ICSSR)*, New Delhi.
6. PPVFRA (2018). *Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Authority, Compendium of Registered Varieties Under PPV&FR Act, 2001, Department of Agriculture and Co-operation, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India*. New Delhi: Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture.
7. Marescotti, A.; Quiñones-Ruiz, X.F.; Edelmann, H.; Belletti, G.; Broscha, K.; Altenbuchner, C.; Penker, M.; Scaramuzzi, S. Are Protected Geographical Indications Evolving Due to Environmentally Related Justifications? An Analysis of Amendments in the Fruit and Vegetable Sector in the European Union. *Sustainability* 2020, 12, 3571.
8. Zhai, Y. *Research on the Comprehensive Value of Geographical Indication Products*; Zhengzhou University Press: Zhengzhou, China, 2018.
9. Government of India. (2016). Annual Report 2015–16, New Delhi: Intellectual Property India, The Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs, Trademarks, and Geographical Indications, Ministry of Commerce and Industry.
10. European Commission. eAmbrosia—The EU Geographical Indications Register. 2020. Available online: <https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/food-safety-and-quality/certification/quality-labels/geographical-indications-register/>.
11. Ajayan (2009). Farmers yet to Benefit From GI tag. Available online at: <https://www.livemint.com/Money/EfojzbNUEKv6zVOjBZvSPP/Farmers-yet-to-benefit-from-GI-tag.html>.
12. Bhattacharya, S (2014) Bioprospecting, Biopiracy and Food Security in India: The Emerging Sides of Neoliberalism. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* Vol 23 (2014) pp 49–56: Online 2014-03-02. SciPress Ltd., Switzerland.
13. Dutta, I (2012) GI Tag to Boost Darjeeling Tea Exports. *The Hindu*, India. [www.thehindu.com/business/industry/gi-tag-to-boost-darjeeling-tea-exports/article2803987.ece](http://www.thehindu.com/business/industry/gi-tag-to-boost-darjeeling-tea-exports/article2803987.ece).
14. Besah-Adanu, C.; Bosselmann, A.S.; Hansted, L.; Kwapong, P.K. Food origin labels in Ghana. Finding inspirations in the European geographical indications system on honey. *J. World Intellect. Prop.* 2019, 22, 349–363.
15. Belletti, G.; Marescotti, A.; Touzard, J.M. Geographical indications, public goods, and sustainable development: The roles of actors' strategies and public policies. *World Dev.* 2017, 98, 45–57.
16. McElwee, G.; Smith, R.; Somerville, P. Conceptualising animation in rural communities: The Village SOS case. *Entrep. Reg. Dev.* 2017, 30, 173–198.
17. Aggarwal, A.K. Rural Entrepreneurship Development Ecosystem—An Emerging Paradigm of Rural Socio-Economic Development. 2017.
18. in Oman. *IJBR* 2019, 25, 480–498.
19. Cei, L.; De Francesco, E.; Stefani, G. From Geographical Indications to Rural Development: A Review of the Economic Effects of European Union Policy. *Sustainability* 2018, 10, 3745
20. Arfini, F.; Antonioli, F.; Donati, M.; Gorton, M.; Mancini, M.C.; Tocco, B.; Veneziani, M. *Sustainability of European Food Quality Schemes Conceptual framework*; Arfini, F., Bellassen, V., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2019; pp. 3–21.

21. Sen, A.K. 2013. The ends and means of sustainability. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities: A Multi-Disciplinary Journal for People-Centered Development*, 14(1): 6-20.
22. Singh, H., and Aggarwal, R. (2013). Marketing of geographical indications in India: an analysis. *Eur. Intellect. Prop. Rev.* 30, 667-673..
23. Radhika, A. M., Thomas, K. J., Kuruvila, A., and Raju, R. K. (2018). Assessing the impact of geographical indications on well-being of rice farmers in Kerala. *Int. J Intellect. Prop. Rights* 9, 1-11.
24. Marie-Vivien, D. (2015). *The Protection of Geographical Indications in India: A New Perspective on the French and European Experience*. New Delhi: Sage.
25. Das, K. (2006). Protection of India's 'geographical indications': an overview of the Indian legislation and the TRIPS scenario. *Indian J. Int. Law* 46, 39-72. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1587352.
26. Das, K. (2009). Socio-Economic Implications of Protecting Geographical Indications in India, Centre for WTO Studies. Available online at: [http://wtocentre.iift.ac.in/papers/Gi\\_Paper\\_CWS\\_August%2009\\_Revised.pdf](http://wtocentre.iift.ac.in/papers/Gi_Paper_CWS_August%2009_Revised.pdf).
27. Ma, T.; Chai, C.; Shang, J. Case Study of Indigenous Restaurant Culture on the Creation and Protection of Traditional Wisdom of Taiwan Indigenous Peoples. *Knowl. Innov. Des. Cult.* 2021, 3-9.
28. De Lima Medeiros, M.; Terra, L.A.A.; Passador, J.L. Geographical indications and territorial development: A soft-system methodology analysis of the Serro Case. *Syst. Res. Behav. Sci.* 2020, 37, 82-96.
29. Sharma, G., & Pradhan, B. K. (2023). Traditional Knowledge and Access and Benefit Sharing in the Context of Himalayan States. In *Biodiversity Conservation Through Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) Himalayas and Indian Sub-Continent* (pp. 127-162). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
30. Rajasekharan, S., Nair, V. T., Navas, M., James, T. C., & Murugan, K. (2023). Traditional Knowledge and Its Sustainable Utilization. *Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Bioresources*, 597-657.
31. Prathap, S. K., & CC, S. (2022). Determinants of purchase intention of traditional handloom apparels with geographical indication among Indian consumers. *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences*, 4(1), 21-38.
32. Török, Á., Jantýk, L., Maró, Z. M., & Moir, H. V. (2020). Understanding the real-world impact of geographical indications: A critical review of the empirical economic literature. *Sustainability*, 12(22), 9434.
33. Yang, J., & Lee, J. (2019). Application of sensory descriptive analysis and consumer studies to investigate traditional and authentic foods: A review. *Foods*, 8(2), 54.
34. Cei, L., Defrancesco, E., & Stefani, G. (2018) From geographical indications to rural development: A review of the economic effects of European Union Policy, sustainability, 2018. MDPI.
35. Albuquerque, T. G., Oliveira, M. B. P., & Costa, H. S. (2018). 25 years of European Union (EU) quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs across EU Member States. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 98(7), 2475-2489.
36. Caputo, V., Sacchi, G., & Lagoudakis, A. (2018). Traditional food products and consumer choices: A review. *Case studies in the traditional food sector*, 47-87.
37. Dias, C.; Mendes, L. Protected Designation of Origin (PDO), Protected Geographical Indication (PGI) and Traditional Speciality Guaranteed (TSG): A bibliometric analysis. *Food Res. Int.* 2018, 103, 492-508. [CrossRef]
38. Mirna de Lima, M.; Cláudia Souza, P.; Passador, J.L. Implications of Geographical Indications: A Comprehensive Review of Papers Listed in Capes' Journal Database. *RAI* 2016, 13, 315-329.
39. Grunert, K.G.; Achmann, K. Consumer reactions to the use of EU quality labels on food products: A review of the literature. *Food Control* 2016, 59, 178-187. [CrossRef]
40. Feldmann, C.; Hamm, U. Consumers' perceptions and preferences for local food: A review. *Food Qual. Prefer.* 2015, 40, 152-164. [CrossRef]
41. Bienenfeld, J.M.; Roe, B. Consumer Willingness to Pay for Organic, Environmental and Country of Origin Attributes of Food Products. *Br. Food J.* 2014, 107, 320-343.