The International Aspect on the Extension of GI Protection: TRIPS Standard and New Development for Protecting GI

Dr. Tanapoj Ekkayokkaya
IP Promotion and Development Division
Department of Intellectual Property of
Thailand

Coverage

- Starting Point : Where is the issue derived from?
- Development of the issue : How has it been negotiated?
- The way forward : What should we do in the future?

Where is the issue derived from?

- From concession in the Uruguay Round to foreseeable benefits for developing countries.
- Paragraph 12 (b) and 18 of the Doha Declaration
- Communication from Bulgaria, Kenya, India Sri Lanka, EU, Thailand (WT/MIN(01)/W/9-11) in 2001
- Proposal TN/C/W/14
- Opponent WT/MIN(01)/W/8

(

Where is the issue derived from?

- Paragraph on Implementation in the General Council Decision of 1 August 2004 for addressing issues of GI extension under Art. 23 of TRIPS
- Hong Kong Ministerial meeting requested more effort from Members to continue work on implementation issues, including GI extension.
- Para 39 of Hong Kong Declaration specified deadline for action(s) to be taken by 31 July 2006

How has it been negotiated?

- Several consultative meetings held through out the years.
- Among the key issues, in the view of DG, are
- 1. Whether the current level of protection for GIs under Art. 22 is or is not sufficient.
- 2. The implications of extension for other producers using terms in question in their own market and 3rd country markets.
- 3. The extent to which extension of the exception under Art. 24 would meet their concerns.

.

How has it been negotiated?

- Overall issues can be divided into 3 groups.
- Legal issues concerning differences of general protection under Art. 22 and additional protection for wine and spirit under Art. 23
- Policy issues or economic issues such as impact of extended protection on producers and consumers
- 3. <u>Practical issues</u> concerning administrative cost and burdens of procedures associated with extended protection

How has it been negotiated? 1. Legal issues

- Balance of rights and obligations between Members.
- Rationale for IPR protection.
- Scope of protection: e.g. Art. 24 exceptions, TM vs. GI, homonymous GI.

How has it been negotiated? 1. Legal issues

- Protectable subject-matter : e.g. country's name? non-places names? Traditional expressions?
- Differences between two levels of protection

How has it been negotiated?

2. Policy and economic issues

- Impact on <u>producers</u>: those who gain benefit from extended protection vs. those who would be prevented from using GI,
- Increase trading opportunities, especially developing countries?
- What is the impact on third party's markets?
- Extension helps prevent GI becoming generic.

9

How has it been negotiated?

- 2. Policy and economic issues
- Impact on <u>consumers</u> (relative importance) : greater clarity of the product's origin vs. higher prices arising from disruption to the existing marketing practices.
- Costs and burdens to be passed on to consumers are not alienated, comparing to other IPRs.

How has it been negotiated?

- 3. Practical issues for Govt.
- Amendment of legislation at various levels.
- Dealing with increased number of applications both from domestic and abroad.
- Effective enforcement requires input from commercial interests concerned and governments. Litigation at national and international level anticipated.

1

How has it been negotiated? At the present time

- Positions remain unchanged and polarized.
- No more informal consultation.
- Complicated by initiatives in other forums.

What should we do in the future?

- Promote the use of GI the best way to demonstrate its benefits to other countries
- Some countries apply similar protection across the board, so extension should not pose any difficulties.
- Legal clarity is certainly needed.

13

What should we do in the future?

- Fear of overwhelming applications must be mitigated and reasonable measures should be introduced.
- Negotiation on extension should be mandated but should not be tied with other issues.
- Agriculture-related products should be given priority



