



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on Culture and Education

2015/2053(INI)

19.5.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 65

Draft opinion
Mircea Diaconu
(PE551.753v01-00)

The possible extension of geographical indication protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products
(2015/2053(INI))

AM\1060635EN.doc

PE557.143v01-00

EN

United in diversity

EN

Amendment 1

Ivan Jakovčić

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the current discussions about a possible extension of the Geographical Indication (GI) protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products; considers that the EU is particularly rich in such authentic products based on local know-how and traditional production methods and often rooted in the heritage of a specific geographical area;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the current discussions about a possible extension of the Geographical Indication (GI) protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products; considers that the EU is particularly rich in such authentic products based on local know-how and traditional **local and regional** production methods and often rooted in the heritage of a specific geographical area;

Or. hr

Amendment 2

Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the current discussions about a possible extension of the Geographical Indication (GI) protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products; considers that the EU is particularly rich in such authentic products based on local know-how and traditional production methods and often rooted in the heritage of a specific geographical area;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the current discussions about a possible extension of the Geographical Indication (GI) protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products; considers that the EU is particularly rich in such authentic products based on local know-how and traditional production methods and often rooted in the **cultural, social and historical** heritage of a specific geographical area;

Or. en

Amendment 3
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the current discussions about a possible extension of the Geographical Indication (GI) protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products; considers that the EU is particularly rich in such authentic products based on local know-how and traditional production methods and often rooted in the heritage of a specific geographical area;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the current discussions about a possible extension of the Geographical Indication (GI) protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products; considers that the EU is particularly rich in such authentic products based on local know-how and traditional production methods and often rooted in the heritage of a specific geographical area, ***and calls for geographical indication protection to be taken into account in the TTIP negotiations;***

Or. fr

Amendment 4
Milan Zver, Marc Joulaud, Andrea Bocskor, Bogdan Brunon Wentă

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the current discussions about a possible extension of the Geographical Indication (GI) protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products; considers that the EU is particularly rich in such authentic products based on local know-how and traditional production methods and often rooted in the heritage of a specific geographical area;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the current discussions about a possible extension of the Geographical Indication (GI) protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products; considers that the EU is particularly rich in such authentic products based on local know-how and traditional production methods and often rooted in the heritage of a specific geographical area; ***recalls that the preservation of these methods is based on a continuous transfer of knowledge from generation to generation;***

Or. en

Amendment 5
Jill Evans

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the current discussions about a possible extension of the Geographical Indication (GI) protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products; considers that the EU is particularly rich in such authentic products based on local know-how and traditional production methods and often rooted in the heritage of a specific geographical area;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the current discussions about a possible extension of the Geographical Indication (GI) protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products; considers that the EU is particularly rich in such authentic products based on local know-how and traditional production methods and often rooted in the heritage of a specific geographical area; ***GIs illustrate the relationship between human activity, culture, land, and resource;***

Or. en

Amendment 6
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Recalls that non-agricultural products are an integral part of our identity and are an important element of the European cultural heritage as well as the cultural heritage of the Member states;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Milan Zver, Andrea Bocskor, Bogdan Brunon Wenta, Marc Joulaud

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Highlights that the geographical indication protection of non-agricultural products can function as an incentive to preserve the cultural heritage, traditional know-how, as well as the traditional ways of knowledge transfer from one generation to the next one;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Emphasises the fact that the existence of a high number of non-agricultural products in Europe, based on traditional skills and handcrafts, represents an integral part of the regional and local culture and stimulates cultural tourism development;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1c. Considers that a uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products would stimulate the technological and

economic development at a regional and local level by increasing the number of people employed in producing traditional products;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1d. Emphasises that one of the main challenges faced by the sector of cultural heritage is the gradual extinction of traditional skills and crafts;

Or. en

Amendment 11
Jill Evans

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. *In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product;*

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. *However, there is a lack of information regarding the legal protection these products enjoy; therefore, it is important to gather and analyse data in order to assess the existing legal frameworks, their strengths and weaknesses with a view to provide all stakeholders with relevant options for possible action at EU level;*

Amendment 12
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception *and countless cases of counterfeiting*; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

Amendment

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception, *counterfeiting and unfair competition*; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

Amendment 13
Isabella Adinolfi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system *could better inform* consumers

Amendment

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system *for registration, protection,*

about the authenticity of products **and protect** the rightful owners of a registered product;

monitoring and enforcement should be designed in order to avoid confusion for administrations and consumers about the authenticity **and quality** of products, **protecting** the rightful owners of a registered product;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Zdzisław Krasnodębski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a **uniform** EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products **and** protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

Amendment

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a **balanced** EU system could **increase awareness of value of these products among consumers and producers**, better inform consumers about the authenticity of products, protect the rightful owners of a registered product **and guarantee their quality and distinctive features**;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but *several* legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and *countless cases of* counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

Amendment

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and *make* counterfeiting *easier*; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product; *what is more, registration of such products by the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market should result in more uniform and better protected GIs*;

Or. it

Amendment 16
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products *and* protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

Amendment

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products, protect the rightful owners of a registered product *and ensure the preservation of traditional handicrafts and skills*;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Tonino Picula

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

Amendment

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several – ***mostly divergent*** – legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks, ***which differ significantly in terms of definition, procedures, the degree of protection, and enforcement***, may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

Or. hr

Amendment 18
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU

Amendment

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU

system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product, *while ensuring sure that EU geographical indications do not, over time, take the place of national or regional indications, which are a guarantee of tradition and know-how*;

Or. fr

Amendment 19

Milan Zver, Andrea Bocskor, Bogdan Brunon Wenta

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

Amendment

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring only national or regional protection, *that do not cover the cross-border products*. In this context, underlines the fact that *the discrepancies between* the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

Or. en

Amendment 20

Emma McClarkin

on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring **only** national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system could better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

Amendment

2. Recalls that, currently, there is no uniform GI protection for non-agricultural products at EU level but several legal frameworks ensuring national or regional protection. In this context, underlines the fact that the present legal frameworks may result in consumer deception and countless cases of counterfeiting; therefore, a uniform EU system could **potentially** better inform consumers about the authenticity of products and protect the rightful owners of a registered product;

Or. en

Amendment 21

Zdzisław Krasnodębski

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Stresses that increased centralisation of policies could result in reduced creativity, plurality and diversity;

Or. en

Amendment 22

Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Underlines that a uniform GI protection would contribute not only toward promoting traditional products,

but also toward the recognition of the quality of the raw materials it uses and the need for excellence at all stages of the production process;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Silvia Costa, Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Takes the view that extending the scope of the geographical indication protection system to cover non-agricultural products could help to make the EU's position on GIs still stronger and more cogent, both in bilateral trade negotiations and in multilateral forums, the ultimate aim being to provide a high level of protection for all high-quality European products outside the EU;

Or. it

Amendment 24
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Highlights that the promotion of local and regional traditional products is essential not only for the preservation of the European cultural heritage, but would also guarantee fair remuneration for producers and the widest possible availability of those products;

Amendment 25
Emma McClarkin
on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses the economic potential of the GI system in terms of jobs creation, especially in rural or poor areas, and supporting SMEs and individual producers, who are central to the production of handicrafts and other traditional objects; ***moreover, GIs are a powerful tool for increasing the overall attractiveness of a region, boosting the sales of a category of products and promoting tourism in the area;***

Amendment

3. Stresses the economic potential of the GI system in terms of ***tourism promotion and*** jobs creation, especially in rural or poor areas, and supporting SMEs and individual producers, who are central to the production of handicrafts and other traditional objects, ***whilst calling for the Commission to conduct a thorough economic impact assessment to ensure that the effect of any proposed new system on producers, their competitors, consumers and Member States is fully considered;***

Amendment 26
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses the economic potential of the GI system in terms of jobs creation, especially in rural or poor areas, and supporting SMEs and individual producers, who are central to the production of handicrafts and other traditional objects; moreover, GIs are a powerful tool for increasing the overall attractiveness of a region, boosting the sales of a category of products and

Amendment

3. Stresses the economic potential of the GI system in terms of jobs creation, especially in rural or poor areas, and supporting SMEs and individual producers, who are central to the production of handicrafts and other traditional objects; moreover, GIs are a powerful tool for increasing the overall attractiveness ***and distinctiveness*** of a region, boosting the sales of a category of

promoting tourism in the area;

products and promoting *sustainable cultural* tourism *and cultural and creative activities* in the area;

Or. en

Amendment 27
Jill Evans

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses the economic potential of the GI system in terms of jobs creation, especially in rural or poor areas, and supporting SMEs and individual producers, who are central to the production of handicrafts and other traditional objects; moreover, GIs are a powerful tool for increasing the overall attractiveness of a region, boosting the sales of a category of products and promoting tourism in the area;

Amendment

3. Stresses the economic potential of the GI system in terms of jobs creation, especially in rural or poor areas, and supporting SMEs and individual producers, who are central to the production of handicrafts and other traditional objects; moreover, GIs are a powerful tool for increasing the overall attractiveness of a region, boosting the sales of a category of products and promoting tourism in the area; *with the potential to protect and promote minority and regional identities and languages*;

Or. en

Amendment 28
Zdzisław Krasnodębski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses the economic potential of the GI system in terms of jobs creation, especially in rural or *poor* areas, and supporting SMEs and individual producers, who are central to the production of handicrafts and other traditional objects; moreover, GIs are a powerful tool for increasing the overall

Amendment

3. Stresses the economic potential of the GI system in terms of jobs creation, especially in rural or *less developed* areas, and supporting SMEs and individual producers, who are central to the production of handicrafts and other traditional objects; moreover, GIs are a powerful tool for

attractiveness of a region, boosting *the* sales of a category of products and promoting tourism in the area;

increasing the overall attractiveness of a region, boosting sales of a category of *local* products and promoting tourism in the area;

Or. en

Amendment 29
Isabella Adinolfi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses the economic potential of the GI system in terms of jobs creation, especially in rural or poor areas, and supporting SMEs and individual producers, who are central to the production of handicrafts and other traditional objects; moreover, GIs are a powerful tool for increasing the overall attractiveness of a region, boosting the sales of a category of products and promoting tourism in the area;

Amendment

3. Stresses the economic, *cultural and social* potential of the GI system in terms of *high quality* jobs creation, especially in rural or poor areas, and supporting SMEs and individual producers, who are central to the production of handicrafts and other traditional objects; moreover, GIs are a powerful tool for increasing the overall attractiveness of a region, boosting the sales of a category of products and promoting tourism in the area;

Or. en

Amendment 30
Marc Joulaud

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

3a. Points out that geographical indications provide an assurance of product quality for consumers, as well as being a recognition of know-how and a means of protection for producers;

Amendment

Or. fr

Amendment 31
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Considers that a uniform EU system could increase the attractiveness of the heritage-related professions;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Silvia Costa, Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Calls for such products to be made a central focus of regional development, research and innovation projects and of Horizon 2020 and cohesion funding;

Or. it

Amendment 33
Milan Zver, Andrea Bocskor, Bogdan Brunon Wenta, Marc Joulaud

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Stresses that preserving of traditional know-how and production can help to stop the depopulation and destruction of rural areas and the flow of young people that are leaving those areas;

Amendment 34
Jill Evans

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. To ensure that any mark or logo of the GI indicator will always reflect the regional/local identity of the goods;

Or. en

Amendment 35
Isabella Adinolfi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural and social components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and stresses the need for preserving the ***traditional know-how and skills associated with them;***

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural and social components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and stresses the need for preserving the ***provenance and the association it carries with heritage, tradition, quality, know-how, skills and product specification;***

Or. en

Amendment 36
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural and social components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and stresses the need for preserving the traditional know-how and skills associated with them;

Amendment

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural and social components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and stresses the need for preserving, ***passing on and increasing the knowledge of*** the traditional know-how and skills associated with them;

Or. en

Amendment 37

Milan Zver, Andrea Bocskor, Bogdan Brunon Wenta

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural and social components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and ***stresses the need for*** preserving the traditional know-how and skills associated with them;

Amendment

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural, ***educational*** and social components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and ***considers it will contribute to*** preserving the ***valuable*** traditional know-how and skills associated with them;

Or. en

Amendment 38

Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural ***and*** social components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and stresses the need for preserving the traditional know-how and

Amendment

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural, social ***and sustainability*** components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and stresses the need for

skills associated with them;

preserving the traditional know-how and skills associated with them;

Or. fr

Amendment 39
Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural and social components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and stresses the need for preserving the traditional know-how and skills associated with them;

Amendment

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural and social components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and stresses the need for preserving the traditional know-how and skills associated with them ***and for fostering closer cooperation with the creative industries, not least with a view to highlighting the quality of the materials used and of the end products;***

Or. it

Amendment 40
Jill Evans

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural and social components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and stresses the need for preserving the traditional know-how and skills associated with them;

Amendment

4. Highlights the importance of the cultural and social components of the non-agricultural products that will be included in this process and stresses the need for preserving the traditional know-how and skills associated with them; ***calls for the use of the name or the sign to be accessible to all producers from the given area who manufacture the product in the way prescribed;***

Amendment 41
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Acknowledges the important role of highly skilled professionals in the production process of non-agricultural products for preserving and passing on traditional skills and handcrafts, which create our European identity;

Or. en

Amendment 42
Milan Zver, Andrea Bocskor, Marc Joulaud, Bogdan Brunon Wenta

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. The traditional know-how represents an important aspect of European cultural heritage and European history and should be specially protected, also through the geographical indication protection mechanism;

Or. en

Amendment 43
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. In this regard, invites the Commission to encourage Member states to optimally use the available EU funding and programs for investment in vocational training of specialists, who participate in producing and promoting local and regional artisanal and industrial products;

Or. en

Amendment 44

Milan Zver, Andrea Bocskor, Bogdan Brunon Wenta

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Educational institutions should teach the young generations about the traditional know-how, production methods and products, which are often more respectful to the nature and are more sustainable than the modern production methods;

Or. en

Amendment 45

Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4c. Encourages the Member states to exchange good practices in creating and supporting initiatives aimed at stimulating the traditional artisanal sector, which

could in turn increase the awareness for the local cultural heritage and stimulate the development of rural areas;

Or. en

Amendment 46
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4d. Stresses the important role of the companies, often situated in regions with high unemployment rates, which invest in high-quality skills and know-how and offer traineeships and apprenticeships for the development and qualification of skilled professionals;

Or. en

Amendment 47
Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4e. Highlights the fact that a well-known GI could play an important role in promoting the European cultural itineraries of the Council of Europe;

Or. en

Amendment 48
Jill Evans

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

5. *Considers that technological innovation for products protected under a GI should remain possible*, provided *that the quality and* authenticity of the final product is not affected;

Amendment

5. *GI protection is an incentive for investing in new technology, innovation and training*, provided *the* authenticity of the final product is not affected;

Or. en

**Amendment 49
Silvia Costa**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

5. Considers that technological *innovation* for products protected under a GI should remain possible, provided that the quality and authenticity of the final product is not affected;

Amendment

5. Considers that technological *and other innovations* for products protected under a GI should remain possible, provided that the quality and authenticity of the final product is not affected;

Or. it

**Amendment 50
Dominique Bilde**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

5. Considers that technological innovation for products protected under a GI should remain possible, *provided that* the quality and authenticity of the final product is not affected;

Amendment

5. Considers that technological innovation for products protected under a GI should remain possible *if, and only if*, the quality and authenticity of the final product is not affected;

Or. fr

Amendment 51
Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Stresses that industrial or handicraft products connected with their origin or rooted in their territory are part of the EU's cultural heritage, and that the adoption at EU level of a system to protect them would preserve their originality;

Or. fr

Amendment 52
Jill Evans

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Recognises the importance of investing in education and training to those that would make these highly specialised, unique goods, in order to ensure that these skills and know-how are passed on and protected;

Or. en

Amendment 53
Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Calls on the Commission to propose, as soon as possible, an instrument to protect industrial or handicraft products connected with their origin or rooted in their territory, after carrying out an impact assessment;

Or. fr

Amendment 54
Isabella Adinolfi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that ***the link*** to the original geographical area remains a priority, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used outside the reference space;

Amendment

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that ***greater traceability, transparency and information linked*** to the original geographical area remains a priority, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used outside the reference space;

Or. en

Amendment 55
Milan Zver, Andrea Bocskor, Bogdan Brunon Wenta, Marc Joulaud

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that the link to the original geographical area remains a priority, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used outside the

Amendment

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that the link to the original geographical area ***and traditional methods*** remains a priority, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used

reference space;

outside the reference space;

Or. en

Amendment 56

Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that the link to the original geographical area remains a priority, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used outside the reference space;

Amendment

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that the link to the original geographical area remains a priority ***in order to increase the credibility and the authenticity of products***, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used outside the reference space;

Or. en

Amendment 57

Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that the link to the original geographical area remains a priority, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used outside the reference space;

Amendment

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that the link to the original geographical area remains a priority, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used outside the reference space; ***further emphasises that such a system should cover non-geographical names which are unambiguously associated with a given place***;

Or. en

Amendment 58
Tonino Picula

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that the link to the original geographical area remains a priority, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used outside the reference space;

Amendment

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that the link to the original geographical area remains a priority, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used outside the reference space; ***considers that open-ended lists of all products, both agricultural and non-agricultural, protected by geographical indications should be included in future EU trade agreements with non-EU countries;***

Or. hr

Amendment 59
Jill Evans

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that the link to the original geographical area remains a priority, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used outside the reference space;

Amendment

6. Emphasises the importance of creating a future legal framework that guarantees that the link to the original geographical area remains a priority, and that clearly specifies the conditions under which the denomination may be used outside the reference space ***in order to protect the authenticity of the label;***

Or. en

Amendment 60
Silvia Costa, Momchil Nekov, Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Calls on the Commission and Member States to promote trans-regional and trans-national cooperation and pooling of best practice between non-agricultural product clusters and related sectors;

Or. it

Amendment 61
Emma McClarkin
on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. Calls on the regulator to take into account the GIs already existing in the Member States in order to avoid unnecessary red tape for their registration at European level.

7. Calls on the regulator to take into account the GIs already existing in the Member States in order to avoid unnecessary red tape for their registration at European level, ***and to ensure that the creation of a single EU level protection of non-agricultural GIs does not lower standards of protection already afforded by, or supersede, pre-existing systems, such as trademarks, in some Member States;***

Or. en

Amendment 62
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls on the regulator to take into account the GIs already existing in the Member States in order to avoid unnecessary red tape for their registration at European level.

Amendment

7. Calls on the regulator to take into account the GIs already existing in the Member States in order to avoid unnecessary red tape for their registration at European level, ***and to allow for national systems of GI protection to continue to coexist with a uniform EU system;***

Or. en

Amendment 63
Isabella Adinolfi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls on the regulator to take into account the GIs already existing in the Member States in order to avoid unnecessary red tape for their registration at European level.

Amendment

7. Calls on the regulator to take into account the GIs already existing in the Member States in order to avoid unnecessary red tape for their registration at European level; ***highlights that the registration process should be transparent and independent, publically managed and free of charge as it is currently for agri/food products; stresses that ongoing monitoring and enforcement procedures should be adopted to ensure that the products maintain the criteria of the status;***

Or. en

Amendment 64
Milan Zver, Andrea Bocskor, Marc Joulaud, Bogdan Brunon Went

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls on the regulator to take into account the GIs already existing in the Member States in order to avoid unnecessary red tape for their registration at European level.

Amendment

7. Calls on the regulator to take into account the GIs already existing in the Member States in order to avoid unnecessary red tape for their registration at European level; ***calls on the regulator to propose the most efficient, simple, useful and accessible mechanism for registration of products;***

Or. en

Amendment 65
Jill Evans

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls on the regulator to take into account the GIs already existing in the Member States in order to avoid unnecessary red tape for their registration at European level.

Amendment

7. Calls on the regulator to take into account the GIs already existing in the Member States in order to avoid unnecessary red tape for their registration at European level; ***the system should provide affordable, clear and transparent registration, modification and cancellation procedures providing legal guarantees to stakeholders. Calls on the Commission to carry out a thorough assessment with a view to minimising financial and administrative work for stakeholders;***

Or. en