

Geographical Indications of Manufactured Goods - A Study of Development in India

Shudharshini E

Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University

Abstract—Geographical Indications (GIs) are traditionally associated with agricultural products, yet manufactured goods embody equally rich heritage, skill, and economic potential. Despite India having 697 registered GIs, only 22 relate to manufactured goods, revealing a structural imbalance in both law and practice. This paper critically examines the development of manufactured goods within India's GI regime, exploring the legal, procedural, and socio-economic barriers that restrict their recognition. It evaluates the mandatory parameters of proof of origin, geographical linkage, uniqueness, reputation, and method of production, and argues that these standards intend to ensure authenticity, but they often disadvantage manufactured goods due to their complex production chains and dispersed knowledge systems.

Through analysis of registered and refused applications, including Coimbatore Wet Grinders, Nicobari Virgin Coconut Oil, and Rajapalayam Locks, the paper identifies recurring gaps in evidence, documentation, and institutional support. It also explores how weak post-registration enforcement and infringement mechanisms dilute the economic benefits that GIs are supposed to deliver, particularly for marginalized producer communities. By comparing TRIPS obligations with national implementation, the paper exposes regulatory asymmetry and the dominance of agricultural GIs in both policy and market visibility.

Ultimately, the study proposes a more inclusive and flexible framework for assessing manufactured goods, emphasizing process-based protection, traditional knowledge preservation, and stronger enforcement. It argues that empowering manufactured goods within the GI system is not merely a legal exercise but a pathway to cultural preservation, rural development, and equitable participation in global trade.

Index Terms—Geographical Indications (GIs), Manufactured Goods, Traditional Knowledge, Post-Registration Support, Intellectual Property Rights, Regulatory Framework, Market Enforcement

I. INTRODUCTION

Geographical indications received its recognition after being incorporated as one of the intellectual property under The Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) in 1994. The Agreement acted as the foundation by providing minimum standards requirement for the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999 in India. It is an unspoken fact that the act provides safeguards for the applicant than the users which proves the inclination on the former side. The act provides for five parameters, which must be complied to get protection under the act. The eligibility criteria for availing protection and effectiveness of the protection system for manufactured goods can play a major role for limited number of GI applications. The main parameters to qualify a particular product as a GI are of Proof of origin of the Product, Linkage between the GI area and the Product, uniqueness, Reputation of the Product and method of production.

Geographical Indications (Gis) occupy a unique space within intellectual property law, sitting at the intersection of culture, economy, and territory. They protect not merely a product, but a story of place, tradition, knowledge, and identity. With the adoption of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) in 1994, Gis became part of the global IP architecture, obligating member states to provide legal protection for goods whose quality, reputation, or characteristics are essentially attributable to their geographical origin. India responded with the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, which has since become one of the most active GI regimes in the world.

We can witness a striking imbalance where out of 697 registered GIs in India, only 22 relate to manufactured goods. This disparity raises a fundamental question that why do manufactured goods, which often involve complex skills, traditional techniques, and cultural heritage, struggle to gain recognition compared to agricultural and natural products? While the law appears neutral, the outcomes suggest otherwise.

This paper argues that the problem is not merely numerical, but structural and systemic. The existing legal framework, although comprehensive, tends to favour goods with direct natural origin, while the eligibility criteria such as proof of origin, geographical linkage, uniqueness, reputation, and method of production are more difficult to establish for manufactured goods, where human creativity and innovation are central. Unlike agricultural products that derive their identity from soil or climate, manufactured goods often reflect intangible cultural practices, inherited craftsmanship, and evolving techniques, elements that are harder to document and legally validate.

Manufactured goods, even when registered, face weak post-registration support, limited market visibility, inadequate enforcement against imitation, and poor institutional coordination. The law places a heavy burden on producer groups to provide historical documentation and maintain quality standards yet gives them minimal guidance or state assistance. As a result, many potential manufactured GIs remain unregistered or rejected despite having strong cultural and economic value.

This issue has international implications. Manufactured GIs such as Scotch Whisky, Swiss Watches, and Murano Glass demonstrate that when effectively protected, such goods can dominate global markets and become national economic symbols. India possesses similar potential, yet its GI system does not fully unlock it. This suggests a deeper tension between TRIPS' minimum standards, domestic implementation, and the lived realities of producers.

Therefore, this paper seeks to critically examine the development of manufactured goods within India's GI framework, analyze the reasons behind their underrepresentation, and explore the legal and policy reforms required to ensure a more equitable and effective GI regime. By integrating case studies, comparative perspectives, and doctrinal analysis, the study moves beyond mere description to address the

core question: Who truly benefits from the current GI system, and how can manufactured goods be repositioned from the margins to the mainstream of GI protection?

II. CONCEPT AND DEFINITIONS

Geographical Indications are often misunderstood as mere labels of origin, but in reality, they operate as collective intellectual property rights that protect identity, heritage, and market value. Under Article 22 of the TRIPS Agreement, a GI is defined as an indication that identifies goods as originating in a territory where "a given quality, reputation, or other characteristic is essentially attributable to its geographical origin." This definition is intentionally broad, allowing countries to include not only natural factors such as soil, climate, or raw materials, but also human factors such as traditional skills and cultural techniques. GIs not only indicate place but signal trust, authenticity, and competitive advantage in global markets. This is evident in international success stories such as Champagne, Roquefort cheese, and Scotch Whisky.

India enacted the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, becoming one of the first countries in Asia to develop a stand-alone GI law. The Act adopts the TRIPS definition almost verbatim but expands on it through detailed procedural and substantive requirements.

The definition of goods is provided under Section 2(f) goods means any agricultural, natural or manufactured goods or any goods of handicraft or of industry and includes food stuff.

Section 2(1)(e) defines geographical indication, in relation to goods, means an indication which identifies such goods as agricultural goods, natural goods or manufactured goods as originating, or manufactured in the territory of a country, or a region or locality in that territory, where a given quality, reputation or other characteristic of such goods is essentially attributable to its geographical origin and in case where such goods are manufactured goods one of the activities of either the production or of processing or preparation of the goods concerned takes place in such territory, region or locality, as the case may be.

The specification of the word 'production or process or preparation of the goods can act as a legit proof of liberal construction to include wide array of protection

spectrum. The aim behind including processing and production of goods was done to preserve the product's authenticity against any imitations and most importantly to safeguard the traditional knowledge behind the product-processing. By having a wide array of protection, it promotes economic development of the producers.

These are the main heads under which different goods are put under, and the act itself provides different class of goods in which the determination of the class depends upon whether they require protection for the product or for both process and product. It is to be noted that even raw materials which possess such uniqueness originating from an area, be protected and it is totally up to the applicant to choose the raw material or the product.

Manufactured goods can be defined as those goods which are produced or processed in a particular region and on which the unique characteristic of the product is attributable. The products produced here have their own reputation and possess some distinctive qualities which is only because of its origination

In practice, GI registration requires producers to satisfy five key elements:

1. Proof of origin
2. Linkage between product and geographical area
3. Uniqueness or distinctive quality
4. Reputation
5. Method of production

At first glance, these parameters appear neutral. However, they often can be seen as hidden barriers for manufactured goods. Agricultural goods naturally demonstrate origin linkage through climate, soil, altitude, etc. But manufactured goods rely heavily on human intervention, skill, innovation, and evolving techniques. These cultural and process-based attributes are more difficult to document, standardize, and legally prove. The law recognizes manufactured goods, but the structure of proof and evaluation is tailored to agricultural realities. This mismatch between legal expectations and practical realities is major reason why manufactured goods are underrepresented, despite having strong heritage and market potential.

III. WHAT CONSTITUTES MANUFACTURED GOODS?

The Geographical Indications Act does not provide an exhaustive list of what qualifies as a manufactured good. This ambiguity raises an important legal and conceptual question: Can any class of goods be treated as a manufactured good, and what are the essential elements that determine such classification? Since the Act allows protection for agricultural, natural, manufactured, handicraft, and industrial goods, the boundaries between these categories are often blurred. Therefore, classification cannot be based merely on labels or product categories, it must be based on the nature of production and the source of distinctiveness.

The Key Determinant: The Method of Production

The most critical factor in determining whether a good qualifies as a manufactured product is the method of production. If the process of preparing or making the product has a significant influence on its unique qualities, characteristics, or reputation, then the product moves beyond mere natural origin and into the realm of manufacturing. In such cases, it is the human skill, technique, and intervention that give the product its distinctive identity.

Unlike agricultural goods, where nature plays the dominant role, manufactured goods derive their uniqueness from:

- Technical processes,
- Traditional craftsmanship,
- Cultural knowledge,
- Artisanal precision.

If these processes are essential to achieving the final quality, and cannot be replicated elsewhere using a different method, then the product satisfies the core logic of GI protection.

The methods used must have a close connection to the region, either because:

- The knowledge has been passed down through generations,
- The community possesses specialized expertise,
- The tools and environment of the region influence production,
- Or the local materials shape the outcome of the process.

This combination of place + people + process creates a product whose reputation and quality are rooted in

its geography, even when the raw materials are not exclusively local.

Human Intervention as the Essence of Manufactured Gis

In essence, the defining characteristic of manufactured goods under GI law is the role of human intervention. It is the creativity, labour, and traditional techniques embedded in the production process that justify GI protection. Without acknowledging this human element, many culturally significant goods would be excluded simply because they do not grow from the soil.

Therefore, any class of goods can be considered a manufactured good if:

1. A substantial stage of production or processing occurs in the region;
2. The method of production significantly determines the product's unique qualities;
3. The method is inseparable from the culture, knowledge, or tradition of that place;
4. The process cannot be authentically replicated elsewhere without loss of quality or reputation.

IV. CASE ANALYSIS

Few references to the case shall the make the concept more understandable

1. Coimbatore wet grinders, registered in 2005 - This wet grinder was registered under class 7 and the product gets its uniqueness because of a particular stone that is available in the hills that are in Coimbatore and Erode district. 'These stones are semi granite in nature with a composition having small quantity of Silica and Mica which is available at a few feet below the surface level in and around Coimbatore and Erode districts'

Methods of production – The method that is used here includes simple but significant technical operation which are performed by those people residing in Coimbatore and Erode as they possess the skills and experience that is required to make a wet grinder. The overall procedure includes drilling, lathes and welding machines.

2. Nicobari Tavi-Ngaich (Virgin Coconut Oil) of Andaman & Nicobar, 2023 – Virgin coconut Oil which has been made by Nicobarese people which I used for energy booster, to support immune

system and it is known for organic purity, health benefits, and traditional extraction methods.

Method of Production – There are different levels of processes where it includes each family collecting the nuts from their ear marked coconut trees and involving in de-husking process and more. The Nicobari Tavi-i-Ngaich (Virgin Coconut Oil) is made using age-old traditional methods passed down through generations of the indigenous Nicobarese people. Kintan Tavi-i: The oil is extracted using a traditional Kintan tavi-i (a pressing device), which helps extract coconut milk from the scrapped coconut kernel.

3. Scotch Whisky, 2009 – Scotch Whisky of Scotland has been around for 500 years, and it has been in the export market around 200 years. It is known for its strict and traditional methods of production. Methods of Production - It is made from three natural raw materials, namely malted barley, water and yeast and the each of them is put into rigorous methods and the crucial process involves 'the distinctive swan-necked copper pot stills, where distillation separates the alcohol and other congeners from the wash. Scotch Malt Whisky is usually distilled twice (occasionally three times), the first distillation taking place in a larger 'wash still', and the second in a slightly smaller 'low wines' or spirit still'.

With the help of the above-mentioned registered GI, we can draw the inference that all these products are subjected to different stages of productions which are vital in nature to make it distinct and unique and without which they might not obtain the desired quality. All these processes are also registered to prevent any infringement of possible imitation which might lead the customers towards the wrong goods.

V. LEGAL AND PROCEDURAL BARRIERS IN THE GI FRAMEWORK

When we read the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, it looks inclusive. It clearly states that protection is available for agricultural, natural, manufactured, handicraft, and industrial goods. On paper, everyone is welcome. But when we look at how the law is actually implemented, a quieter truth emerges: the system is unintentionally designed in a way that makes it much easier for agricultural goods to get registered than manufactured goods.

The core issue lies in the requirement that a product must have a quality, reputation, or other characteristic that is “essentially attributable” to its geographical origin. For agricultural goods, this is easy to prove the climate, soil, rainfall, altitude, temperature, where nature does the talking. But manufactured goods are different. Their uniqueness is rarely about the land and more about the people: the way artisans’ hands move, the techniques that have been passed down for generations, the cultural memory embedded in every stage of production. These human factors are incredibly powerful, but they don’t fit neatly into a legal form. You can scientifically test soil, but you cannot scientifically measure tradition. This is where the law, without intending to, becomes unfair.

Another problem is the demand for a fixed, standardized “method of production” in the GI application. In reality, many traditional manufactured goods do not follow a single rigid process.

- Different families or communities may have slightly different techniques.
- Tools may evolve as artisans adapt over time.
- Innovation itself can be part of the tradition.

But when the GI Registry insists on one unchanging method, it forces a living culture into a static box. Ironically, to preserve tradition, the law sometimes requires us to freeze it and in doing so, it risks suffocating the creativity that makes the product unique in the first place.

Documentation is another major barrier. To prove reputation or historical origin, the Registry expects written records, archival references, trade documents, or official reports. Agricultural products often have these large plantations, colonial trade, government data. Manufactured goods, however, especially those made by rural or tribal communities, often survive through oral history and hands-on transmission. Their knowledge lives in memory, not in paperwork. But the system rarely accepts “memory” as evidence. So incredibly authentic products get rejected, not because they lack tradition, but because their history was preserved in the oldest, most human way, which is by living it rather than writing it down.

This reveals a deeper truth: the law appears neutral, but functions with a built-in bias toward nature-based products. It is not that manufactured goods lack heritage or uniqueness, they have plenty of both. The problem is that the legal framework was originally

shaped around agricultural logic, and it never fully adapted to recognize human creativity and cultural techniques as legitimate sources of geographical identity.

In short, the issue is not that manufactured goods are unworthy of GI protection. The issue is that the system does not know how to see them. The law is not intentionally discriminatory, but its standards of proof and interpretation are better suited to tea leaves and rice grains than to weaving patterns or metalwork. Until the legal framework evolves to genuinely value the human element at the heart of manufactured goods, these products will always be at a disadvantage despite having stories, skills, and identities just as worthy of protection as any agricultural product.

Institutional and Administrative Challenges Faced by Producers

Even when a manufactured product meets all legal criteria, securing GI registration in India is often a formidable task. Most manufactured goods originate from small-scale, informal artisan communities, whose expertise is embedded in practice rather than paperwork. While these communities hold deep cultural and technical knowledge, they frequently lack the resources, legal literacy, and institutional guidance necessary to navigate the application process.

State facilitation through legal aid, technical guidance, or procedural support is minimal. Authorities are often more familiar with agricultural products, whose quality and origin are easier to quantify through natural factors like soil, climate, or water. This implicit bias results in subtle but real disadvantages for manufactured goods, where human skill, tradition, and innovation define uniqueness. Without standardized mechanisms to document these skills, applications for manufactured GIs are more likely to be delayed, rejected, or contested.

Documentation requirements reveal another structural challenge. The GI Registry often demands fixed, written records to establish origin, reputation, or method of production. While agricultural products benefit from plantation records, export data, or colonial trade documents, manufactured goods rely heavily on oral traditions, community memory, and hands-on techniques passed down through generations. Authentic products may thus be rejected not due to lack of merit, but because the system cannot

formally “see” the knowledge encoded in living practice.

This administrative gap has broader economic and cultural implications. Without adequate support, small producers are excluded from the formal benefits of GI recognition, such as market differentiation, legal protection against imitation, and enhanced economic returns. Furthermore, weak post-registration enforcement exacerbates this marginalization, leaving artisanal communities exposed to imitation and unfair competition.

Comparative experience highlights potential solutions. In the EU, GI authorities provide technical guidance, training workshops, and standardized documentation templates that account for human skill and artisanal methods. In China, local GI offices actively support producers with both application and enforcement processes. Such models demonstrate that institutional intervention, rather than mere legislation, is essential to ensure manufactured goods realize their full market and cultural potential.

- Small-scale artisan communities face systemic exclusion despite meeting legal criteria.
- Bureaucratic procedures and documentation requirements favor agricultural goods.
- Implicit bias in regulatory authorities undervalues skill-based production and cultural techniques.
- Clear, flexible, and culturally sensitive procedural mechanisms can significantly improve access to GI protection for manufactured goods.
- Post-registration enforcement and institutional support are essential to translate legal recognition into economic and social benefits.

VI. ANALYSING THE SHORTAGE OF REGISTRATION UNDER MANUFACTURED GOODS

Despite the existence of 34 classification of goods and 697 registered GIs only 22 goods have been registered as manufactured goods. To register a good under GI there are parameters which must be satisfied, and these requirements are given under Section 11 of Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999. The producers shall find it difficult to satisfy any of the requirements as mandated under the GI Act, 1999. Another possible reason can be lack of awareness among those producers. There

are manufactured products which are yet to be registered but have the potential to qualify as a GI, but they still are unregistered because of lack of awareness. And one other reason can be the dominance of Agricultural products in the GI world as it complied with the requirements as mandated under the GI Act, 1999. There are those applications which have been filed but has been refused due to several reasons, the section below will deal with it in detail. In Rajapalayam Lock application, the reason for refusal was that the applicant failed to provide evidence for the contents of the application and the historical documents and which in turn resulted in the failure of proving any existing reputation.

VII. LACK OF POST-REGISTRATION BENEFITS AND MARKET SUPPORT

For many artisan communities, the excitement of obtaining a GI registration is often tempered by reality. A certificate in hand does not automatically translate into higher prices, better market access, or international recognition. Manufactured goods, in particular, struggle because their uniqueness rooted in human skill, tradition, and cultural memory is invisible without deliberate branding, marketing, or promotion. A GI alone cannot convey the story of the product, and consumers rarely appreciate its heritage without effort to communicate it.

The challenges do not end there. Enforcement remains weak. Counterfeit products and imitations continue to circulate, often indistinguishable to buyers, which erodes both the economic and reputational benefits for genuine producers. Over time, this creates a sense of frustration and distrust among communities, discouraging them from even attempting GI registration in the future.

Moreover, the absence of structured post-registration support means that small producers are left to fend for themselves. Unlike large agricultural GIs, which may receive government or cooperative backing, artisan manufacturers rarely have access to resources for marketing, trade fairs, export promotion, or quality monitoring. Without visibility or tangible gains, the GI becomes a symbolic label rather than a transformative tool—recognition in name, but not in impact. GI registration is only meaningful when it is paired with active measures to create market awareness, protect authenticity, and support the producers economically.

Without these, the system risks being a procedural hurdle rather than a mechanism for empowerment, leaving the very communities it intends to help on the sidelines.

Tea Board India v. ITC Ltd. (2019)

In this case, the Calcutta High Court addressed the scope of protection under the GI Act. The Tea Board, which held the GI registration for "Darjeeling" in relation to tea, filed a suit against ITC Ltd. for using the term "Darjeeling Lounge" in its hotel. The Court ruled that the GI registration for "Darjeeling" tea did not extend to services like hotel lounges, as the registration was specific to tea. This decision highlighted the limited scope of GI protection under the Act, especially concerning services and non-agricultural products.

Scotch Whisky Association v. JK Enterprises (2023)

The Madhya Pradesh High Court dealt with the Scotch Whisky Association's (SWA) suit against JK Enterprises for using the term "Scotch Whisky" in their product. The Court upheld the independent rights of the registered proprietor of a GI, affirming that they have the right to maintain a suit for GI infringement without necessarily impleading an authorized user. This case underscores the importance of enforcement mechanisms and the need for clear legal standing to protect GI rights effectively.

Bikanerwala v. New Bikanerwala

In this case, the Delhi High Court restrained the defendant from using the name "Agarwala Bikanerwala," as it was deceptively similar to the registered name "Bikanerwala." The Court emphasized the need to protect the distinctiveness of GI names to prevent consumer confusion and safeguard the interests of genuine producers.

VIII. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS AND LEGAL PROVISIONS AROUND THE WORLD

European Union (EU)

Legal Framework

- Regulation (EU) 2019/787: Establishes the legal framework for GIs concerning agricultural products and foodstuffs, wines, and spirit drinks. It outlines the procedures for registration, protection, and enforcement of GIs within the EU.
- Regulation (EU) 2024/1143: Introduces a new EU intellectual property right, extending the protection for GIs to craft and industrial products,

thereby broadening the scope of GI protection beyond traditional agricultural products.

Institutional Support – There exists European Commission which will oversee the implementation of GI regulations and provides guidance to Member States and producers. Each EU Member State has designated authorities responsible for the registration and enforcement of GIs within their jurisdiction. At the end the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) manages the registration process for GIs and provides resources for producers.

Post-Registration Support – EU regulations mandate active monitoring of GI products in the market to prevent misuse and ensure compliance with established standards. They also conduct campaigns to educate consumers about the significance of GIs, thereby enhancing market demand and protecting producers' interests. They provide Financial Assistance programs which offers financial support to producer groups for marketing and promotional activities related to GI products.

Procedural Flexibility – Recent reforms aim to streamline the registration process for GIs, reducing administrative burdens and facilitating easier access for producers by involving simple procedures.

China

Legal Framework

- Measures for the Protection of Geographical Indication Products (2024): Serves as the primary legislation for the protection of GIs in China, outlining the procedures for registration, protection, and enforcement.
- Provisions for the Protection of Products with Geographical Indications (2005): Earlier legislation that laid the groundwork for GI protection in China, now superseded by the 2024 Measures.

Institutional Support – China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA) is responsible for the registration and administration of GIs in China, where local authorities such as Provincial and municipal authorities assist in the implementation of GI regulations and support local producers.

Post-Registration Support – They established designated quality inspection departments oversee the quality of GI products, ensuring they meet established standards. Authorities also conduct regular inspections to prevent the unauthorized use of GI marks and protect consumers from counterfeit products.

Government initiatives support the promotion of GI products in domestic and international markets, aiding producers in expanding their reach.

Procedural Flexibility – The GI system in China allows for adjustments based on regional characteristics and the specific needs of local producers which ensures Adaptability to Local Conditions. They recognize and incorporate traditional production methods and local knowledge into the GI registration process, accommodating the unique aspects of manufactured goods, which shows Support for Traditional Knowledge:

3 ASEAN

Legal Framework

- **ASEAN Guidelines on Protection of Geographical Indications:** Provides a framework for the protection of GIs across ASEAN member states, promoting consistency and cooperation in GI matters.
- **National Legislation:** Each ASEAN member state has its own laws and regulations governing the protection of GIs, often adopting a *sui generis* approach tailored to their specific needs.

Institutional Support – ASEAN Intellectual Property Rights Action Plan which is a regional initiative aimed at enhancing the protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights, including GIs, within ASEAN countries. Each member state has a designated authority like National IP Offices, responsible for the registration and protection of GIs within its jurisdiction.

Post-Registration Support – They encourage the formation of producer groups to manage and promote GI products collectively, enhancing market presence and negotiating power. Provides training and resources to producers to improve quality, marketing, and business practices related to GI products. Facilitates Regional collaboration among member states to share best practices, harmonize standards, and promote GI products in regional and international markets.

Procedural Flexibility – Allows member states to develop GI systems that reflect their cultural heritage, economic conditions, and legal frameworks, providing flexibility in implementation. They recognize the challenges faced by small-scale and informal producers, offering support to integrate them into the formal GI system.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite providing a legal framework for the protection of Geographical Indications, the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999 remains limited in its regulatory and practical impact, especially for manufactured goods that derive their uniqueness from human skill, artisanal techniques, and traditional knowledge rather than natural factors. While the Act envisions post-registration quality control and internal inspection mechanisms, in practice, producer groups are largely left to self-regulate, resulting in inconsistent standards and diminished accountability. To address this, there is an urgent need to establish dedicated oversight committees that combine representation from producer communities, technical experts, and government authorities, tasked with monitoring compliance, verifying production processes, and ensuring ongoing quality assurance.

Beyond regulatory supervision, the GI system must integrate market-facing mechanisms that bridge the gap between registration and commercial benefit. This could include a centralized digital authentication platform that allows consumers to verify products in real time using QR codes, blockchain, or other traceability technologies, while simultaneously enabling producers to report violations, track infringement, and maintain public visibility of authentic goods. Legal and enforcement reforms are equally critical: fast-track dispute resolution, standardized guidelines for penalties, and coordination with customs and trade authorities are necessary to prevent unauthorized use, counterfeiting, and market dilution. Furthermore, post-registration capacity-building is essential to empower producers with marketing strategies, branding initiatives, and process documentation that respect evolving artisanal techniques, allowing traditional methods to coexist with commercial viability.

Emerging technologies, including IoT-based supply chain monitoring, blockchain verification, and AI-driven quality analytics, can provide transparency, safeguard authenticity, and generate data to inform evidence-based policymaking. Learning from international best practices underscores the importance of such holistic support: the EU's PDO/PGI system demonstrates how collective marketing and strong enforcement can elevate GIs into

globally recognized premium brands; China's integration of local government support, traditional knowledge recognition, and export facilitation enables rural and artisan producers to reach broader markets; and ASEAN countries exemplify regional cooperation, capacity-building programs, and flexible procedural approaches that empower small-scale producers while maintaining product authenticity. By combining these lessons with India's domestic context, a strengthened GI framework can transform registration from a symbolic certificate into a dynamic, empowering instrument preserving cultural heritage, promoting economic development, enabling equitable participation in domestic and international markets, and ensuring that manufactured goods achieve both recognition and tangible socio-economic benefits.

X. CONCLUSION

Manufactured goods involve human creativity and that makes the product special; by having the liberal provisions, the act extends its protection for process as well. It can be concluded that for the product to be considered as manufactured goods, there must be a significant step involved which will constitute and bring out the uniqueness of the product. And we can make sure that complying with 5 requirements and ensuring there are no ambiguities, are one of the important factors to be considered before registration. In Post registration, it is important to strike a balance between the increase price and the affordability of consumers, ensure that they don't have unjust enrichment by increasing the price above the level. By incorporating enhanced penalties enforcement and a proper regulatory authority.

REFERENCES

- [1] Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999. Government of India. Available at: <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/1981/5/A1999-48.pdf>
- [2] European Commission. (n.d.). Geographical indications and quality schemes explained. Available at: [https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/farming/geographical-indications-and-quality-schemes-explained_en](https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/farming/geographical-indications-and-quality-schemes/geographical-indications-and-quality-schemes-explained_en)
- [3] China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA). (n.d.). Geographical Indication. Available at: <https://english.cnipa.gov.cn/col/col2997/index.html>
- [4] ASEAN Intellectual Property Rights Action Plan. (2020). Guidelines on Protection of Geographical Indication in ASEAN. Available at: https://www.aseanip.org/docs/default-source/asean-ip-publications/asean-gi-guidelines.pdf?sfvrsn=af962a7a_1
- [5] Legal500. (n.d.). The Protection of Geographical Indications in China. Available at: <https://www.legal500.com/doing-business-in/the-protection-of-geographical-indications-in-china/>
- [6] WIPO. (2019). Protection and Development of Geographical Indication in ASEAN. Available at: https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/sct/en/wipo_geo_lis_19/wipo_geo_lis_19_4.pdf
- [7] Bustamante, V. (2025). The EU System of Geographical Indications, Their Added Value and Advantages.
- [8] Bashaw, B. M. (2008). Geographical Indications in China: Why Protect GIs with Both Trademark and GI-Specific Legislation? *Washington International Law Journal*, 17(1). Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wilj/vol17/iss1/4/>