

Mgr Wiktoria Sikorska

Uniwersytet Śląski w Katowicach

ORCID: 0000-0003-2242-2039

e-mail: wiktoria.sikorska@us.edu.pl

Certification and collective marks versus geographical indications in European Union and Italian law: Competition, cumulation or hybrid protection?¹

Znaki certyfikacyjne i wspólne a oznaczenia geograficzne w prawie Unii Europejskiej i we Włoszech: konkurencja, kumulacja czy hybryda ochrony?

Abstract

The article examines the relationship between geographical indications and certification and collective marks under European Union law and within the Italian legal framework. Although both regimes aim to enhance consumer trust and safeguard product reputation, they are grounded in distinct legal concepts. Geographical indications function as instruments that link product quality, characteristics, or reputation to a specific geographical origin, whereas certification and collective marks rely primarily on quality standards established by the mark proprietor or an association of producers. The Italian case study illustrates how certification marks are sometimes used as quasi-geographical indications, particularly in relation to non-agricultural products such as traditional crafts. However, the coexistence of these systems may give rise to regulatory uncertainty, a risk of consumer confusion, and potential legal conflicts. The paper concludes that the future development of the legal framework should seek to reconcile the flexibility of trademark-based mechanisms with the institutional and collective character of the *sui generis* system of geographical indications.

Keywords: geographical indications, certification marks, collective marks, EU law, Italy

JEL: K15, K33, K39

Introduction

Contemporary European markets are increasingly shaped by intangible values, including product reputation and credibility. A key role in this regard is played by instruments of

Streszczenie

Celem artykułu jest analiza relacji między oznaczeniami geograficznymi a znakami certyfikacyjnymi i wspólnymi w prawie Unii Europejskiej oraz we włoskim systemie prawnym. Choć oba reżimy pełnią podobną funkcję, wzmacniając zaufanie konsumentów i chroniąc reputację produktów, opierają się na odmiennych podstawach konstrukcyjnych. Oznaczenia geograficzne koncentrują się na związku jakości z miejscem pochodzenia, natomiast znaki certyfikacyjne i wspólne opierają się na kryteriach jakości ustalanych przez właściciela znaku lub zrzeszenie producentów. Studium przypadku Włoch ukazuje możliwość funkcjonowania znaków certyfikacyjnych jako quasioznaczeń geograficznych, szczególnie w odniesieniu do produktów nierolniczych. Jednoczesne stosowanie obu systemów może jednak prowadzić do niejasności regulacyjnych, ryzyka wprowadzenia konsumenta w błąd oraz konfliktów prawnych. W konkluzji wskazano, że przyszły rozwój prawa powinien zmierzać do pogodzenia elastyczności mechanizmów znakowych z charakterem systemu *sui generis* oznaczeń geograficznych.

Słowa kluczowe: oznaczenia geograficzne, znaki certyfikacyjne, znaki wspólne, prawo UE, Włochy

industrial property law, particularly geographical indications and certification marks. Both mechanisms enhance consumer trust and strengthen producers' competitiveness, although they are based on different conceptual premises. Geographical indications protect the close link between a product's geographical origin and its quality

and reputation, whereas certification marks guarantee compliance with a specific quality standard irrespective of the place of production (Mogyoros, 2025, pp. 91–114). The former regime emphasises the bond with territory, while the latter focuses on objective quality criteria, which may but need not have a geographical dimension. This dualism increases market flexibility, yet it also gives rise to certain risks, including consumer confusion, dilution of territorial reputation, and regulatory arbitrariness. Within European Union law, the issue assumes particular importance because the EU regulatory framework establishes a distinct system for the protection of geographical indications while simultaneously allowing the registration of certification marks. This article examines the relationship between these mechanisms within EU law and within the Italian legal order, where certification marks and collective marks may be used to protect non-agricultural products. The analysis demonstrates that such marks may function as *quasi*-geographical indications, supporting the protection of quality and reputation. However, their overlap with traditional geographical indications may also create significant regulatory risks, including legal conflicts and uncertainty for consumers.

Regulatory framework

For the purposes of this article, collective marks are understood as trademarks used by members of a producers' organisation in accordance with the regulations governing their use. Certification marks (referred to in Polish terminology as guarantee marks) serve to confirm specific characteristics of a product, such as its quality, method of production, or materials. In the remainder of the article, the term "collective marks" refers exclusively to such association-based marks.

Certification marks *sensu stricto* have not been explicitly regulated in international agreements. Only Art. 7bis of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property refers to collective and guarantee marks, permitting their protection even where the association concerned does not carry on commercial or industrial activities.² Member States themselves determine the conditions that an association must fulfil in order to obtain such protection.³ The proprietor of a certification mark is typically an entity independent of producers and responsible for supervising the use of the mark. In order to avoid conflicts of interest, such an entity may not itself offer products covered by the certification. A breach of the principle of impartiality, a lack of supervision, discriminatory practices, or use of the mark in a misleading manner may lead to the invalidation of the registration (Calboli, 2023, p. 477). A mark may also lose protection if it becomes generic, functional, or devoid of distinctive character. A producer meeting the certification criteria may not be arbitrarily excluded from the right to use the mark, which underscores its public function as a guarantor of quality. EU law distinguishes certification

marks from marks indicating commercial origin, as their purpose is not to identify the commercial source of goods but to confirm compliance with specific standards.⁴ Under Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 on the European Union trade mark⁵ and Directive (EU) 2015/2436⁶ approximating the laws of the Member States relating to trade marks, a certification mark is defined as a trademark used to distinguish goods by reference to their material, mode of manufacture, quality, or other characteristics, excluding geographical origin. Its proprietor may be a natural or legal person or a public institution, provided that it does not itself trade in the certified goods.

Collective marks in EU law may, by contrast, contain geographical elements provided that they meet the relevant formal requirements.⁷ They do not guarantee product quality but are based on an associative structure and on regulations governing their use. Historically, they derive from the activities of guilds and brotherhoods (Promińska, 2010, p. 226). In Poland, the right to apply for registration of a collective mark is vested in organisations representing the interests of their members, and the use of the mark is governed by internal regulations (Skubisz, 2019, pp. 15–17). A collective mark facilitates the joint promotion of products and reduces marketing costs (Osajda & Żelechowski (Eds.), 2021, pp. 315–327). An example is the Polish mark Herbapol, originally used by state-owned enterprises and later by companies formed as a result of their transformation.⁸ In Italy, by contrast, the collective mark Melinda protects apples from the Val di Non region, which simultaneously hold the status of a protected designation of origin.⁹ This example illustrates the overlap between the systems of collective marks and geographical indications. These differences reflect the objective of the European Union to ensure that geographical indications are not associated with a single undertaking but rather function as a common good protecting the reputation of a territory. For this reason, exclusive control of a geographical indication by a single entity is considered inadmissible.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the question arises whether the current legal framework genuinely guarantees adequate protection for geographical indications, ensuring that consumers receive reliable information about the origin and quality of products while effectively preventing misleading practices.

Risk of misleading the consumer

Against the background of the current regulatory framework, including Regulation (EU) 2023/2411, a clear legislative trend can be observed towards strengthening the autonomy of geographical indications in relation to trademarks. Article 44 of the Regulation provides that the protection of a geographical indication does not affect rights arising from earlier trademarks, provided that such marks were applied for, registered, and used in good faith. At the same time, an earlier trademark does not automatically preclude the registration of a protected designation of

origin (PDO) or protected geographical indication (PGI), provided that there is no risk of misleading consumers and that the remaining registration requirements are fulfilled. In practice, therefore, the principle of priority (“first in time, first in right”) is balanced against the function of geographical indications as instruments guaranteeing origin and quality.

The case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union increasingly reflects a nuanced and balanced approach. In the *Torres* case (Cavaliere, 2018, p. 15; WIPO, 1999, p. 1), the Court indicated that an earlier trademark may be invalidated where a later geographical indication possesses sufficient identifying force and is capable of giving rise to confusion. In *Toscano v. Toscoro*,¹¹ decisive importance was attached to the visual and phonetic similarity between the signs, as well as to the date of priority of registration. In *Bavaria v. Bayerisches Bier*,¹² the Court accepted the coexistence of both regimes, emphasising the importance of the principle of legal certainty.

The Court’s case law also stresses the need for a global assessment of the likelihood of consumer confusion. In the *Halloumi* judgment (Case C-766/18¹³), the Court held that even where an earlier mark has a weak distinctive character, the risk of confusion cannot be automatically excluded. It is necessary to take into account the interdependence between the similarity of the signs and the similarity of the goods designated by them; thus, a low degree of similarity between the signs may be offset by a high degree of similarity or even identity of the goods. Current tensions are illustrated by the *Salaparuta* case, in which the Corte Suprema di Cassazione examined a conflict between a PDO and earlier trademarks containing the designation *Duca di Salaparuta*. The court held that rules protecting the reputation of trademarks cannot retroactively invalidate the earlier registration of a PDO. However, it referred preliminary questions to the Court of Justice of the European Union concerning the compatibility of such situations with the prohibition of misleading consumers.¹⁴ Further clarification of this line of case law was provided by the judgment of 11 September 2025,¹⁵ in which the Court held that disputes of this kind are not to be assessed on the basis of the general provisions governing conflicts between geographical indications and trademarks laid down in later sectoral regulations. Instead, they must be resolved exclusively on the basis of the specific mechanism provided for in point F(2), second subparagraph, of Annex VII to Regulation (EC) No 1493/1999. This provision reflects the EU legislature’s intention to safeguard acquired rights during the introduction of the system for the protection of wine names, allowing the temporary coexistence of earlier trademarks containing geographical indications with newly established protected names. In this judgment, the Court of Justice of the European Union thus confirmed that conflicts between protected wine designations and earlier trademarks must be assessed in light of the specific sectoral rules established under the former common organisation of the wine market, which aim to ensure legal certainty and the protection of previously acquired rights.

More significant interpretative and practical implications arise in relation to the registration of geographical indications in the form of EU collective marks. Although their primary function is to distinguish the goods of members of an organisation, as demonstrated in the *Darjeeling* case,¹⁶ such marks may evoke geographical associations and potentially lead to confusion (Gangjee, 2023). In *Ornua Co-operative Ltd v. Tindale & Stanton Ltd España SL*,¹⁷ the Court of Justice of the European Union examined the use of geographical references from the perspective of honest commercial practices. *Ornua Co-operative Ltd* defended the mark *Kerrygold* against the use of *Kerrymaid* in Spain. The Court held that the proprietor of an earlier trademark cannot prohibit the use of a designation referring to geographical origin where such use falls within the scope of honest practices in industrial or commercial matters. The Court emphasised the need for a comprehensive assessment of the overall presentation of the product, the measures taken to eliminate the risk of confusion, and the socio-cultural differences between Member States of the European Union. Consequently, compliance with honest commercial practices may be assessed differently depending on the market concerned. Particular importance in this context attaches to the judgment of the General Court of the European Union of 2 April 2025 in the *Swisse* case,¹⁸ which concerned a trademark used for dietary supplements that could suggest a connection with Switzerland. The application for invalidity was based on allegations of misleading indications as to origin and bad faith on the part of the applicant. The Court held, however, that the assessment must be conducted exclusively on the basis of the factual circumstances existing at the date of filing. The mark “*Swisse*” did not contain explicit geographical references, and its graphic elements (including colours resembling those of the Swiss flag) were insufficient to classify the sign as misleading, particularly since, at the time of filing, there was no discrepancy between the mark and the potential place of production. The Court also rejected the allegation of bad faith, stressing that the burden of proof rests with the party seeking invalidation and must be supported by objective evidence. The mere use of a designation capable of evoking geographical associations does not, according to the Court’s reasoning, constitute a sufficient ground for invalidating a trademark.

This judgment confirms that the registration of a trademark may still be permitted despite the presence of elements associated with a geographical region, provided that no clear risk of consumer confusion exists at the time of filing. In the context of the protection of protected designations of origin (PDO) and protected geographical indications (PGI), the decision highlights the importance of preventive scrutiny of trademarks containing geographical elements, as well as the need for a precise interpretation of Art. 7(1)(g) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 on the European Union trade mark and its national equivalents, such as Art. 129¹(12) of the Polish Industrial Property Law Act.

The example of Italy

The complexity of the functions and protective regimes of certification marks, collective marks, and geographical indications assumes particular importance in countries with a strong local identity of production and a rich cultural heritage, such as Italy. This system is based on a distinction between trademarks, including collective and certification marks, and geographical indications, which operate as an autonomous form of industrial property. Regulations concerning trademarks are contained in the Codice della Proprietà Industriale,¹⁹ whereas the protection of geographical indications derives primarily from European Union law. With regard to craft and industrial products, Italy has additionally developed a system of collective and certification marks administered by public authorities or producers' consortia (Sarti, 2022, p. 452). In this context, geographical indications serve not only to protect producers' interests but also to support regional identity and to promote the quality and authenticity of products. The Italian example demonstrates that the distinction between the reputation of a trademark and the reputation of a geographical indication is not merely theoretical but entails direct practical consequences for the system of protection and for market functioning. Examples include the mark "Ceramica Artistica Tradizionale" (CAT), which protects traditional Italian artistic ceramics, and the mark "Vetro Artistico Murano" relating to glass products originating from the island of Murano. In both cases, these are *quasi*-public constructions granted and administered by public authorities including regional administrations and the Ministry of Enterprises and Made in Italy rather than exclusively by private associations of producers. They are often regarded as umbrella trademarks because they may identify different types of products anchored in local traditional production, each regulated by specific product specifications (Marie-Vivien, 2017, pp. 221–252). Law No. 188/1990,²⁰ which established the CAT mark, explicitly refers to the appellation of origin as a component of trademark regulation in order to compensate for the historical absence of a national system for the protection of geographical indications for craft and industrial products (Guerrieri, 2023). Despite the absence of registration in a national or EU trademark register, the CAT mark operates as an instrument confirming origin from a specific area, particular manufacturing techniques, and elements of cultural heritage. Article 2 of the law precisely provides that the trademark should contain "a geographical area renowned for its tradition in ceramic production, to be identified by name or additionally by a characteristic graphic representation [...] associated with the ceramics to be protected."²¹ This constitutes an attempt to create a top-down model of protection in which public administration rather than self-organised groups of producers determines the conditions of access, control, and representation.

By contrast, the semi-figurative collective trademark containing the words "Vetro Artistico Murano" is registered at EU level and, at the national level, was established and is

owned by the authorities of the *Veneto* region pursuant to Regional Law No. 70/1994²² of Veneto and is managed by producers organised in a consortium. Through a traceability system and an electronic QR code, the trademark signals to consumers that the object has been produced in Murano. Within the Italian system of trademark protection, this example illustrates how different instruments of protection operate in practice and how they influence local systems of production. In the case of geographical indications, a product may be covered only if an objective link between its quality and its geographical origin can be demonstrated, which requires transparent control procedures and compliance with specific production standards. In contrast, for certification marks such as CAT (Controlled Appellation of Origin) or *Qualità Controllata*, this relationship may merely be implied; there is no formal requirement or evidentiary verification, which affects the evidential strength and transparency of these systems.

Furthermore, the absence of a mandatory association of producers around a certification mark, combined with non-uniform control standards, makes the certification system less transparent, less inclusive, and more weakly connected with the collective interest than the *sui generis* model of geographical indications (Gangjee, 2023, p. 376). Differences between geographical indications and certification or collective marks are therefore subtle and conceptual in nature (Gangjee, 2023, p. 376).

The first category of information they convey concerns product quality. Certification trademarks focus on guaranteeing a specific and consistent level of quality, whereas geographical indications communicate both quality characteristics and information regarding the origin of the product and the methods of its production, which are subject to verification. Both systems operate according to the principle of "open doors", meaning that access to the use of the sign must be granted to any producer within the relevant area provided that the applicable regulations are respected (Guerrieri, 2023). However, in the case of geographical indications, participation in a producers' group may be either mandatory or voluntary, whereas in collective trademarks membership is obligatory and constitutes a central element of the mark's communicative function (Giovannucci et al., 2009, p. 14).

The *sui generis* system for the protection of geographical indications is collectively oriented and lacks an owner in the traditional sense. The registration process requires detailed documentation and entails higher financial costs for monitoring and enforcement. This creates an institutional link between the product and the place of origin, fostering the formation of a common legal interest and the establishment of uniform production standards (Donner, Fort & Vellema, 2017, p. 173). Certification and collective trademarks, by contrast, are inherently private, flexible, and dependent on the applicant for the mark, who is responsible for its enforcement. This flexibility allows adaptation to systems based on private property rights and commercial interests, while quality standards may be modified without direct state intervention. Collective marks

function within a club-like structure with formalised rules of membership and use. Geographical indications typically provide a broader scope of protection and are associated with a sustained price premium (Evans, 2010, p. 647), whereas the trademark system enables the building of reputation and the commercialisation of products, which requires marketing efforts and investment. Additionally, trademarks may belong to public-law legal persons. Differences also arise with respect to the duration of protection. Geographical indications enjoy protection of unlimited duration, while trademarks must be renewed every ten years. The scope of protection against unauthorised use and against the degeneration of the name also differs. Moreover, the state plays a significantly greater role in enforcing the protection of geographical indications than in the case of trademarks (Benson, 1978, pp. 122–123). In Italy, certification trademarks function as intermediaries between the protection of commercial reputation and the preservation of regional heritage. Their effectiveness depends on the clarity of the legal framework, transparency of procedures governing access to the mark, the quality of control mechanisms, and the genuine involvement of producers.

In the context of the implementation of Regulation (EU) 2023/2411, Italy will be required to introduce a system for the protection of geographical indications for craft and industrial products, allowing applications for new indications from 1 December 2025 and the notification of existing names to the European Commission and the European Union Intellectual Property Office by 2 December 2026.²³ The coexistence of geographical indications and trademarks provided for both in the TRIPS Agreement and in Article 44 of Regulation 2023/2411²⁴ allows these instruments to complement one another while simultaneously generating potential conflicts, for example in cases involving collisions with reputed trademarks. In this process, the role of the state is crucial, as public authorities support craft producers in developing their potential, implementing quality standards, and designing marketing strategies, often within regional projects or non-governmental initiatives (Reviron, Thévenod-Mottet & Benni, 2009, p. 19). Nevertheless, the ultimate commercial and investment risk remains with private actors. The provisions of the Codice della Proprietà Industriale (Art. 11) permit the registration of collective trademarks by public-law legal persons and producers' associations, provided that rules concerning membership, procedural transparency, and mechanisms preventing abuse are respected.²⁵ Comparable provisions exist in EU law, in particular Article 75 of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001²⁶ on the European Union trade mark, which underscores the necessity of structured and formalised governance in the management of such systems.

Conclusion

In conclusion, although both certification marks and collective marks demonstrate a certain potential for

protecting geographical indications, they cannot fully replace the *sui generis* system, which remains the cornerstone of protection under both European Union and international law. An analysis of case law and registration practice shows that both trademark-based systems operate within a private-law logic, primarily linked to the interests of a specific entity or association, rather than to the collective interest that constitutes an inherent feature of geographical indications. Consequently, the protection obtained through trademark law, even where it includes elements of quality assurance or control, does not guarantee equal access to the designation for all producers from a given region, nor does it provide protection against misuse that is as comprehensive as that offered by the *sui generis* mechanism. As noted by A. Moerland, the system of certification marks does not constitute a genuine alternative to the protection afforded by geographical indications for three principal reasons. First, it is not fully compatible with the requirements of the TRIPS Agreement. Second, it does not guarantee representation of the interests of all producers within a given region. Third, it does not provide sufficient protection against the use of a designation in a manner that misleads consumers as to the geographical origin of the product (Moerland, 2022).

Additional doubts also arise in the reverse situation – namely, regarding the potential of collective marks as instruments for the protection of geographical indications. Although Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 on the European Union trade mark allows the registration of collective marks indicating geographical origin,²⁷ this system does not impose an obligation to demonstrate a link between the quality, characteristics, or reputation of the product and its geographical origin. Yet such a link constitutes a fundamental requirement for protection under Article 22 of the TRIPS Agreement.²⁸ At the same time, it is worth noting that the practice of certain Member States, particularly Italy, points to the growing importance of the concept of “cumulative protection”, under which geographical indications operate alongside certification and collective marks. Such an approach increases the flexibility and diversity of legal instruments available to producers and may contribute to the creation of additional market value (Gangjee, 2017, pp. 8–12). Nevertheless, the Italian experience also reveals significant limitations of this model. In practice, it may lack transparency and does not always ensure inclusiveness, thereby creating a risk of excluding smaller producers and weakening the genuine community-oriented function of protection (Moerland, 2019, p. 68).

In this context, the future development of the law should aim to reconcile the flexible protection mechanisms offered by trademark law with the institutional and collective character of the geographical indication system. Such an approach would make it possible to ensure effective and equitable protection of local goods while simultaneously responding to the challenges of the global economy, in which product reputation and quality increasingly constitute key competitive assets.

Notes/Przypisy

¹ This research was funded by the National Science Centre, Poland UMO-2025/57/N/HS5/00645. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC-BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) version arising from this submission.

² A collective mark may, but need not, attest to product quality, whereas a certification mark is specifically intended to certify particular characteristics of goods without referring to their origin, unlike geographical indications. Article 7bis of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property encompasses both collective and guarantee marks.

³ Convention of the Union of Paris of 20 March 1883 for the Protection of Industrial Property.

⁴ European Union Intellectual Property Office, *EUIPO Guidelines*, 31 July 2025, <https://guidelines.euipo.europa.eu/1935303/1788882/trade-mark-guidelines/2-2-specific-function>

⁵ Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 on the European Union trade mark of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 June 2017 on the European Union trade mark (OJ EU L 154, 2017, p. 1, as amended).

⁶ Directive (EU) 2015/2436 approximating the laws of the Member States relating to trade marks of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2015 approximating the laws of the Member States relating to trade marks (OJ EU L 336, 2015, p. 1, as amended).

⁷ Art. 28(2) of Directive (EU) 2015/2436 approximating the laws of the Member States relating to trade marks and Art. 83(2) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 on the European Union trade mark.

⁸ For example: Herbolpol-Lublin S.A. or Herbolpol-Łódź S.A., available at the database of the Polish Patent Office, <https://ewyszukiwarka.pue.uprp.gov.pl/search/search-results/b0e43752-d51a-4f37-b53b-2f7c13416e49> (accessed: 18 August 2025).

⁹ Melinda, *The First Italian Designer Apple*, <https://www.wipo.int/en/web/ip-advantage/w/stories/melinda-the-first-italian-designer-apple> (accessed: 17 August 2025).

¹⁰ Judgment of 1 December 1987 of the Cour de cassation (Commercial Chamber), No. 86–11.328, cited in: Song, 2018, p. 442.

¹¹ Case T-510/15: Action brought on 7 September 2015 – Paolo Mengozzi v. Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market – Consorzio per la Tutela dell'Olio Extravergine di Oliva Toscano (TOSCORO) (OJ EU C 354, 2015, p. 46).

¹² Judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 2 July 2009, Case C-343/07, Bavaria NV and Bavaria Italia Srl v. Bayerischer Brauerbund eV, ECR 2009, No. 7A, I-5491.

¹³ Judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 5 March 2020, Case C-766/18 P, Foundation for the Protection of the Traditional Cheese of Cyprus named Halloumi v. European Union Intellectual Property Office, LEX No. 2797925.

¹⁴ Request for a preliminary ruling lodged by the Corte Suprema di Cassazione on 8 May 2024 – Duca di Salaparuta SpA v. Ministero dell'Agricoltura, della Sovranità alimentare e delle Foreste, Consorzio volontario di tutela dei vini DOC Salaparuta, Baglio Gibellina Srl, Cantina Giacco Soc. coop. agricola, Madonna del Piraino Soc. coop. agricola, Case C-341/24, OJ EU C 2024, No. 4955.

¹⁵ Judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 11 September 2025, Case C-341/24, Duca di Salaparuta SpA v. Ministero dell'Agricoltura, della Sovranità alimentare e delle Foreste and others, OJ EU C 2025, C/5804.

¹⁶ Judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 20 September 2017, Case C-673/15 P, The Tea Board v. European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), ECR 2017, No. 9, I-702.

¹⁷ Judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 20 July 2017, Case C-93/16, Ornua Co-operative Ltd v. Tindale & Stanton Ltd España SL, ECR 2017, No. 7, I-571.

¹⁸ Judgment of the General Court of the European Union of 2 April 2025, Case T-442/23, Giuliani v. European Union Intellectual Property Office – H&H, OJ EU C 2025, No. 2857.

¹⁹ Codice della proprietà industriale, Testo del D.Lgs. 10 febbraio 2005, n. 30 aggiornato alla L. 30 dicembre 2023, n. 214, <https://www.altalex.com/documents/codici-altalex/2014/10/30/codice-della-proprietà-industriale> (accessed by 1.08.2025).

²⁰ Legge 9 luglio 1990, n. 188, Tutela della ceramica artistica e tradizionale e della ceramica di qualità, <https://www.normattiva.it/uri-res/N2Ls?urn:nir:stato:legge:1990-07-09;188>

²¹ Codice della proprietà industriale, Testo del D.Lgs. 10 febbraio 2005, n. 30 aggiornato alla L. 30 dicembre 2023, n. 214, <https://www.altalex.com/documents/codici-altalex/2014/10/30/codice-della-proprietà-industriale> (accessed by 1.08.2025).

²² Legge 25 gennaio 1994, n. 70, La Camera dei deputati ed il Senato della Repubblica hanno, <https://www.normattiva.it/uri-res/N2Ls?urn:nir:stato:legge:1994-01-25;70> (accessed by 1.08.2025).

²³ Indicazioni Geografiche Protette (IGP) per i prodotti artigianali e industriali, <https://uibm.mise.gov.it/index.php/it/le-indicazioni-geografiche/indicazioni-geografiche-protette-igp-per-i-prodotti-artigianali-e-industriali> (accessed by 19.08.2025).

²⁴ Regulation (EU) 2023/2411 on the protection of geographical indications for craft and industrial products of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 October 2023 on the protection of geographical indications for craft and industrial products and amending Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 on the European Union trade mark and Regulation (EU) 2019/1753 (OJ EU L 2023, 2411).

²⁵ Codice della proprietà industriale, Testo del D.Lgs. 10 febbraio 2005, n. 30 aggiornato alla L. 30 dicembre 2023, n. 214, <https://www.altalex.com/documents/codici-altalex/2014/10/30/codice-della-proprietà-industriale> (accessed by 1.08.2025).

²⁶ Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 on the European Union trade mark of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 June 2017 on the European Union trade mark (OJ EU L 154, 2017, p. 1, as amended).

²⁷ Article 74(2) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 on the European Union trade mark of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 June 2017 (OJ EU L 154, 16.06.2017, pp. 1–99).

²⁸ TRIPS Agreement (OJ EU L 336, 1994, p. 214, as amended).

References/Bibliografia

Literature/Literatura

Benson, R. W. (1978). Regulation of American wine labeling: In vino veritas? *UC Davis Law Review*, 11(2), 115–160.

Calboli, I. (2023). The combined use of trademarks or service marks with certification marks or collective marks. In N. Wilkof, S. Basheer, & I. Calboli (Eds.), *Overlapping intellectual property rights* (pp. 457–504). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192844477.003.0018>

Cavalieri, A. (2018). *The recent conflicts between geographical indication and EU trademarks in the light of the recent developments in Community law and jurisprudence: A GIs' overprotection?* [Master of Laws in IP, WIPO Academy, University of Turin and ITC-ILO]. Research Papers Collection, 2017–2018, 15.

Donner, M., Fort, F., & Vellema, S. (2017). From geographical indications to collective place branding in France and Morocco. In W. van Caenegem & J. Cleary (Eds.), *The importance of place: Geographical indications as a tool for local and regional development* (Vol. 58, pp. 173–196). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53073-4_7

EUIPO. (2025). *Trade mark guidelines* (2.2. Specific function). <https://guidelines.euipo.europa.eu/1935303/1788882/trade-mark-guidelines/2-2-specific-function>

- Evans, G. E. (2010). The comparative advantages of geographical indications and community trademarks for the marketing of agricultural products in the European Union. *Yearbook of European Law*, 29(1), 224–260. <https://doi.org/10.1093/yel/29.1.224>
- Gangjee, D. S. (2017). Proving provenance? Geographical indications certification and its ambiguities. *World Development*, 98, 12–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.04.009>
- Gangjee, D. S. (2023). Overlaps between trademarks and geographical indications. In N. Wilkof, S. Basheer, & I. Calboli (Eds.), *Overlapping intellectual property rights* (pp. 373–398). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192844477.003.0014>
- Giovannucci, D., Josling, T., Kerr, W., O'Connor, B., & Yeung, M. T. (2009). *Guide to geographical indications: Linking products and their origins*. International Trade Centre.
- Guerrieri, F. (2023). *Governing governance: Collective action and rulemaking in EU agricultural and non-agricultural geographical indications*. UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository). <https://dare.uva.nl/search?identifier=18bacc0d-b726-4ebb-95e6-337f48a2b985> (accessed by 30.10.2024).
- Herbapol-Lublin S.A./Herbapol-Łódź S.A. (n.d.). *Trademark registry entry*. Polish Patent Office – eWyszukiwarka. <https://ewyszukiwarka.pue.uprp.gov.pl/search/search-results/b0e43752-d51a-4f37-b53b-2f7c13416e49>
- Marie-Vivien, D. (2017). Do geographical indications for handicraft deserve a special regime? Insight from worldwide law and practice. In W. Van Caenegem & J. Cleary (Eds.), *The importance of place: Geographical indications as a tool for local and regional development* (pp. 221–252). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53073-4_9
- Moerland, A. (2019). Geographical indications and innovation: what is the connection? In J. Drexler & A. K. Sanders (Eds.), *The Innovation Society and Intellectual Property*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Moerland, A. (2022). Protecting GIs through EU collective marks. In E. Vandecastelaere et al. (Eds.), *Worldwide perspectives on geographical indications*. CIRAD – Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement.
- Mogyoros, A. (2025). The inconsistent reality of certifying trade marks: How certification marks are failing their truth ideals. *IIC – International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, 56, 91–114. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-024-01533-w>
- Osajda, K., & Żelechowski, Ł. (Eds.). (2021). *Prawo własności przemysłowej. Komentarz*. Vol. VIII B, C.H.Beck.
- Promińska, U. (2010). *Znaki towarowe wspólne (kolektywne)*. *Studia Prawa Prywatnego*, 5(1–2), 191–219.
- Reviron, S., Thevenod-Mottet, E., & El Benni, N. (2009). *Geographical indications: Creation and distribution of economic value in developing countries*. NCCR Trade Regulation Working Paper No. 2009/14.
- Sarti, D. (2022). I marchi collettivi e di certificazione geografici. *Orizzonti del Diritto Commerciale, Fascicolo, 2*.
- Skubisz, R., *Znaki towarowe i ich ochrona*. C.H.Beck.
- Song, X. (2018). The role played by the regime of collective and certification marks in the protection of geographical indications: Comparative study of law and practice in France, the EU and China. *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 21(5–6), 437–457.
- WIPO. (1999). *Symposium on the protection of geographical indications: Geographical indications and trademarks, harmony or conflict?* World Intellectual Property Organization.
- WIPO. (n.d.) *Melinda: The first Italian designer apple*. <https://www.wipo.int/en/web/ip-advantage/w/stories/melinda-the-first-italian-designer-apple>

Judgments/Orzecznictwo

- Cour de cassation (France). (1987, December 1). Arrêt n° 86-11.328 (Chambre commerciale).
- Court of Justice of the European Union. (2009, July 2). *Bavaria NV & Bavaria Italia Srl v. Bayerischer Brauerbund eV* (C-343/07), ECLI:EU:C:2009:415.
- Court of Justice of the European Union. (2017, July 20). *Ornua Co-Operative Ltd v. Tindale & Stanton Ltd España* (C-93/16), ECLI:EU:C:2017:571.
- Court of Justice of the European Union. (2017, September 20). *The Tea Board v. EUIPO* (C-673/15 P), ECLI:EU:C:2017:702.
- Court of Justice of the European Union. (2024, May 8). *Duca di Salaparuta SpA v. Ministero dell'Agricoltura et al.* (C-341/24) [preliminary ruling request].
- Court of Justice of the European Union. (2025, September 11). *Duca di Salaparuta SpA v. Ministero dell'Agricoltura, della Sovranità Alimentare e delle Foreste and Others* (C-341/24), ECLI:EU:C:2025:5804.
- General Court of the European Union. (2017, July 13). *Mengozzi v. OHIM – Consorzio per la Tutela dell'Olio Extravergine di Oliva Toscano* (T-510/15), ECLI:EU:T:2017:495.
- General Court of the European Union. (2025, April 2). *Giuliani SpA v. EUIPO – H&H (Suisse)* (T-442/23), ECLI:EU:T:2025:354.

Legal acts and official documents/Akty prawne i oficjalne dokumenty

- Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights. Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, 15 April 1994.
- Codice della proprietà industriale. (2005/2023). Decreto legislativo 10 febbraio 2005, n. 30 (text updated by L. 30 dicembre 2023, n. 214). <https://www.altalex.com/documents/codici-altalex/2014/10/30/codice-della-proprietà-industriale>
- Directive (EU) 2015/2436 to approximate the laws of the Member States relating to trade marks. OJ L 336, 23.12.2015.
- Law of 9 July 1990, n. 188: Protection of traditional and quality artistic ceramics. <https://www.normattiva.it/uri-res/N2Ls?urn:nir:stato:legge:1990-07-09;188>
- Law of 25 January 1994, n. 70: Measures to protect Murano artistic glass. <https://www.normattiva.it/uri-res/N2Ls?urn:nir:stato:legge:1994-01-25;70>
- Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, 14 April 1891, as revised (Brussels 1900; Washington 1911; The Hague 1925; London 1934; Nice 1957; Stockholm 1967; amended 1979). OJ 1993 Nr 116, p. 514.
- Ministero delle Imprese e del Made in Italy. (2025). *Protected Geographical Indications (PGI) for craft and industrial products*. <https://uibm.mise.gov.it/index.php/it/le-indicazioni-geografiche/indicazioni-geografiche-protette-igp-per-i-prodotti-artigianali-e-industriali>
- Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, 20 March 1883, as amended 28 September 1979. WIPO. <https://wipo.int/ru/text/287556>
- Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 on the European Union trade mark. OJ L 154, 16.06.2017.
- Regulation (EU) 2023/2411 on the protection of geographical indications for craft and industrial products. OJ L 2023/2411.

Mgr Wiktoria Sikorska

Doktorantka w Szkole Doktorskiej Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach, członkini zespołu naukowego prawa własności intelektualnej.

Mgr Wiktoria Sikorska

PhD student at the Doctoral School of the University of Silesia in Katowice, member of the intellectual property law research team.