

Adoption of (EEC) Regulations 2081/92 and 2082/92 in Italy*

Maria Cecilia Mancini

Department of Economic and Quantitative Studies – Parma University
2003

1. Premise

(EEC) Regulations 2081/92 and 2082/92 on agri-food products of a specific nature represent two examples of EC norms which are of great interest for Italy. The data published by NOMISMA¹ in 2000 bears witness to this; according to the report, typical Italian agri-foods activate industries of over 6 billion Euros, providing work for 300,000 employees and guaranteeing an annual GSP of almost 3 billion Euros, equal to 7% of the national agriculture's entire GSP. The economic role of these products is of particular significance in certain areas: in Northern areas, for example, the production of cheeses of protected origin uses almost 60% of the milk produced in Sardinia, and over 30% of the ovine livestock is destined for production of sheep's milk cheeses of protected origin.

Some typical Italian products, particularly in the dairy and processed meat sectors, have made the most of traditional and authentic characteristics, not just in the national and European markets, but also in that of the United States. Analysis of statistics relevant to the exporting of typical Italian products clearly highlights that the greatest success is enjoyed by products with a more consolidated tradition², and with efficient organisational structures which provide the customer with a guarantee of the product's characteristics.

It is undeniable that in Italy, the Consortia have played a fundamental role in the exploitation of typical products both in the past and the present. In the course of time, these have developed their own line of action in different directions, from technical assistance to the commercial promotion of the products, supported and legitimised by the national legislator. For this reason, it can be stated that EC regulations 2081/92 e 2082/92 have been inserted into a context which is already consolidated if not always coherent with the new legislation, rendering adjustments to the pre-existing national norms necessary.

The coming into force of the two regulations has, in particular, forced the redefinition of the role of these same institutions - the Consortia - which have represented the key to the success of typical Italian products. The national legislator has therefore been given the difficult task of intervening in such a way as to not penalise or limit excessively the

* A special thanks to Ciro Lazzarin, researcher of Agri 2000 S.r.l., for his technical support in the elaboration of paragraphs 4,5, 6 e 7.

¹ VIII NOMISMA Report

² In the prepared meats sector, the near-total (98%) exporting of PDO and PGI cured hams and pork meats can be traced back to just three products: Prosciutto di Parma, Prosciutto di San Daniele and Speck of Alto Adige. In the PDO cheeses sector, 78% of overseas sales can be attributed to Grana Padano, Parmigiano Reggiano and Pecorino Romano.

fields of action of the Consortia, whilst at the same time ensuring that the Community regulations are respected. The problem which has posed itself has been greater than could have been expected on first analysis: in actual fact, the politics of the European Union, much as it might have been finalised with the aim of safeguarding typical products, risked diminishing the role of the Consortia, and therefore weakening those small and medium companies on which our PDO and PGI products are based.

2. Brief note on the norm framework for the safeguarding of typical products prior to (EEC) Regulations 2081/92 and 2082/92

Unlike France, which already before 1992 had a complete legislation of the denomination of the origins of agricultural and food products³, the panorama of Italian norms has faced up to the same issue without an organic legislation, making use instead of single laws finalised to protect the denomination of origin in relation to certain products: cheeses, wines and cured meats.

The signing of the Stresa agreement on the use of nominatives of origin and designations on the 1 June 1951, acknowledged in Italy with the public decree of the 18/11/1953 no. 1099, represented the first firm step towards the regulation of cheeses⁴. Up until that point, the international legislative confusion was considerable, and the commercial exchanges, which intensified after the second world war, highlighted the problems which derived from it.

The foundation provision in the Italian cheese-making sector, in as far as it was institutive of the protection of designation of origin and typical of cheeses, is law no.125 of 10 April 1954.

Article 2 of this law recognises two categories of protected cheeses:

1) cheeses of designated origin; that is, produced in defined areas in line with constant methods and customs, whose marketable characteristics derive principally from the conditions in the production environment,

³)The principal stages which lead France to having a complete norms framework were:

- law of 6 May 1919, regarding the safeguarding of designation of origin;
- Law decree of 30 July 1935 and the establishment, in the same year, of the INAO (Institut National des Appellations d'Origine);
- the creation in 1960 of agricultural "labels";
- law no.66/482 of 6 July 1966;
- recognition and protection in 1980 of products of biological origin;
- la creation in 1988 of conformity certification.

⁴) Through this, the characteristics of the most important and traditional European cheeses were defined; amongst the Italian ones were Gorgonzola, Parmigiano Reggiano, Pecorino Romano, Fontina, Fiore Sardo, Asiago, Provolone and Caciocavallo. Those taking part reciprocally recognized the designation of the cheeses and aimed to avoid any abuse thereof, forming two categories of cheeses, the first having "nominative of origin", which could be produced only within one member state, and in accordance with specifically defined physical-chemical characteristics, and the second having "designation" which could be produced in any participating country, (on condition that it respected the physical-chemical characteristics and instructions of the producing country).

2) the cheeses of typical designation which are produced nationally according to constant habits, whose characteristics derive from special methods in the production techniques.

The same law has established that the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry can entrust the task of supervision to voluntary production consortia (having satisfied some prerequisites⁵), upon publication of a decree in the Official Journal.

Two successive Presidential Decrees (no. 667 of 5.8.1955 and no. 1269 of 30.10.55) have regulated the application of the law, and recognised the denomination of origin and characteristics of Italian cheeses.

It is important, however, to underline that the cheese-making sector, at the time of the decrees cited above, had already provided proof of its considerable spirit of initiative through the constitution, by various producers, of private associated bodies aimed at protection and promotion of typical products. This was the case with the Parmigiano Reggiano Cheese Consortium (CFPR), born in 1934⁶ as a voluntary protection Consortium which from then on carried out, and still carries out, a fundamental role in development in the sector, distributing Parmigiano Reggiano using the Consortium's own brand. Only in 1955 was its protective action publicly recognised with the Public Decree of the 30 May, which awarded Parmigiano Reggiano "Designation of Origin" (DO) and defines the "area of origin", standards and means of control and protection⁷.

In contrast, an important example in the cold pork meats sector is supplied by law no. 506 of 4 July 1970 on the protection of the designated origin of Parma ham. This states (art. 1) that the designation "Prosciutto di Parma" should be reserved exclusively for hams having the qualitative characteristics owing to the geographical environment, including natural and human factors. Its preparation phases, from the salting to the final seasoning, take place in the typical area of production, which is suitably defined within a certain territory. This law, like law no. 125 of the 10 April 1954 for the cheese-making sector, establishes a penalty system against cases of fraud and unfair competition; those with legitimate interests can appeal to this law, such as the Consortia. The law attributes the responsibility for supervision of the products to the appropriate Ministry, with the

⁵) The Consortium:

- must comprise, amongst its members, at least ten single or associated producers, who have attained a recognized degree of skill for over three years;
- the statute must permit admission to the Consortium to any producer;
- the constitution, organization and financial means of the Consortium must be such as to permit an efficient and impartial carrying out of supervision.

⁶)From 1994 the Statute of the CFPR establishes participation in the Consortium also of companies who work principally in the fields of production, seasoning or marketing of Parmigiano Reggiano cheese.

⁷)Amongst the aims of the CFPR, (defined in Article 3 of the Statute) is included that of the carrying out of "an active supervision of the production and sale of Parmigiano Reggiano cheese, on the use of the designation, brands and consortium stamps"...to impede and suppress abuses or irregularities which damage the reputation and image of the product and the interests and rights of the Consortium and its members". In carrying out this aim, the Inter-ministerial decree of 17 June 1957 delegated to the CFPR the responsibility of monitoring and controlling the quality of the safeguarded production, and the task of affixing the labels set out in the regulations and made available by the same Consortium. In fact, the Statute states that "the labeling and affixing of the marks on the cheese, the feeding of the cows which produce milk destined for use in making Parmigiano Reggiano and the aims of producing cheese" be regulated by appropriate rules set by the directive council, and approved by the general meeting of the delegates.

possibility to make use of a voluntary production Consortium.⁸ The latter has the task of carrying out supervision and control of the activities carried out by the various elements of the supply chain, in as far as observing the provisions for production, and those concerning the affixing of stamps, seals and marks. It is evident that recognition of this power has, for some time now, granted the Consortia a special function; that is, in spite of being private bodies, they have carried out public roles of a general application with authority granted specifically by the state. In addition to managing and protecting a “public” brand, they have participated in the introduction of a product which, of its type, is unique. They have guaranteed its geographical origin, its production methods and its quality. In this way, the Consortia have performed their function as guarantor to the consumer of the final product’s conformity with the regulatory provisions which define its characteristics.

With this aim, a significant example is provided by a recent survey⁹ carried out with the intention of evaluating consumer confidence with regards to the Parmigiano Reggiano Cheese Consortium, and to quantify the value which the Consortium’s brand and the Community’s PDO label add to the product. The results show that 75% of the sample group indicated the Parmigiano Reggiano Cheese Consortium as the body capable of providing the highest guarantees of the of the product purchased, whilst the remaining 25% places its preferences with public and other private bodies. The same survey also shows that the sample of consumers, presented with two hypothetical Parmigiano Reggiano cheeses¹⁰, of which the first was branded only by the Consortium and the second only with the “PDO” designation, was prepared to pay a higher price (an average of 15%) for the first cheese, as opposed to the second. Generalising these results, it is possible to state that the consumers place greater faith in the work carried out by the Consortium than the guarantees offered by other institutions, including the European Union.

The history of the Parmigiano Reggiano Cheese Consortium and the result of the survey therefore confirm the role taken on by the consortium, in both the production supply

⁸ The Consortium:

-must have amongst its members not less than 50% of producers from the typical area, in representation of at least 50% of the average production from the previous three-year period;

-must be governed by a statute which permits admission to the Consortium, with equal rights, to any producer qualified in accordance with the law;

- guarantees for its establishment, organization and for the financial means available to it, an impartial and efficient carrying out of the supervision entrusted to it.

⁹ For further information refer to: Arfini F.(2000), *The Value of Typical Products : the Case of "Prosciutto di Parma" and "Parmigiano Reggiano Cheese"*, in (B. Sylvander, D. Barjolle, F. Arfini) *The Socio-Economics of Origin Labelled Products in Agro-Food Supply Chains: Spatial, Institutional and Co-ordination Aspect, Act and Communications*, INRA no. 17.

¹⁰ The interviews were carried out according to the contingent method of evaluation, which is developed by means of interviews and a sample of consumers/ users to whom detailed information is presented, one being the foundation scenario and one or more hypothetical scenarios. They are asked how much they would be prepared to pay to obtain one or more benefits, represented by the hypothetical scenarios. In this case, the foundation scenario is represented by an undistinguished grana cheese, and the two hypothetical scenarios are represented by a cheese marked by the Consortium for Parmigiano Reggiano cheese, and a cheese with the PDO community label.

chain and in the eyes of the final consumer. They justify the long and tortuous journey, analysed in the paragraphs below, undertaken by the legislator to reach a double target of fulfilling Community requirements and of respecting the socio-economic organisation of the national sector for typical products.

3. The national legislation framework following the issuing of (EEC) Regulations 2081/92 and 2082/92

After approval of (EEC) Regulations 2081/92 and 2082/92, the Italian legislator was obliged to intervene in a supervisory capacity, and to check products having a protected designation or an attestation of specificity in order to implement the norms contained therein. Article 10 of Regulation 2081/92 and Article 14 of Regulation 2082/92 do in fact establish that Member states must set up, within six months of the two Regulations coming into effect, control structures with the task of guaranteeing that agricultural and food products in possession of protected designation or an attestation of specificity adhere to the regulatory provisions. These same Articles also request that, starting from the 1 January 1998, to obtain the authorisation of the Member State, the designated control authorities meet the conditions outlined in EN standard 45011 of the 26 June 1989¹¹.

The national legislator's first intervention with regards to the requirements expressed in the community regulations was formalised in the bill of law no. 2717. The text of the bill of law, made up of sixteen articles, was aimed at regulating those sectors which the community norms expressly require the normative intervention of the member States. This included, in particular, the request for registration, any opposition to this, labelling, presentation and publicising of products and the functions of supervision and control. Approved by the Chambers on 18 December 1993 and subsequently transmitted to the Senate where it was received favourably by all Commissions excepting that of the Budget, which was unable to pass judgement/ pronounce itself owing to the additional dissolution of the Chambers; today, the Bill draft, also owing to the subsequent legislative interruptions found, should be considered as expired.

The legislator's action was therefore expressed by means of a series of legislative acts in which, one by one, the single aspects were confronted, according to their priority and the deadlines specified at Community level.

¹¹ EN Norm 45011 is the official document which specifies the general requirements to which an independent body, which manages a product certification system, must adhere to guarantee impartiality and correct judgement.

The certification body must:

- be impartial and possess a structure in which the members of the governing body represent the interests involved in the certification process, without there being any predominant interests;
- it must have a permanent staff, under the guidance of a responsible manager for the fulfillment of the checking operations carried out independently of the influence of those who have direct commercial interests in certification;
- have an organizational structure which includes an organigram with the attribution of responsibility and hierarchical structure of the body, a description of the means of financing, documentation of the certification systems, the rules and procedures to be followed for obtaining certification, and documentation attesting to its legal status.

The first measure taken in this sense was the ministerial decree of 3 November 1995, in which the national legislator entrusted (art. 1) the control and supervision tasks set out in Article 10 to the Central Inspectorate for Fraud Prevention; a task which, according to the decree also involves co-ordinating the specific supervisory tasks carried out by the Consortia or by other authorised bodies.

Article 2 does in fact state that the Inspectorate can avail itself of external bodies (either public or private) for the purpose of carrying out the control activities, on the condition that they conform to the requirements established in Article 10 of EEC regulation 2081/92 and Article 14 of EEC regulation 2082/92¹², which the Consortia specifically comprise. Clause 4 of Article 2 sets out that, once the validity of the requirements has been established, the control and supervisory tasks be attributed with ministerial decree. The last clause of Article 2 establishes in short that, whilst awaiting the adoption of the decree as per clause 4, and in any case no later than one year from the date of registration of the designations, the supervisory tasks remain entrusted to the Consortia in accordance with the procedures laid out in the assignment decrees in force.

With the subsequent decree of 24 June 1997 an extension was granted up to the 1 January 1998, fixed by (EEC) regulation no. 2081/92 to fulfil the conditions in norm EN 45011, specifying that the control tasks involve all those who intend to use the PDO and PGI designations.

The temporary system laid out in the first decree and the extension granted by the second have not proven sufficient to resolve the problem of how to bring about Article 10 of (EEC) regulation 2081/92 in such a way as to respond unequivocally to the dispositions which state that the private bodies designated for carrying out the checks must provide guarantees of objectivity and impartiality to each producer subjected to the checks, and fulfil the conditions established by EN standard 45011. For this reason, with the decree of 18 December 1997, the Ministry for Agricultural Policy was recognised (articles 1 and 2) as the national authority for co-ordination of control, and responsible for supervision; furthermore it established that the control activity as at Article 10 of (EEC) Regulation 2081/92 must be carried out by the public by public control authorities by decree of the Ministry for Agricultural Policy. Subsequent articles (3 and 4) found a technical evaluation Committee for evaluating compliance of the control bodies. They then establish (Article 5) that the authorisation request from a private body to carry out checks must be presented by the parties proposing registration or the associated body which principally represents the interested parties in the event of designations registered temporarily in line with the norms of Article 17 of regulation no. 2081/92. The decree also stipulates that each designation of origin or geographical indication must be subjected to control by only one private authorised body, (Article 6) and that supervision of the private authorised control body must be carried out by the

¹²As the content of Article 10 of Regulation 2081/92 and Article of Regulation 2082/92 is the same, henceforth we shall refer only to Article 10.

Ministry for Agricultural Policy and the Autonomous Regions and Provinces for those structures falling within the territorial jurisdiction (Article 7).

Finally, the last temporary norm (Article 8) grants another extension of six months, this time however beyond the 1 January 1998 date set in Article 10 of (EEC) Regulation 2081/92, specifying that the task of control continue to be carried out by the Central Inspectorate for Fraud Prevention and by the Autonomous Regions and Provinces responsible for the territory, who in carrying out control tasks may avail of the inspectorates of the Consortia. In this way, an unusual relationship between public and private is created, in that it is no longer based on the attribution of legal tasks, but simply referring to a functional relationship whose judicial supposition is not clear.

Whilst it is apparent that the national legislator's intention was to grant the necessary time to the Consortia to organise themselves in accordance with the new Community legislation, it is however undeniable that the extension awarded in the decree rendered it impossible for those making typical products to respect the 1 January 1998 deadline set out in (EEC) Regulation 2081/92. Furthermore, the decision to entrust the task of expressing a binding opinion on the conformity of the private control bodies to a ministerially-appointed technical evaluation committee in line with standard EN 45011, whilst legitimate in its literal interpretation¹³ of Article 10 of (EEC) Regulation 2081/92, proved to be a choice which only minimally respects the institution of certification by an accredited body based on EN standard 45011 and recognised at an international level.

4. Definition of the new national legislative framework

Whilst the Consortia, in the course of the extension granted in the Ministerial Decree on 1 December 1997, took steps to reorganise their own structures so as to comply with the community provisions, the national legislator has issued numerous provisions with an end to setting up a complete judicial reference framework for the control bodies.

On 24 April 1998, law 128 was issued, which confirmed that the Ministry for Agricultural Policy was the national authority in charge of co-ordinating control activities and supervision of the same. Furthermore, it established that (Article 53) the control activity referred to in Article 10 of (EEC) Regulation 2081/92 must be carried out by designated public control authorities, and by private bodies authorised by decree of the Ministry for Agricultural Policy, having first consulted the Regions (Clause 1). The authorisation to privately controlled bodies is subject to a preliminary investigation (clause 2):

- conformity with EN standard 45011;
- availability of qualified staff and means for the carrying out of control activities;
- adherence to relevant procedures.

¹³ Clause 13 of Article 10 of (EEC) Regulation no. 2081/92 states that "the bodies must comply with the conditions established in EN norm 45011 of 26 June 1989.

The private bodies which comply with the requirements cited in clause 2 are enrolled (clause 6) in the “Register of private control bodies for the protected designation of origin (PDO) and Protected Geographical Indication (PGI)”. Article 53 of the same law also establishes that the authorised private bodies and the designated public authorities can carry on their activity for one or more recognised products in accordance with (EEC) Regulation 2081/92, and that all designations and Protected Geographical Indications are subject to control by one private authorised body only (Article 10). The principles according on which the supervision of private authorised control bodies is carried out by the Ministry of Agricultural Policy and by the Regions for the structures falling within the territorial jurisdiction (clause 11).

One month later, the Ministerial Decree of 25 May 1998 founded a technical evaluation group for evaluating the private control bodies, based at the Ministry of Agricultural Policy, charged with the task of evaluating the compliance of the private control bodies with the requirements set out in Article 53 of law 128 of 24 April 1998 for the successive authorisation and enrolment to the Register (clause 1).

The technical group is in charge of:

- giving its opinion, in the case of public authority, on the availability of qualified staff and means for the carrying out of control activities and adherence to relevant procedures;
- monitor and evaluate the activity of the designated public authorities and of the authorised control bodies;
- express opinions relating to the adoption of provisions for suspension and revocation of the authorisations given to private control bodies;
- formulate guide lines for the control activities, also with regards to the rate of costs sustained.

The last act to guarantee the functioning of the new system of control typical products was defined in the Ministerial Decree of the 29 May 1998: this established the relative procedures for authorisation of control for private bodies, essentially regarding the organisation of the bodies themselves, and their specific competence in relation to the different products for which the control authorisation is requested.

The chronology of the decrees published in the period between April and May 1998 leads one to make the following observation; if, on the one hand the legislator, in recognising the six-month extension to the deadline established in the Community Regulations, wanted to concede a period to the benefit of the Consortia for the reorganisation of their own organisational structures, on the other hand it seems that, in that same period, it was necessary to prepare the complicated legislative basis of a new control system, paying attention to the pre-existing national framework and, at the same time, respecting the community regulations. Having defined the basis of the new control system, the legislation issued in the following two years focussed on the redefining of the competencies of the consortia.

5. Redefining of the roles of the Consortia. Competencies, criteria for representation and division of costs

With the new community regulations becoming effective, it has been necessary for the legislator to intervene to adapt the institutional framework formed in Italy over the course of several decades, being no longer in line with the community provisions. As was pointed out previously, the institutions principally involved in the revision process have been the Consortia, that is to say the same organisations which represented the foundations of the success of typical products. In bearing in mind the irreplaceable role played by these, the first decrees issued by the national legislator following the issuing of the Community Regulations appear to be an attempt to maintain the roles of the Consortia unaltered; indeed, if the decrees issued in the period between 1992 and 1997 are considered, the effort to confirm the Consortia' power to control productions, previously recognised in national decrees, is evident; or in any case to guarantee these the maximum period of time possible to find the most appropriate solution in accordance with the dictates of the community regulations. In effect, the Ministerial Decree of the 18 December 1997, honouring a six-month extension for the Consortia for adjustment starting from 1 January 1998, has in fact contravened that which is outlined in Article 10 of (EEC) Regulation 2081/92, in which 1 January 1998 is the last possible date for complying with the requirements with respect to community standard EN 45011.

In the six-month extension granted, the consortium institutions have in any case demonstrated that they possess the spirit of flexibility necessary to confront the new legislation, and have undertaken to reorganise their structures and the relevant responsibilities¹⁴.

Whilst the Consortia were undertaking their own reorganisation, the legislator began to create the basis for establishing the new normative system with law no. 128 of 24 April 1998, subsequently modified by the Community Law of 1999, no.526, which, with regards to the competencies of the Consortia, singles out the following significant aspects:

- protection;
- promotion;
- exploitation;
- consumer information.

In the carrying on of their activities, as per clause 15 of Article 14 of the Community Law, the Safeguarding Consortia can:

¹⁴ For further information regarding the solutions adopted, refer to Paragraph 6 of this document.

- put forward regulatory proposals and carry out consultation tasks relative to the product concerned;
- define programmes aimed at improvement of the quality of products in terms of sanitary safety, chemical, physical, organoleptic and nutritional characteristics of the product;
- collaborate in the supervision and safeguarding of the PDO, PGI and TSG from unfair competition;
- promote the adoption of decisions with methods and content as outlined in Article 11 of legislative decree no.173 of 1998.

With reference to the last point, Article 11 of the legislative decree no.173 of 1998 outlines the possibility to bring about agreements, with a limited time period, which concern the provisional and co-ordinated planning of the production of PDO, PGI, TSG and biological agriculture products.

It is not a true productive self regulation, but instead, through the creation of an appropriate inter-professional body for the supply-chain, of carrying out a type of “production observatory” which, by monitoring the market, can make predictions regarding demand and supply non-binding information to the producers (the only one to make use of the norm at present is the Consortium for Prosciutto San Daniele). This aspect is of considerable importance when considering the position adopted by the dall'Autorità Garante della Concorrenza e del Mercato. The established laws for the protection of products of designated and typical national origin¹⁵ state that the bodies to whom the task of protection was entrusted, (and therefore the Consortia), could adopt a programme for protected production and assign production quotas to all the parties concerned. In recent years and in certain cases, fulfilment of this task was challenged in front of the AGCM. The plaintiffs sustained that this was in breach of the norms on freedom of competition. The cases of planning and imposition of quotas on production brought to the attention of the Antitrust were those involving the Consortia of Prosciutto di Parma and San Daniele (Decision no.3999 of 1996) and the Consortium of Parmigiano Reggiano cheese (Decision no.4352 of 1996). In both decisions, the Antitrust criticised the production programmes which imposed limits on the quantities to be produced, and consequently on the purchases of raw materials. These limits provoked certain farmers' associations into filing charges, claiming that these violated agreements laid out in law no.287 of 1990, as they distorted competition in the national market. In both cases, the Consortia ran for cover requesting, with suitable changes to the plans, a dispensation for temporary authorisation, being permitted by law no. 287.

¹⁵ Ministerial decree of. 14 December 1981 “Controlled by voluntary consortia of production of designated origin and typical cheeses, given the task of supervising production of said cheeses” entrusts to the Consortia the task of planning production. The Ministerial Decree of 15 February 1993, no. 253, “Regulation of execution of law of 13 February 1990, no. 26, on the safeguarding of the denomination of origin of “Prosciutto di Parma” at Article 30 establishes that the Consortium, body entrusted with supervision, can adopt provisions and issue directives in relation to the adoption of planning of the safeguarded production.

Indeed, the Consortium for Parmigiano Reggiano cheese turned the quantitative programming mechanism into a system for verifying production requests presented by individual consortia with quantities which can be exceeded if a business shows that it can also produce the quantity exceeding the limit in line with the established quality regulations.

The legislation carried out to define the new role of the Consortia was followed the year after by the publication of the Community Law of 1999, by means of four ministerial decrees.

It should be underlined that production of the four provisions required a considerable amount of effort owing to the very different situations existing between and even within the various supply chains themselves, some of which would have certainly found it difficult to adapt to the dynamics of the sector, if confronted with excessively rigid plans. The principal aim was therefore to entrust the management of the Consortia to those entities which directly produce and obtain the agricultural or food product of recognised designation. However, one preliminary question posed itself which needed to be resolved before drafting the provisions; it related to Article 14 of the Community Law of 1999 which unequivocally regulates the PDO and PGI Consortia (recognised in accordance with EEC Regulation 2081/92) and those of the TSG (recognised in accordance with EEC Regulation 2082/92). The question was whether or not it was actually possible to identify common criteria which would be valid for both types of production. In actual fact, the situation in Italy for products recognised in accordance with either of the regulations is very different. At the time when the question presented itself, 105 products were recognised as being either PDO or PGI, whilst only one TSG product existed; furthermore, this product could not be made available for consumption as there was no body authorised to carry out necessary testing checks. In addition, unlike PDO and PGI which are controlled by only one body, the TSGs can be controlled by different bodies, and production may be carried out, respecting the production regulations registered in Brussels, anywhere within the European Union.

Considering the differences to be taken into account with an end to identifying the representativity and representation criteria within the corporate entities, the Administration's decision was to regulate, in the initial phase, just the PDO and PGI Consortia, and to postpone the regulation of the STG Consortia until a second phase. Secondly, the problem of defining the two categories of parties involved, already identified in the aforementioned Community Law: "producers and processors interested in designation" and "producers and users". This definition represented a particularly important moment because it provided a base for confronting and resolving some serious issues relating to the organisation of Consortia following the new Community legislation. In particular, the new regulation had created a situation in Italy which endangered the survival of the Consortia which, with regards to producers who were in compliance with production regulations, could not have prevented the use of the brand, thereby risking a considerable reduction in the financing sources. The issue was confronted in Ministerial Decree no.61413 of 12 April 2000, stating that the first

category - “producers and processors interested in designation” – includes the entirety of parties who make up a part of the supply chain for each designation, whilst the second category, more restricted than the first, identifies the parties whose activity assumes a special and irreplaceable role in giving the product its individual PDO or IGP characteristics. Bearing this definition in mind, the latter was made up, in the cheeses supply chain, of “dairies”, in the meat-production supply chain, by “processing companies”, in the fresh meats supply chain, by “farmers and butchers” and, in the fruit, vegetable and unprocessed cereals supply chain, by “producers”¹⁶.

On the basis of this distinction, Article 2 of the decree gives the responsibility to all the parties who comprise the Consortium, and all the parties classified as “producers and users” of PDO and PGI, even if they are not members of the Consortium, for any costs arising from the activities carried out in accordance with clauses 14 and 15 of the 1999 Community Law, no.526; that is, activities related to protection, promotion, exploitation, consumer information and general maintenance of the interests related to the designations¹⁷. Ministerial Decree no.61413 also established that the representation of the Consortia is recognised by participation in the company structure of the “producers and users” representing at least 2/3 of the certified production, calculated over a considerable period of time, and that tests for the representation be carried out by the Ministry every three years. In addition, Article 2 ratifies the obligation to set up a specific Consortium for each PDO or PGI: this choice, in line with the general aim set by the legislator, can be attributed to the will to guarantee that the strategies and actions of the Consortium come from the parties who operate directly in the supply chain of each specific PDO and PGI.

With reference to representation in the corporate entities, on the other hand, the Ministerial Decree of 12 April 2000, no. 61414, took the category of “producers and processors interested in designation” into consideration; that is to say, all those parties who make up the supply chain. Thus, in the seasoned cheeses supply chain, the parties concerned are the farmers, the dairies, and the seasoners and or portioners; whilst in the meat production supply chain is made up of farmers, butchers, processing companies, portioners and packagers.

For a balanced representation, all the parties making up each supply chain must take part in the corporate entities, and in any case assuring a quota equal to 66% to the “producers and users”. This amount is based on the complete participation in the Consortium by all those falling within the category; where this is not the case, a reduction in the quota proportional to the quantity of controlled production belonging to parties who are not in the Consortium is required. With relation to the values of voting, these are measured in terms of the relationship between quantity of certified product which can be attributed to the voter, and the total quantity certified within each category.

¹⁶ The decree identifies the category “producers and users” also for the oils supply chain, represented by olive cultivators and for the supply chain of bakery products represented by “preparers”.

¹⁷ The cost-division aspect was successively examined in greater depth in the Ministerial decree of 12 September 2000, no.410, analyzed later in this paragraph.

The adherence of the Consortia' statute to the decrees issued has been fixed to take place within one year of the publication of these same decrees.

The third Ministerial Decree of 12 April 2000, focuses on the co-operation between the Central inspectorate for Fraud Prevention and the PDO and PGI Consortia. Nonetheless, this law was revoked and was substituted by the Ministerial Decree of 12 October 2000, which highlighted the co-operation between the Inspectorate and the Consortia in the following areas:

- control that protected production for which the certification on the part of the authorised control body meet the quality requirements set out in the regulations;
- supervision of similar products, produced and/or marketed in the European Union which, with false indications of origin, type, nature and specific qualities of the product, could lead to confusion amongst consumers and therefore damage PDO and PGI products.

Article 2 sets out the establishment of a nucleus for supervision of all PDO and PGI products, composed of a functionary from the Central Inspectorate for Fraud Prevention, and a representative of the Consortia, which annually drafts a programme¹⁸ of activities and then carries it out. The Consortia undertake to periodically report on their activity carried out in the corresponding satellite office of the Central Inspectorate for Fraud.

The change carried out to the content of this decree have permitted the confusion which followed the publication of the previous decree (12 April 2000) to be reduced, regarding possible conflicts in responsibilities between the tasks attributed to the control bodies and the supervisory agents of the Safeguarding Consortia.

In actual fact, the control activities assigned to the Consortium, should be taken as concerning principally the marketing and, in any case, after the control activity carried out by the authorised certification body has been completed. It is however true that the adverb used-“principally”- to define the Consortium's field of action still leaves some doubt, as it does not categorically exclude the phases prior to commercialisation, but instead states that, in particular cases, moreover not identified, the control activity can be extended also to the production and transformation phases, subject to agreement with the Central Inspectorate for Fraud Prevention.

Finally, Article 2, clause 3 of the same decree specifies that “the supervisory agents of the PDO and PGI Consortia may not, under any circumstances, carry out checks on the control bodies, nor can they carry out auto-checks on production”.

With the decree of 12 September 2000, no. 410, the legislative framework which regulates the activity of the Protection Consortium is completed. The obligation to take part in meeting the costs incurred by the Consortia of geographical designation (PDO-

¹⁸ The program contains indications regarding the methods and numbers of inspection visits to be carried out, the number of samples to be taken in relation to the volume of the product being checked, the checks to carry out on similar productions and the laboratories where analysis of the samples taken is to be carried out. The program can set, where the operative and functional circumstances require it, checking of the correspondence between the quantity of safeguarded product and the amount on the market.

PGI), even by non-member producers, introduced by clause 16, Article 14 of Law no.526/99 (Community Law 1999).

The provision in question identifies two types of parties to whom the costs fall: the members of the Consortium, and those who, even though not members of the Consortium, belong to the category “producers and users”.

The costs deriving from the Consortium’s activities are distributed amongst each category within the supply chain, to an extent which does not exceed the representation percentage fixed in the corporate entity. Following this criteria, and according to the decree on representation, the category of “producers and users” must meet costs of no more than 66%, whilst the remaining quota falls to the other categories identified in each supply chain.

For example, in the case of the “seasoned cheeses” supply chain, 66% of the costs deriving from the Consortium’s activities are met by the dairies, whilst the remaining 34% falls to the farmers and seasoners. For the minority categories, in this case the farmers and seasoners, the means of division are defined by the individual Consortium’s based on the consideration that each designation is characterised by a specific set of characteristics, and the weighting to be attributed to these categories can only be correctly defined after having carried out the necessary evaluations of the case. Those parties belonging to the minority categories, unlike those laid out for the “producers and users”, are obliged to meet costs only if members of the Consortium.

Having defined the means of dividing the costs between the various categories of each specific agri-food supply chain, the legislator further established that the quota division between the parties operating within each category is objectively linked to the quantity of product certified by the authorised body.

The “producers and users”, as previously recalled, are called to meet the Consortium’s costs even if they are not members of that particular structure; in particular, they can only be called to meet costs incurred by the Consortium regarding the activities outlined in clause 15, Article 14 of law 21 December 1999, no.526. This clause states that the PDO and PGI Consortia are constituted in accordance with Article 2602 of the Civil Code, with the task of protection, promotion, product exploitation, consumer information, general care of the interests involved in designation and supervision according to the directives issued by the MIPA.

Considering the points set out by the legislator, all the costs incurred by the Consortium in favour of the management of geographical designation fall also to non-members of the Consortium. For example, the purchase of a new headquarters represents a cost which can not be passed on to non-members of the Consortium, whilst costs sustained for a publicity campaign will fall to both members and non-members. As indicated, the relative decree for division of the expenses was keenly awaited by the Consortia for geographical designation. The collective brands which identify PDO and PGI products are, in fact, held by the Consortia on the condition that their relative use is guaranteed to all producers who respect the approved production regulations, and who permit checks

by the pre-chosen control body¹⁹. The risk deriving from this set up was a loss in the important role carried out by the consortium structures in the protection and evaluation of products, a risk connected to the use of the collective brand with the acquirement of related benefits; we need only think of the “value” of brands such as “Parmigiano Reggiano” or “Prosciutto di Parma”, on the part of “producers and users” who, having decided not to adhere to the Consortium, would have limited themselves to supporting the costs of checks, leaving to the members the responsibility of costs incurred from the protection and evaluation activity brought about, to the advantage of all concerned, by the Consortium structure.

To date, there have been no cases of violation of this decree; there thus remains some doubt regarding the procedures from which a breach could occur, considering that the decree does not mention any type of penalty, nor does it establish a judge responsible for resolving such disputes.

It is therefore not irrelevant to bear in mind that, before any controversy arising between the parties, the PDO and PGI registration brought about with the European Commission’s Regulations enjoy complete autonomy with respect to the previous national provisions; the national laws operate only as legalisation of a national protection policy prior to the Community’s request for recognition. Furthermore, this has not become a condition necessary or even sufficient for Community registration.

6. The control bodies in Italy

The 1999 Community law has given the Ministry for Agricultural Policy the role of national authority responsible for co-ordinating the control activity and supervision, therefore adopting a choice which favours just one public institution. As noted, however, the national legislator also states that the control activity as per Article 10 of (EEC) Regulation 2081/92 must be carried out by designated public control authorities (Chamber of Commerce) and by private bodies authorised by decree of the Ministry of Agricultural Policy.

In the environment of the second category- that is, that of the private bodies- two options were in fact found, which were alternatively adopted by the Protection Consortium: the first stated that the checks must be carried out by already existing control bodies and authorised by the technical evaluation Committee nominated by the Ministry of Agricultural Policy; the second was accomplished by the constitution of new control bodies, derived from the same Protection Consortia, authorised by the technical Committee. The second solution, in fact, has been adopted by few Consortia which are, however, amongst the most important at a national level, being the Consortium for Prosciutto di Parma, the Consortium for Prosciutto di San Daniele and the Consortium for Parmigiano Reggiano cheese. Notwithstanding the initial doubts

¹⁹ Clause 16 of Article 14 of the Community Law states that, where the place of designation coincides with the brand registered by the Consortium, the same is held by the Consortium with the obligation to guarantee its use to all producers who undergo checks by the authorized body.

expressed by experts in the sector, the control bodies set up in this way have been recognised as complying with EN norm 45011 by the Technical Evaluation Committee which has verified its compliance with the requisite independence, through the constitution of its own juridical nature and the availability of autonomous sources of income.

For this reason, at present the control activities in Italy are performed by some public entities, and a majority of private bodies. However, this has created a situation which, in time, has revealed some critical points; amongst these, it particularly emerges that the problem connected to the heterogeneity of the control programmes adopted for single products, even within the same category, which risks creating inequalities between the producers of different designations, owing to different methods of carrying out control. To this end, the Ministry of Agricultural Policy is currently defining a project aimed at rendering the checks homogenous, thus guaranteeing equal market conditions, necessary to operate in a system of free competition, and are indispensable above all to producers of designations of a low economic profile, such as those operating out of economically disadvantaged areas, in other words the parties to whom (EEC) Regulation 2081/92 is primarily directed. It is therefore to be hoped that such an obligation be formalised and imposed on all the control bodies operating throughout the country.

7. Some reflections to conclude

Following a long and tortuous course, the new regulations of the Consortia finally seems complete. Undoubtedly, the Community regulations have set the stage for analysing and reorganising a legislation which, developed over a period of decades, was becoming clumsy. The revision carried out and the limits imposed on the work carried out by the Consortia goes, in reality, well beyond the question of control of production: for example, we can consider the fact that, the norm previously in effect attributed the power to issue regulations to the Consortia which, once ratified by the national Authority, became operative and subsequently suitable to modify the production regulations, unlike the events following the issuing of Community regulations which only allow changes in the regulations if precise procedures are observed. These are concluded with the issuing of a specific regulation of which only the approval of the changes to the production process are permitted. With regard to the new limits of the roles assigned to the Consortia, we have already seen that these include the management of the brand, taken in its loosest terms, and therefore including all the activities involving protection, exploitation, innovation, and revision of regulations, but not the activity of control production. There are those who sustain that the loss of the task of control, in addition to guaranteeing in a transparent manner the quality of the product declared in the regulations, reinforcing its image amongst consumers, permits the Consortia to focus their own interventions on the management of the brand; without going into the issue, it is nonetheless undeniable that, much as the new European

legislation might have permitted the creation of a single new legislative design, it has not signalled the end of several serious problems affecting our typical products.

In particular, many Italian products, above all those chiefly known in overseas markets, continue to be the object of imitations, encroachments, misleading indications and more, involving the Consortia in costly legal battles to defend the brand. This was the case, for example, for Prosciutto di Parma which, in some chains of modern distribution, (for example Asda in Great Britain) was being sliced and packaged in contravention of the registered regulations, and without efficient intervention by the courts of the countries involved. Another example is supplied by Gorgonzola's legal battle with the brands "Osterzola" and "Cambozola". For the latter, the European Court of Justice, which should represent the highest level of judgement, has referred the question to the Austrian courts, being the country in which the brand was registered. It is thus evident that there is still an insufficient amount of consideration given over to Community norms, both on the part of the judicial authorities of many member states and, more serious still, by the European Court of Justice itself.

8. Bibliography

Agri 2000 (2000), *Consorzi di valorizzazione dei prodotti agroalimentari tipici: ruolo e funzioni in relazione al rinnovato quadro legislativo*, Atti del Convegno, Sana edizione 2000

Arfini F. (1999), *I problemi della filiera del Parmigiano Reggiano alle soglie del nuovo millennio*, Trade Marketing, n. 26

Arfini F. (2000), *The Value of Typical Products : the Case of "Prosciutto di Parma" and "Parmigiano Reggiano Cheese*, in (B. Sylvander, D. Barjolle, F. Arfini) *The Socio-Economics of Origin Labelled Products in Agro-Food Supply Chains: Spatial, Institutional and Co-ordination Aspect*, Act e Cominications, INRA n. 17

Gardini C., Lazzarin C. (2000), *Il ruolo dei consorzi di tutela in relazione alle nuove norme*, Terra e Vita, n.50

Gardini C., Lazzarin C. (2001), *Consorzi di tutela delle denominazioni geografiche: i criteri di ripartizione delle spese*, Terra e Vita, n.44

Giacomini C. (1998), *La disciplina delle denominazioni tutelate: i Regolamenti CEE 2081/92 e 2082/92 come parte integrante della politica comunitaria della qualità*, Documenti CNEL, Roma, pp. 207-241

Mancini M. C., (1998), *Dop e Igp, chi farà il controllore?*, Terra e Vita, n.19

NOMISMA (2001), *Prodotti tipici e sviluppo locale. Il ruolo delle produzioni di qualità nel futuro dell'agricoltura italiana*, VIII Rapporto Nomisma sull'Agricoltura Italiana, Editrice Il Sole 24 Ore, Milano

OCDE (2000), *Appellations of origin and geographical indications in OECD member countries: economic and legal implications*, Working Party on Agricultural Policies and

Markets of the Committee for Agriculture, Joint Working Party of the Committee for Agriculture and the Trade Committee, Directorate for Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, Trade Directorate

Tab. 1 - PDO e PGI products and control bodies

N.	Name of the PDO/ PGI product	Control body	Ministerial Decree	Publication on the Official Journal of Italian Republic
1	Aceto balsamico tradizionale di Modena	CERMET-Certificazione e Ricerca per la Qualità	15/01/01	n.21 del 26 gennaio 2001
2	Aprutino Pescarese	C.C.I.A.A. di Pescara	27/07/99	n.187 dell' 11 agosto 1999
3	Arancia Rossa di Sicilia	AGROQUALITA'	27/07/99	n.187 dell' 11 agosto 1999
4	Asiago	CERTIASIAGO	27/07/99	n.187 dell' 11 agosto 1999
5	Bitto	C.S.Q.A.- Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.-	14/12/98	n.297 del 21 dicembre 1998
6	Bra	I.N.O.Q.	02/06/99	n.139 del 16 giugno 1999
7	Bresaola della Valtellina	C.S.Q.A.- Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.-	28/01/99	n.28 del 4 febbraio 1999
8	Brisighella	CERMET-Certificazione e Ricerca per la Qualità	30/11/98	n.297 del 21 dicembre 1998
9	Bruzio	3A - Parco Tecnologico Agroalimentare dell' Umbria	08/09/00	n.221 del 21 settembre 2000
10	Caciocavallo Silano	IS.ME.CERT.	23/04/99	n.102 del 4 maggio 1999
11	Canestrato Pugliese	BIOAGRICOOP	10/09/99	n. 220 del 18 settembre 1999
12	Canino	C.C.I.A.A. di Viterbo	08/10/99	n.248 del 21 ottobre 1999
13	Cappero di Pantelleria	AGROQUALITA'	04/05/01	n.122 del 28 maggio 2001
14	Casciotta di Urbino	ASSAM - Agenzia Servizi Settore Agroalimentare Marche	08/10/99	n.248 del 21 ottobre 1999
15	Castagna di Montella	IS.ME.CERT.	26/03/99	n.81 dell' 8 aprile 1999
16	Castelmagno	I.N.O.Q.	02/06/99	n.136 del 16 giugno 1999
17	Chianti Classico	AGROQUALITA'	28/12/00	n.6 del 9 gennaio 2001
18	Cilento	IS.ME.CERT.	23/04/99	n. 101 del 3 maggio 1999
19	Clementine di Calabria	AGROQUALITA'	27/07/99	n. 187 dell' 11 agosto 1999
20	Collina di Brindisi	BIOAGRICOOP	30/11/98	n.297 del 21 dicembre 1998
21	Colline Salernitane	IS.ME.CERT.	23/04/99	n.102 del 4 maggio 1999
22	Colline Teatine	C.C.I.A.A. di Chieti	13/07/00	n.178 del 1 agosto 2000
23	Coppa Piacentina	ECEPA	12/03/99	n.68 del 23 marzo 1999
24	Cotechino Modena	I.N.E.Q. - Istituto Nord Est Qualità	09/01/01	n.18 del 23 gennaio 2001
25	Culatello di Zibello	Istituto Parma Qualità	23/04/99	n.101 del 3 maggio 1999
26	Dauno	AGROQUALITA'	23/04/99	n.101 del 3 maggio 1999
27	Fagiolo di Lamon della Vallata Bellunese	C.S.Q.A.- Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.-	14/12/98	n.4 del 7 gennaio 1999
28	Fagiolo di Sarconi	AGROQUALITA'	21/03/01	n.85 dell' 11 aprile 2001
29	Farro della Garfagnana	A.I.A.B.	10/09/99	n.231 del 1 ottobre 1999
30	Fiore Sardo	O.C.P.A.	03/07/01	n.161 del 13 luglio 2001
31	Fontina	Certidop Valle d' Aosta	07/12/99	n.293 del 15 dicembre 1999
32	Formai de Mut dell' Alta Valle Brembana	CERTIPRODOP	18/12/98	n.4 del 7 gennaio 1999
33	Fungo di Borgotaro	P.A.I. - Product Authentication Inspectorate Limited	12/05/00	n.125 del 31 maggio 2000
34	Garda	C.S.Q.A.- Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.-	18/03/99	n.77 del 2 aprile 1999
N.	Name of the PDO/ PGI product	Control body	Ministerial Decree	Publication on the Official Journal of Italian Republic

35	Gorgonzola	C.S.Q.A.- Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.-	27/07/99	n.187 dell' 11 agosto 1999
36	Grana Padano	C.S.Q.A.- Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.-	07/08/98	n.193 del 20 agosto 1998
37	La Bella della Daunia	AGROQUALITA'	06/07/01	n.179 del 3 agosto 2001
38	Laghi Lombardi	CERTIQUALITY	04/10/99	n.243 del 15 ottobre 1999
39	Lametia	AGROQUALITA'	07/12/99	n.294 del 16 dicembre 1999
40	Lenticchia di Castelluccio di Norcia	3A - Parco Tecnologico Agroalimentare dell' Umbria	28/01/99	n.28 del 4 febbraio 1999
41	Limone Costa d' Amalfi	IS.ME.CERT.	07/08/01	n.188 dell' 14 agosto 2001
42	Limone di Sorrento	IS.ME.CERT.	07/08/01	n.188 dell' 14 agosto 2001
43	Marrone del Mugello	A.I.A.B.	10/09/99	n.231 del 1 ottobre 1999
44	Marrone di Castel del Rio	Check Fruit	28/01/99	n.29 del 5 febbraio 1999
45	Montasio	C.S.Q.A.- Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.-	29/12/00	n.5 dell' 8 gennaio 2001
46	Monte Veronese	C.S.Q.A.- Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.-	27/07/99	n.187 dell' 11 agosto 1999
47	Monti Iblei	AGROQUALITA'	13/03/00	n.70 del 24 marzo 2000
48	Mortadella Bologna	I.N.E.Q. - Istituto Nord Est Qualità	21/12/00	n.1 del 2 gennaio 2001
49	Mozzarella di Bufala Campana	CERTIDOP	04/12/98	n.291 del 14 dicembre 1998
50	Murazzano	I.N.O.Q.	02/06/99	n.139 del 16 giugno 1999
51	Nocellara del Belice	AGROQUALITA'	06/07/01	n.179 del 3 agosto 2001
52	Nocciola del Piemonte	I.N.O.Q.	26/03/99	n.81 dell' 8 aprile 1999
53	Nocciola di Giffoni	IS.ME.CERT.	23/04/99	n.101 del 3 maggio 1999
54	Pancetta Piacentina	ECEPA	12/03/99	n.68 del 23 marzo 1999
55	Parmigiano Reggiano	Dipartimento Controllo Qualità Parmigiano Reggiano	13/10/98	n.265 del 12 novembre 1998
56	Pecorino Romano	O.C.P.A.	27/07/99	n.187 dell' 11 agosto 1999
57	Pecorino Sardo	O.C.P.A.	27/07/99	n.187 dell' 11 agosto 1999
58	Pecorino Siciliano	Consorzio di ricerca per la filiera lattiero-casearia	13/06/01	n.147 del 27 giugno 2001
59	Pecorino Toscano	C.S.Q.A.- Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.-	10/11/98	n.271 del 19 novembre 1998
60	Penisola Sorrentina	IS.ME.CERT.	23/04/99	n.102 del 4 maggio 1999
61	Pera dell' Emilia-Romagna	Check Fruit	28/01/99	n.29 del 5 febbraio 1999
62	Pera Mantovana	C.S.Q.A. - S.r.l.- Certificazioni, in Thiene	23/04/01	n.106 del 23 aprile 2001
63	Pesca e Nettarina di Romagna	Check Fruit	28/01/99	n.29 del 5 febbraio 1999
64	Pomodoro S. Marzano dell' Agro Sarnese Nocerino	IS.ME.CERT.	18/03/99	n.77 del 2 aprile 1999
65	Prosciutto di Carpegna	CERMET-Certificazione e Ricerca per la Qualità	27/07/99	n.187 dell' 11 agosto 1999
66	Prosciutto di Modena	Istituto Parma Qualità	30/11/98	n.297 del 21 dicembre 1998
67	Prosciutto di Norcia	3A - Parco Tecnologico Agroalimentare dell' Umbria	14/12/98	n.297 del 21 dicembre 1998

N.	Name of the PDO/ PGI product	Control body	Ministerial Decree	Publication on the Official Journal of Italian Republic
68	Prosciutto di Parma	Istituto Parma Qualità	13/10/98	n.265 del 12 novembre 1998
69	Prosciutto di San Daniele	I.N.E.Q. - Istituto Nord Est Qualità	13/10/98	n.265 del 12 novembre 1998
70	Prosciutto Veneto Berico Euganeo	I.N.E.Q. - Istituto Nord Est Qualità	30/11/98	n.297 del 21 dicembre 1998
71	Prosciutto Toscano	C.S.Q.A. - Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.	27/07/99	n.187 dell' 11 agosto 1999
72	Provolone Valpadana	C.S.Q.A. - Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.	10/11/98	n.270 del 18 novembre 1998
73	Quartiolo Lombardo	CERTIPRODOP	18/12/98	n.4 del 7 gennaio 1999
74	Radicchio Rosso di Treviso	C.S.Q.A. - Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.	14/12/98	n.297 del 21 dicembre 1998
75	Radicchio Variegato di Castelfranco	C.S.Q.A. - Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.	14/12/98	n.297 del 21 dicembre 1998
76	Ragusano	Consorzio di ricerca per la filiera lattiero-casearia	13/06/00	n.144 del 22 giugno 2000
77	Raschera	I.N.O.Q.	02/06/99	n.136 del 12 giugno 1999
78	Riso Nano Vialone Veronese	Ente Nazionale Risi	31/01/00	n.30 del 7 febbraio 2000
79	Riviera Ligure	C.C.I.A.A. di Genova, Savona, Imperia, La Spezia	29/12/99	n.5 dell' 8 gennaio 2000
80	Robiola di Roccaverano	I.N.O.Q.	02/06/99	n.136 del 12 giugno 1999
81	Sabina	C.C.I.A.A. di Roma	21/12/99	n.2 del 4 gennaio 2000
82	Salame Brianza	C.S.Q.A. - Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.	12/05/00	n.125 del 31 maggio 2000
83	Salame Piacentino	ECEPA	12/03/99	n.68 del 23 marzo 1999
84	Scalognone di Romagna	Check Fruit	28/01/99	n.29 del 5 febbraio 1999
85	Speck dell' Alto Adige	I.N.E.Q. - Istituto Nord Est Qualità	10/09/99	n.220 del 18 settembre 1999
86	Taleggio	CERTIPRODOP	18/12/98	n.4 del 7 gennaio 1999
87	Terra di Bari	BIOAGRICOOP	03/08/99	n.195 del 20 agosto 1999
88	Terre di Siena	AGROQUALITA'	28/12/00	n.6 del 9 gennaio 2001
89	Terre d' Otranto	AGROQUALITA'	04/10/99	n.243 del 15 ottobre 1999
90	Toma Piemontese	I.N.O.Q.	02/06/99	n.139 del 16 giugno 1999
91	Toscano	CERTIQUALITY	30/11/98	n.297 del 21 dicembre 1998
92	Umbria	3A - Parco Tecnologico Agroalimentare dell' Umbria	30/11/98	n.297 del 21 dicembre 1998
93	Valle d' Aosta Fromadzo	CERTIDOP Valle d' Aosta	07/12/99	n.294 del 16 dicembre 1999
94	Valle d' Aosta Lard d' Arnad	I.N.E.Q. - Istituto Nord Est Qualità	03/08/01	n.195 del 23 agosto 2001
95	Valli Trapanesi	AGROQUALITA'	04/10/99	n.243 del 15 ottobre 1999
96	Valtellina Casera	C.S.Q.A. - Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.	14/12/98	n.297 del 21 dicembre 1998
97	Vitellone bianco dell' Appennino Centrale	3A - Parco Tecnologico Agroalimentare dell' Umbria	18/10/99	n.250 del 23 ottobre 1999
98	Zampone Modena	I.N.E.Q. - Istituto Nord Est Qualità	09/01/01	n.18 del 23 gennaio 2001

Fonte: MIPA

Tab.2 – List of the control bodies authorized by Ministerial Decree

1	3A - Parco Tecnologico Agroalimentare dell' Umbria
2	A.I.A.B.
3	BIOAGRICOOP
4	CERTIQUALITY
5	C.C.I.A.A. di Genova, Savona, Imperia, La Spezia
6	C.C.I.A.A. di Roma
7	C.C.I.A.A. di Chieti
8	C.C.I.A.A. di Viterbo
9	C.C.I.A.A. di Pescara
10	AGROQUALITA'
11	ASSAM - Agenzia Servizi Settore Agroalimentare Marche
12	BIOAGRICOOP
13	Check Fruit
14	CERMET-Certificazione e Ricerca per la Qualità
15	CERTIASIAGO
16	CERTIDOP
17	Certidop Valle d' Aosta
18	CERTIPRODOP
19	Consorzio di ricerca per la filiera lattiero-casearia
20	C.S.Q.A.- Certificazione Qualità Agroalimentare S.r.l.-
21	Dipartimento Controllo Qualità Parmigiano Reggiano
22	Ente Nazionale Risi
23	ECEPA
24	I.N.E.Q. – Istituto Nord Est Qualità
25	I.N.O.Q.
26	IPQ - Istituto Parma Qualità
27	IS.ME.CERT.
28	O.C.P.A.
29	P.A.I. - Product Authentication Inspectorate Limited

Fonte: MIPA