Abstract - Distinctive signs, with characteristics of collective use, have been an alternative to producers that, through the use of individual trademarks, hardly enter the market. These signs are called in Brazil, collective marks (CM), certification marks and geographical indications (GIs). The article aims to analyse the evolution of the protection of last two signs in the wine sector. To these issues on made a research in the database of the INPI and on analyse the perception of a group of actors from the UNESC about the GIs and CM related to wine. The results, calculated up to June 2014, are presented below. From 46 GIs recognized in Brazil, 05 are “indicação de procedência” and 01 is “denominação de origem”, recognized for Brazilian wines. Of the total of 17 MC, 06 were granted. With respect to field research, some results can be highlighted. Of the 3,790 questionnaires sent, on have return of 250 respondents. Asked if they knew what was a GI, 61% said they had some knowledge, 30% who had no knowledge and 9% knew what was a GI. As a conclusion, it’s important give more information in order to form the consumer about these signs of collective use.

1. Introdução

The vitiviniculture is a traditional activity in several Brazilian regions. Currently the activity occupies an area of approximately 80,000 hectares with vineyards established from regions located at the southernmost of the country until very close to the equator line.

The temperate regions are: Alto Uruguai, Campanha, Campos de Cima da Serra, Depressão Central, Encosta do Sudeste, Encosta Inferior do Nordeste, Missões, Planalto Médio, Serra Gaúcha, e Serra do Sudeste of the state of Rio Grande do Sul; Litoral Sul Catarinense, Planalto Catarinense, Vale do Rio do Peixe, and Vale do Rio Tijucas in the State of Santa Catarina; the southeastern state of São Paulo and the southern region of Minas Gerais. (BRASIL, 2014)

The northern region of Paraná is typically subtropical. The northwest of the state of São Paulo, North of Minas Gerais and Vale Submédio do São Francisco, situated between Pernambuco and Bahia States, all of that regions are characterized as tropical areas, with management systems adapted to their specific environmental conditions.

Grape production is around 1.2 million tons / year. Nearly 45% of this volume is destined for processing, for the elaboration of wines, juices and other derivatives, and 55% marketed for fresh consumption. From the total of processed products, 212,01 million liters are table wines, 78,2 million liters are grape juice ready to drink, 34,9 millions of kilograms are concentrated grape juice, all of them made by Vitis labrusca or hybrid. About 20,7 million liters are still wine, and 15,88 millions liters are sparkling wine, made with grapes from Vitis vinifera (IBRAVIN, 2014).

Much of the Brazilian production is destined for the domestic market. The main export product by volume, is concentrated grape juice, approximately 15% of the total allocated to the foreign market and; only 5% of the production of table grapes is exported and less than 1% of the wines produced are marketed abroad. Brazil currently exports wine to 22 countries, including the main (in order of highest export volume): Russia, Spain, United States, Paraguay, Japan, Colombia, United Kingdom, Germany, Finland, China, Canada, Netherlands, Australia, Switzerland, Uruguay, Hong Kong, Czech Republic, Poland, Sweden, Belgium, Norway among others (IBRAVIN, 2013).

For the domestic market, however, is valid to emphasize that the distinctive signs, with characteristics of collective use, have been an alternative to producers that, through the use of individual trademarks, hardly enter the market due to high costs of disclosure.

These signs are called in Brazil, through Law no. 9.279/1996 (Industrial Property Law - IPL), collective marks (CM), certification marks and geographical indications (GIs). Currently, a sign is the main link that is established between the producer and the consumer, because it is through it that identifies the origin and this differs from the others. With the passage of time, becomes the benchmark of the quality of that product. Such signs may currently act as the bond of trust established between the producer and the consumer to identify the origin of this besides making it distinct from the others.

To Jungmann and Bonetti (2010), the trademark symbolizes to the consumer some features of the product manufacturer or service provider, such as reputation, quality control, investments in research and development, the quality of the product design and qualification of professionals who provide the service. The trademark allows the consumer to associate these qualities to the products and services identified by it.
According to the IPL, the trademark is all visually perceived distinctive sign (word, figure, symbol) that identifies and distinguishes products or services from other identical or similar, with diverse origin. In this sense, this definition does not include sound, taste or smell trademarks.

Although, the legislation classifies trademark in four natures: for product, for service, certification marks and collective mark. The trademark of product or service is used to distinguish the product or service of another identical, similar or related, of diverse origin. The certification mark is used to attest the conformity of a product or service with certain standards or technical specifications, particularly regarding the quality, nature, material used and methodology employed. Already collective mark is used to identify products or services of members from a same entity. This paper focuses on the collective mark, due to its character of collective use, the approaches it of the geographical indications.

The IPL divides geographical indications (GI) into two species: Indicação de Procedência / Indicação of Origin (IP) and Denominação de Origem / Denomination of Origin (DO). The indication of origin is the geographic name of the area, which became known as a center of production or manufacture of the product or service delivery. The denomination of origin is also the name of geographical region, however, is essentially related to natural and human factors from this area that make the product or service delivery certain quality or characteristic (BRUCH, AREAS, 2011).

Among other differences, the GI has as the main point of differentiation with MCs having to be tied to a particular geographic region. They allow certain place are recognized by the products and services that are produced or rendered there by having typical characteristics, reflecting the human and natural factors.

According to Bruch and Areas (2011) the two ways of protection are considered interesting ways to ensure the preservation of culture, local customs and traditions, and to foster the development of the region, especially in the aspect of development.

Given the aforementioned context, the present study aims to analyse the evolution of the protection of the main Brazilian distinctive signs for collective use - collective marks and geographical indications – applied at national wine sector. Check if there are or not similarity between the collective marks and geographical indications for wine protected at Brasil, and also analyis how group of university audience, including students, professors and staff of the University Extremo Sul Catarinense (UNESC), perceives these signs and how to interpret them. Important to emphasize that this is a university located near the Indication of Origin "Vales da Uva Goethe“ in southern Santa Catarina - Brazil.

Investigative resources used for this study were the bibliographical research using secondary sources such as scientific papers, theses, dissertations and books. The study was classified as exploratory, since its main purpose is to develop and clarify concepts and ideas (MOREIRA, CALEFFE, 2006).

In addition, the database available online on the official website of the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) was analysed in order to quantify and identify applications for recognition of GI and MC for the wine industry, especially wines.

Related the perception of the university public about the GI and MC, the survey was conducted by applying a semi-structured questionnaire mailed via google docs, to professors, students and staff of institution. This method of approach is classified as quantitative, therefore, explores the characteristics and situations resulting from numerical data obtained through a questionnaire and makes use of measurement and statistics (MOREIRA, CALEFFE, 2006).

This article is structured into five sections: the first, this introduction. The second is dedicated to the conceptual analysis of collective marks and geographical indications in Brazil. The third makes the first quantitative analysis of geographical indications and collective marks protected by the INPI in the wine sector. The fourth section presents and analyse the data obtained from responses to questionnaires sent to staff, professors and students of UNESC. Finally, the conclusions are presented.

2. Distinctive signs whit collective use: between collective marks and geographical indications granted to the Brazilian wine producer

2.1 Collective marks

According to art. 123 of the IPL, collective mark is "one used to identify products or services of members from a particular entity." In other words, collective mark is one used by a producer affiliated with an association or organization. However, such members must respect and follow the rules contained in the private standard, mandatory document in a collective mark.

From the point of view of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO): "A collective mark usually belong to an association or cooperative whose members can use this collective mark to market their products. The association usually establishes a series of criteria for the use of the collective mark (eg. quality standards) and authorizes each associated company to use the mark provided that it meets these criteria. Collective marks may be an effective means for the joint marketing of the products of a group of companies to which it would be harder to get consumers to recognize their own trademark or take the main distributors to accept the distribution of their products."

According Brazil Law, the collective mark can only be requested by a collective entity, being extinguished when such collective cease to exist.

Barbosa, Peralta and Fernandes (2013) state that the use of the collective mark does not prevent any individual member use their trademark to distinguish your product from another member of the community.
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Therefore, the two brands - individual and collective - can be used together. As the high cost of dissemination of a trademark that hinders small producers promote their product individually this step may occur more easily when performed collectively, reducing costs and risks further dividing (REGALADO et al, 2012).

This was one of the premises for the registration in 2013 of ACAVITIS collective mark of Santa Catarina Association of Producers of Altitude Fine Wines. Founded in November 2005, for members located in the regions of São Joaquin, Caçador and Campos Novos, the wines of this brand have different characteristics due to the grape produced in highlands, that means “Altitude” in Portuguese. The main objective of ACAVITIS is defending the interests of producers of this kind of wine from Santa Catarina, Brazil, give subsidies to public policies, facilitate the qualification and differentiation of this products from its associates, and help their open new markets for altitude wine from Santa Catarina. At the end, these producers could use both forms of distinctive signs (BRUCH and AREAS, 2011, p. 135).

According to the authors, the Brazilian law requires for the recognition of a geographical indication this must necessarily be composed of a geographical name, which is more restrictive than the provisions of the TRIPS Agreement rules. So, the producers of high-altitude wines were forced to choose to use the collective mark, because these terms "altitude" or "altitude wines" do not constitute geographical names. However, if they opt for geographical names like "San Joaquin," "Caçador" and "Campos Novos", would be better supported to require a geographical indication. But it’ll need by analysing a case, if each on really are a geographical indication (and BRUCH AREAS, 2011).

**Figure 01.** Collective Mark ACAVITIS

Source: INPI, 2014.

Examining Table 01 allows observe that 17 applications for registration of Brazilian collective mark were applied at INPI until June 2014. Of these, six had grant the register and one the case is still pending for examination. The others claims were filed.

One of the collective marks that had received the register in 2013 was CPEG, belong to the Consortium of Producers of Sparkling Garibaldi. The CPEG was founded in 2007, and it is integrated by the sparkling wineries of Garibaldi City, in the State of Rio Grande do Sul. This region, since the beginning of the twentieth century produces more than 90% sparkling wines in Brazil (INPI, 2013). The option for a collective mark should be attributed to rigor given to the interpretation of Brazilian law, in which one can be understood that for a denomination of origin all grapes need come from the delimitate area. In the case of Garibaldi, that is a small city, a part of the grapes come from other cities like Bento Gonçalves, Farroupilha, Flores da Cunha, Caxias do Sul, and other one, all at Rio Grande do Sul State. But the main part of the process to transform these grapes in wine and after in sparkling wine are totally made in Garibaldi.

**Table 01:** collective marks for wines applied in the INPI until June 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processo Marca</th>
<th>Classe</th>
<th>Data de Aplicação</th>
<th>Titular</th>
<th>Situação</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>819961426 ALLELLANCE CN.3510,3530,3520* 26/06/97 IGA BRASIL [BR]</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Pedida arquivado definitivamente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828398038 CPEG DE ESPUMANTES GARIBALDI LTDA 31 30/07/10 IBRASILEIRO DO VINHO [BR]</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Registro de marca em vigor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825355131 FREIA 31 08/10/06 IBRASILEIRO DO VINHO [BR]</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Pedido arquivado definitivamente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820194704 FILIUS 31 23/06/12 IGI COMÉRCIO DE VINHOS BRASIL [BR]</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Registro de marca em vigor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825355130 TERRA À TERRA LTDA [BR] [BR] [BR] [BR]</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Pedido arquivado definitivamente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This was a national classification used in Brazil before the signature of the International Classification in 2000, were alcoholic beverage change the place and the wine take the class 33.

Source: Authors elaboration from INPI (2014) data.

It is also observed that the application for collective mark "Vinhos de Montanha", that currently is filed, was made by the Association of Wine Producers from Pinto Bandeira. This Association at present represent the “Indicação de Origem Pinto Bandeira”, that, in this case, is more appropriate because is a really indication of origin and have a geographic name.

---
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In the other hand, the Brazilian Wine Institute (IBRAVIN), at the duties incumbent on it in order to represent the Brazilian wine, contributes to the promotion of collective mark “Vinhos do Brasil” (Registration 902819470) whose wine are located in all Brazilian territory.

Figure 02. Collective Mark Vinhos do Brasil

This is an example of the application of the characteristics of collective marks to a specific business sector, where a market segment joins to use a sign in common, under certain rules. And now, they are using this collective mark in all world, wit register at United States Of America, Europe Union, and a application in Chine.

2.2. Geographical Indication

In accordance with Brazilian law, Geographical Indication (GI) is distinctive sign which identifies certain place that is recognized by the products or services that are produced or rendered there (IP), as well as the outstanding quality of these products or services which are essentially or exclusively to that delimited place. These signs have been used as product differentiation mechanism, inserted in the strategies of competition between countries and companies or consortium of producers.

This theme is regulated in several international agreements, that the main one at present is the Agreement on Intellectual Property Rights Related to Trade (TRIPS), of which Brazil is also a signatory.

In light of TRIPS, Brazil has adapted its regulatory framework promulgating the LPI, which deals in your articles 176-182 about geographical indications. Internally, to regulate the protection of these signs and their record, the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) published the Normative Instruction No. 25/2013.

However, Brazilian law does not define what is a GI, but only their species, classifying them into Indication of Origin (IP) Denomination of Origin (DO). There is no legal hierarchy among them, are considered protective possibilities parallel with different characteristics. It is up to producers or service providers who plan to pursue this kind of protection, provided the requirements of its regulation, verify which of these species will be better for them.

The IG has the distinctive feature and quality to differentiate the products produced or services provided in the region, informing consumers of their origin. Consumers seeking food and service with a guarantee of originality and self-identity may feel pressure to pay a higher price (Garcia, 2006, p. 156). Thus, the IG should be thought of as a tool of harmonious cultural occupation of space, combining the typical value of a product and its historical and cultural aspects, biodiversity conservation and rural development (MAPA, 2014).

It is also worth noting that “when a geographical name comes into common use, with product or service shall not be considered a geographical indication” as pointing to Brazilian legislation (art. 180 of the IPL). Ie, when the geographical name becomes known as a type of product and no longer has any relationship with the region where it is produced, its no more a geographical indication, it became a common name. Like “parmesão” for cheese in Brazil: nobody thinks this product is made in Parma.

Moreover, the use of the geographical indication is restricted to producers and service providers set in place, (art. 182 IPL). However, in the case of DO, it also requires compliance with certain quality that is inherent to the products from these regions (BRUCH, 2008). GI in the wine sector had consolidated and surfaced gradually when producers and consumers began to realize flavours or peculiar qualities in some products that come from certain places (BRUCH, 2011).

In Brazil, are currently recognized in the INPI 46 geographical indications. From these, 38 are national and 8 are foreign DO. Between the national GI, 30 are indication of origin (IP) and 8 are denomination of origin (DO). One national IP is for service. And is possible protect GI for beverages, like wine, spirit alcoholic drinks, and so one, for food, crafts, and every product or service that have a relationship with a specific place and had became recognized or had a particular quality and identity related with the natural and human factors of this place.

In the wine sector, object of this article, are granted 7 GI. On had 6 IP and 1 DO, as presented in Table 02, issued by INPI in Brazil until June 2014.
Table 02: GI of Brazilian wines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Date</th>
<th>Geographical Indication</th>
<th>GI representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19/11/2002</td>
<td>Vale dos Vinhedos (IP)</td>
<td>A. P. de Vinhos Finos do Vale dos Vinhedos - APROVALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/07/2009</td>
<td>Vale do Submédio São Francisco (IP)</td>
<td>Conselho da União das Ass. e Coop. Dos Produtores de Uvas de Casa e Mangas do Vale do Submédio São Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/07/2010</td>
<td>Pinto Bandeira (IP)</td>
<td>Associação dos Produtores de Vinhos de Pinto Bandeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/02/2012</td>
<td>Vales da Uva Goethe (IP)</td>
<td>PROGOETH - Associação dos Produtores de Uva e do Vinho Goethe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012</td>
<td>Altos Montes (IP)</td>
<td>Associação de Produtores dos Vinhos dos Altos Montes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/2013</td>
<td>Monte Belo (IP)</td>
<td>Associação dos Vitivinicultores de Monte Belo do Sul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/09/2012</td>
<td>Vale dos Vinhedos (DO)</td>
<td>Associação dos Produtores de Vinhos Finos do Vale dos Vinhedos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors elaboration from INPI (2014) data.

The first geographical indication for wines was granted to “Indicação de Origin Vale dos Vinhedos”, located in Serra Gaúcha, State of Rio Grande do Sul. The registration was requested in 1997, and was recognized in 2002 by the INPI. Later, the same region made a new application at the INPI for the “Denomination of Origin Vale dos Vinhedos”, which was recognized in 2012, and is the first and unique DO for Brazilian wines until now.

Among the other GIs for wines and derivatives, the Indicação de Origin Pinto Bandeira, Indicação de Origin Altos Montes and the Indicação de Origin Belo Monte are in the state of Rio Grande do Sul. The Indication of Origin Vales da Uva Goethe is located in the state of Santa Catarina, also in southern Brazil. All of them are for still and sparkling wines. Already the Indicação de Origin Vale do Submédio São Francisco, which refers to grape and mango, its place in the Brazilian Northeast, specifically in the division of the states of Pernambuco and Bahia.

There are also vitivinicultural zones of production, already mentioned in the introduction. But these are specifically regulated for wines and are not in scope of the IPL.

Finally, Table 03 combines the main differences between marks, collective marks and geographical indications, since some aspects about them should be mentioned. Just like trademark, IG respects the principle of territoriality, i.e., if the recognition in other countries is desired it is necessary requires it in every one of them. However, different from trademarks and collective marks that need to have their registration renewed every 10 years, once granted the IG, this has an unlimited validity (BARBOSA, PERALTA and FERNANDES, 2013).

Table 03: Main differences between marks, collective marks and geographical indications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>GI representative</th>
<th>Trademark</th>
<th>Collective mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Protect a geography name related to a product or a service</td>
<td>Identify and distinguish products and services</td>
<td>Identify products and services from members of an association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Producers and service providers located in the region delimited</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Association applicant that represent a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific rules</td>
<td>Use regulation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Private standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to use</td>
<td>Producers and service providers located in the region delimited and observe the use regulation</td>
<td>The applicant and who has a licence from the applicant to use the trademark</td>
<td>Members of the Association that observe the private standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of protection</td>
<td>Unlimit</td>
<td>10 years from the application</td>
<td>10 years from the application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors elaboration adapted from Barbosa (2013).

3 Analysis of the applied research at UNESC.

Taking the hypothesis that the consumers currently do not differentiate between the concepts of trademark, collective marks and geographical indications, on felt the need to do a search, although be with a small number of respondents. In order to assess whether this could be substantiated hypothesis and how these signs were perceived, on opted for the application of a structured questionnaire with multiple-choice quiz.

The place selected was the University Extremo Sul Catarinense (UNESC), specifically the Unit for Applied Social Sciences, whith the courses of Law, Economics, Management, Technology and Accounting. This questionnaire was sent to 134 professors, 3642 students and 14 staff of the academic unit, totalling 3,790 questionnaires sent.

Obtained the return of 250 completed questionnaires, where 49% of respondents have up to 25 years, 26% 26-35 years 13% 36-45 years old, 8% 46-55 years and 4% over 56 years. As the questionnaires were not named, it was not possible to quantify the numbers of responses from professors, students and staff, to prepare a more detailed profile. However, it can be considered, according to more participatory age, that most of the responses were from students.

One of the questions which were aimed to identify the factors that most influenced at the time of purchase decision (Table 04).
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Table 04: Factors that influence the buying decision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quality</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>price</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>origin</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appearance</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors elaboration with research data: UNESC (December 2013/January 2014).

By examining the Table 04, it appears that the main reason given by respondents as determinant in the decision to purchase a product is the quality he possesses (73%). Then 51% of respondents said that price is the major factor. In smaller numbers, 4% and 3% answered that prioritize the question of origin and appearance, respectively.

Another question asked if the person knew what is a geographical indication (Figure 03).

Figure 03: Recognition of the concept of IG.

According to Figure 03, the majority of respondents (61%) said that they have little knowledge about what is a geographical indication; 30% responded that they have no knowledge and only 9% said they have a lot of knowledge and know what is a GI. These data are indicative that although GI are not yet well known, some people already have the knowledge on the subject.

Exactly by ignorance, not knowing eventually differentiates what is a denomination of origin and an indication of origin: only 22% said they know the difference, and 78% said they did not know the difference.

According Barbosa (2011), which in their study described the degree of recognition of the GI “Paraty” in the specialized market in liquor in the state of Rio de Janeiro, from the 04 groups of specialized consumers, only 02 knew GI (50%), from 09 specialized stores in selling liquor only 04 knew about the existence of the GI. In the region of Paraty, from 05 producers of cachaça, 2 did not know the GI. After a few years, on realize that unawareness is still present.

Coming back to this research, it is noteworthy that 71% of respondents say they have no knowledge of the Indication of Origin of Vales da Uva Goethe (IPVUG). This GI was chosen to be part of the research, because its region is near to the survey area. However, despite constantly there are publications and reports on the subject in the mainstream media in the region, only 29% of respondents have knowledge about Vales da Uva Goethe. This is a worrisome indicator, since it is the first geographical indication in the State of Santa Catarina.

When asked if the respondents know what is collective mark, 42% responded that they have knowledge and 58% don’t know what it is. Correlating the degree of ignorance of the IG that was 30% with the lack of collective mark that was 58%, on have the collective mark is even less known than the GI.

Interesting to recall that Santa Catarina already has a collective mark in the wine industry: ACAVITIS, under the ownership of Santa Catarina Association of Producers of Fine Wines of Altitude. The ACAVITIS currently has approximately 32 projects associated distributed around 300 hectares of vineyards in Santa Catarina da Serra state. To be entitled to use the collective mark ACAVITIS shall meet three requirements: producing wine from grapes of Vitis vinifera in Santa Catarina state; produce at altitude above 900 meters and under strict with quality control.

Also important to note that this mark is not present in Table 01 because it was protected in the class 43, for Advisory Services, consultancy and information about wine and its characteristics and not to the wine product that is in the class 33, from where the search results in Table 01 has taken.

Relating to the act of buy a wine, on asked what was the preference related to the origin of the product. Among the respondents, 42% said they have preference for domestic wine, 29% said they purchase foreign wine and 28% said they purchase handcrafted wines (Figure 04).

Figure 04: Preference related to the origin of the wine

Source: Authors elaboration with research data: UNESC (December 2013/January 2014).

The questionnaire also asks about buying wines marked with GI or Collective Marc (Figure 05). Among the responses, 88% of respondents said they would buy wines with seal GI and 12% said no. Still in Figure 05 on shows that kind of sign the respondents would choose: analysing the responses there was a preference for wines by IG.
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In this sense, it is seen that 52% of respondents said they would buy wines with the protection of GI, according to Figure 05, and the remaining 48% who preferred a collective mark. From the context presented may infer that a large number of people are still unaware, almost entirely, the concepts and the importance for the development of a region, the institutes of the trademark, collective marks and geographical indications. The low number of responses to feedback questionnaires may be more indicative of this unawareness. 3,790 questionnaires sent because there was a return of only 6.6% of responses.

4. Conclusions

With the results found in this study, on can be seen that, despite the unawareness, still present some evidence that when the product look like with "quality" the consumer choice will be by this factor. Only later it checks the price issue. Still, among the respondents, there is a preference for domestic wine, indicating that Brazilian products reached a level of quality already perceived by consumers.

Therefore, the actions of public policies directed only to increased production, although important, are no longer sufficient for the increasingly globalized and competitive market. The competitiveness of Brazilian agribusiness increasingly relies on the valuation of the product by ensuring its quality. Over the past years the society has demonstrated an increased awareness of the importance with social and environmental issues related to the form of production and marketing of agri-food.

According to a survey conducted by the Brazilian Service of Support for Micro and Small Enterprises (Sebrae), it indicates that the price of the products with quality, either through protecting the institution of collective mark or geographical indication, may rise up to 30% when the consumer identifies benefits the seal. This scenario agrees with the survey data presented, when interviewed stated that among the main requirements and attributes for a product, they prioritize the issue of quality.

For small less developed regions, take the recognized by the market related from theirs typical characteristics through the use of a sign as the Collective Mark or Geographical Indication can be an interesting alternative to entering the market.
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