

[BERNARD-MONGIN, Claire]  
[claire.bernard-mongin@cirad.fr ]  
[UMR INNOVATION, Cirad], [France]  
Forum Origine, Diversité et Territoires  
[Workshop n°1], [Sesion n°4]

## **Geographical indications and climate change: what recomposition(s) are needed?** *The contributions of a management approach.*

Hello, my name is Claire Bernard Mongin, I work at CIRAD in the Innovation Joint Research Unit, and today I would like to talk to you about the future recomposition of GIs in the face of climate change. \*

To answer this question correctly, it seems important to us to start again from the configurations of collective action on a global scale in the face of the challenges posed by climate change and the erosion of biodiversity. By considering the changes taking place at the heart of environmental and climate governance regimes, we propose to understand more precisely how these issues require a reassessment of the basic principles underlying GIs. The third step is to assess the conditions under which GIs can adapt to this new period, evolving from their initial scheme to become tools to support adaptation and mitigation of CC.

1min

### **1/ Importance of the climate issue: architectural public good and interplays**

When considering collective action on a global scale in the face of environmental challenges, climate change is certainly at the centre. It is the subject of more intense international coordination from both a scientific and intergovernmental perspective. And more than that, climate change is a key factor in the action and resolution of other environmental issues. This is not because it minimises the importance of biodiversity, land degradation (etc.), but because, depending on the climate trajectory, these other global environmental issues will differ not only in intensity but also in quality.

In this respect, climate (and stabilisation of the temperature rise at 1.5°C) can be qualified as an architectural public good in that it determines the provision of other global public goods. But this is not a one-way relationship. And there is a major challenge in dealing with these cross and reciprocal effects (interplays) in a systematic way and in all their complexity, because too narrow a framing of climate governance will not allow the formulation of coherent and supportive collective responses. I refer to Stefen Aykut's book "The Climate of the World")

**(2min)**

## **2/ The climate/biodiversity nexus ... and its territorial resolution**

In this respect, we feel it is appropriate to emphasise today the nexus between climate and biodiversity. On the one hand, because the solutions proposed to respond to climate change mitigation are mainly based on energy transition measures - which have proven negative impacts on biodiversity and food security issues. And there is too little investment in the options offered by ecosystems, even though these solutions offer a series of interesting co-benefits (table). For example, some studies estimate that these nature-based solutions could account for more than 30% of the mitigation measures needed until 2030 to stabilise warming below 2°C . At the same time, the current trend is towards severe degradation of biodiversity on a global scale, as illustrated by the graph of the 9 global limits. There is therefore a twofold urgency: to work to limit the rise in temperature and to reduce the pressure of anthropogenic activities on the biosphere and its ecosystems.

(2min)

This climate-biodiversity nexus proposes a general framework for the search for more integrative solutions - which anticipate conflicts of use, or even conflicts of objectives. This also presupposes that adaptation-mitigation mechanisms find specific, identified territorial anchors. For beyond the national or sectoral variations of the joint issues of biodiversity and response to climate change, each local/territorial situation offers an almost infinite variety of combinations of factors and specificities which make them, each time, not models but experiences. It is therefore crucial to place these particular circumstances at the heart of the construction of the intervention issue and the implementation of integrated responses.

(1min)

## **3/ Towards new problematisations of local origin-linked quality enhancement schemes**

From this perspective, geographical indications - and more broadly, origin-linked product differentiation approaches - are a particularly interesting tool - since at the heart of the management philosophy of the tool is the demonstration of a particular link to the origin of a terroir, a territory, a production and/or processing area defined and justified by natural and human factors, knowledge and know-how linked to the place.

The GI makes the recognition of particular, local, identified conditions of production - the core of a unique quality or reputation to be protected and promoted. The link to origin is at the heart of the legal justification of this intellectual property instrument, and of the specific protection given to these origin-linked products on the markets.

This link to origin is also at the heart of the economic model of the tool. It justifies the premium obtained on the product: it makes it possible to obtain a higher willingness to pay from consumers. This territorial rent thus obtained can be redistributed to all private operators and reinvested in the collective regulation mechanism (control and certification) of quality. This creates an incentive to maintain local production factors (soil quality,

biodiversity, water). The link to the origin is therefore the driving force behind positive externalities at the territorial level (employment, tourist appeal, maintenance of landscapes) represented here by the virtuous circle of quality)  
(2min)

Today, under what conditions are Geographical Indications a tool capable of helping to formulate integrated and inclusive collective responses to climate change and the erosion of biodiversity?

This questioning can be done in two stages:

1/ To what extent are GIs suitable tools for equipping producer collectives to face the dual challenge of biodiversity protection and CC adaptation/mitigation?

2/ To what extent are GIs adaptive tools for continuing to enhance/protect a quality that is bound to be recomposed as the terroirs of origin and production practices change under climate constraints?

**(30s)**

### **First observations and empirie**

What then are the first elements of an answer to this question?

If we consider the existing literature, we can see that there is not much of it on this subject. Nevertheless, the wine sector (in Europe) and more generally the major cash crops under GI have begun to question the evolution of production conditions under the cc constraint, by addressing the issues of maintaining yields, evolving cultivation practices and systems, and changing the geographical area of the appellation.) The question was extended to a larger number of agri-food products 4/5 years ago, highlighting the heterogeneity of situations, the importance of "site-specific" responses and increasingly questioning the construction of an "intrinsic" product quality linked to immutable territorial attributes.

On the biodiversity side, a rather international literature, based on case studies, is rather critical of the capacity of GIs to protect biodiversity and enhance traditional knowledge - which is one of the justifications of GIs by sustainable development, carried over the last 15 years in particular in the public development aid sector.

(1min30)

In the day-to-day life of GI producer associations, climate change is reflected in occasional requests for derogations from specifications arbitrated by the competent authorities. And these one-off derogations can also be established over time. And so, on a European scale, there has also been an increase in the number of requests for permanent changes to the specifications for climatic reasons.

(30s)

What we also see is the diversity of strategies for adapting to climate change. To take a French example, on the one hand, we have a wine industry - most of whose production is

under the appellation sign - which this year finalised its national adaptation strategy, identifying 7 priority areas for action (varietal work, irrigation, climate insurance and storage, mitigation, etc.), all in consultation with the Ministry/FAM, the Inao and the ODGs, with strong support from INRAE research.) In a more decentralised way, but still with a "product" input, the PDO/IGP cheese sectors have just drawn up their roadmap to arrive at a CC adaptation strategy! What is interesting is that, in addition to the questions of adaptation levers, they also raise the question of GI participation in the redefinition of territorial dynamics and the sharing of local resources (particularly through access to water and grazing areas).

Conversely, in South Africa, in the Western Cape, there is above all a territorial strategy (in fact three agricultural strategies/prospects) for adapting to and mitigating CC, which are then applied through principles of collective action and the use of territorial identities/attitudinal factors. In this context, GIs are interesting tools for action.

(1min30)

To come to the third point of this presentation: all these elements point to poles of tension - which are also axes of innovation for GIs. And if we put on a management lens, considering GI as a management tool, we can consider that climate change and the climate/biodiversity nexus invite us to reconsider three hard points of this tool:

- its management philosophy - what about the original link?
- the technical substratum of GIs: the specifications and the control plan (conditions)
- the simplified view of organisational relationships - whether of the GI ecosystem (competent authorities, control body, GDOs, etc.) or more broadly the relationships a GI organisation has with its territory and other institutions (park, municipalities) or even, in a sectoral/market way, with other sustainability-related specification approaches (voluntary standards)

In this respect, a series of strategic choices (and therefore trade-offs) must be made according to the nature of the desired collective response.

(1 :30 min)

In terms of the evolution of the management philosophy, JM touzard, based on 10 years of support work with the French wine industry, clearly sets out the possible options for redefining a specific quality linked to origin:

- If we stay with a conservative definition, we are heading for the death of GIs through immobility - if we do nothing, we will lose the GI productions impacted by the CC anyway.
- If we go for an off-the-ground definition of quality, supported by highly technological adaptation choices, we completely break the link to place and terroir - we lose GIs too.
- Finally, we can opt for a procedural definition of quality linked to place. A quality that is not given by a terroir, but that is constructed from the territory. An adaptive and open quality - committed to preserving and enhancing local resources, taking advantage of the specificities of agro-ecosystems to adapt and mitigate the cc.

(1 min)

This being said, how can this VISION, this management philosophy, be articulated to an operational technical substrate? How can we move from specifications and a control plan resulting from a very long construction, validation and registration process, to agile quality engineering capable of providing agro-climatic and biodiversity diagnoses on an operational scale adapted to the products and sectors under consideration, engineering equipped to take into account and report on the various environmental dimensions (climate/biodiversity) and to make trade-offs. This raises the question of a successful, recognised and communicable environmental accounting system. And how should this engineering be financed? Are these costs internalised in the economic model of the GDOs or by private operators? Is it the public authorities and research that contribute?

(1min)

And so all this also impacts on the organisational relationships structured by the GI tool - who uses GIs and for what purpose?

In a caricatural way: will GIs serve as a tool for capturing local resources or as a tool for equitable distribution over a territory? How do GIs contribute to the management of the local commons in a context of global change?

Moreover, the major change of period in which we find ourselves, and this great environmental transformation that we are facing with the CC, is an opportunity to re-evaluate the role of many actors, and in particular environmental actors within the framework of territorial and sectoral mechanisms. In the panoply of agricultural and economic tools, can GIs be used to equip environmental actors? Also, these three poles make it possible to structure the extent of an open field of experimentation and to compare and put into perspective different learning situations in producer groups under geographical indications and also to specify the questions to be asked in the framework of future action research!

(1min)

## **Bibliographic references**

- Cornelis van Leeuwen, Philippe Friant, Xavier Choné, Olivier Tregoat, Stephanos Koundouras, Denis Dubourdieu "Influence of Climate, Soil, and Cultivar on Terroir" *American Journal of Ecology and Viticulture* January 2004 Volume 55: 207-217.
- Anne-Laure Lereboullet "How do Geographical Indications interact with the adaptive capacity and resilience of viticultural systems facing global change?" *Conference: XXVth Congress of the European Society of Rural Sociology, July 2013 at Florence, Italy, Volume: pp. 331-332*
- Ashenfelter O., and Storchmann K. "The economics of wine, weather, and climate change." *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, 2016,10(1), 25-46
- Cornelis Van Leeuwen and Philippe Darriet "The Impact of Climate Change on Viticulture and Wine Quality" *Journal of Wine Economics*, Volume 11, Number 1, 2016, Pages 150-167
- Raz Barneal, "Appellations And Adaptations: Geographical Indication, Viticulture, And Climate Change" *Washington International Law Journal Association* 2017 VOL. 26 No. 3.



- Teil, 2020. *Les vigneronns seraient-ils climato-sceptiques ? Les effets du changement climatique analysés par les vigneronns dans les appellations d'origine protégée d'Anjou et d'Alsace.* Cahiers Agricultures, EDP Sciences, 2020, 29 (9), 7 p.
- Clark and Kerr, 2017. *Climate change and terroir: The challenge of adapting geographical indications.* J. World Intellect. Prop., 20, 88-102
- Xian, Y., et al. (2021). "Predicting the current and future distributions of major food crop designated geographical indications (GIs) in China under climate change." Geocarto International.
- Salpina, D. and F. Pagliacci (2022). "Contextual vulnerability to climate change of heterogeneous agri-food geographical indications: A case study of the Veneto region (Italy)." Environmental Science & Policy 136: 103-113.
- William A Kerr and Lisa F Clark, [Are Geographical Indications sustainable in the face of climate change?](#), (2022) 12 Queen Mary Journal of Intellectual Property (2) 226–241, <https://doi.org/10.4337/qmjip.2022.02.04>. Published 30 June.
- Xian, Y., et al. (2022). "Will citrus geographical indications face different climate change challenges in China?" Journal of Cleaner Production 356.
- Parakram Rautelal (2011) "Global warming may rob basmati of its fragrance" <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Global-warming-may-rob-basmati-of-its-fragrance/articleshow/7387659.cms>
- Patra, P.S., Bisen, J.S., Kumar, R., Choubey, M., Mazumdar, A.B., Singh, Mahipal, Bera, B., 2013. Effect of climate change on production of Darjeeling Tea: a case study in Darjeeling Tea research & Development Centre, Tea Board, Kurseong. GJBAHS 2 (4), 174–180.