

Integration of GI-Tagged Products into Indian Tourism Promotion: An Analysis of Government Policies, Frameworks, and Platforms

– Tangjakhombi Akoijam*

Associate Professor, School of Tourism and Hospitality Management Services, IGNOU, New Delhi

✉ akoijam@ignou.ac.in  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1459-938X>

– Shivani Singh

Research Scholar, School of Tourism and Hospitality Management Services, IGNOU, New Delhi

✉ shivaniisingsh1895@outlook.com  <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4584-9913>



ARTICLE HISTORY

Paper Nomenclature: Review of Literature (ROL)
Paper Code: GJEISV17I4OD2025ROL5
Submission at Portal (www.gjeis.com): 01-Oct-2025
Manuscript Acknowledged: 03-Oct-2025
Originality Check: 08-Oct-2025
Originality Test (Plag) Ratio (Drillbit): 01%
Author Revert with Rectified Copy: 10-Oct-2025
Peer Reviewers Comment (Open): 14-Oct-2025
Single Blind Reviewers Explanation: 16-Oct-2025
Double Blind Reviewers Interpretation: 18-Oct-2025
Triple Blind Reviewers Annotations: 21-Oct-2025
Author Update (w.r.t. correction, suggestion & observation): 25-Oct-2025
Camera-Ready-Copy: 28-Oct-2025
Editorial Board Excerpt & Citation: 31-Oct-2025
Published Online First: 31-Dec-2025

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Geographical Indications (GIs) represent unique cultural and economic assets that link products to their specific origins, offering significant potential for place-based tourism branding. This study analyzes the extent to which Indian States and Union Territories (UTs) integrate GI-tagged products into their tourism policies and promotional strategies.

Methodology: Adopting a qualitative-descriptive research design, the study analyzes official tourism policies, planning documents, promotional materials, and digital platforms of all 28 Indian states and 8 Union Territories. Indicators are developed to assess policy references, branding visibility, and the presence of GI-based tourism experiences. The analysis is further contextualized using domestic and foreign tourist arrival data to interpret GI integration, leading to the identification of seven distinct types of States/UTs (Type 1-7).

Findings: The findings of the study reveal a systemic disconnect between GI abundance and formal tourism policy integration and limited GI tag visibility in tourism promotion platforms. Nevertheless, strong experiential readiness—manifested through craft trails, agro-tourism, festivals, and artisan interactions—indicates substantial untapped potential for GI-led tourism development. Only two states—Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu—are found to be Type 1 Aligned states and thus high-performing models.

Originality: There is hardly any study done to specifically examine how governments integrate GI tagged products into tourism policies and promotional strategies. This paper addresses the gap and underscores the importance of institutional recognition and policy convergence in transforming GI-tagged products into strategic tourism assets. Grounded in tourist motivation theories, policy framing theory, and destination branding theory, the paper concludes with policy recommendations to strengthen GI-based tourism development and promotion in India.

Paper Type: Review of Literature

KEYWORDS: Geographical Indication (GI) | Tourism Policy | Tourism Promotion | Destination Branding | GI Tourism

*Corresponding Author (Tangjakhombi)

- Present Volume & Issue (Cycle): Volume 17 | Issue-4 | Oct-Dec 2025
- International Standard Serial Number:
Online ISSN: 0975-1432 | Print ISSN: 0975-153X
- DOI (Crossref, USA) <https://doi.org/10.18311/gjeis/2025>
- Bibliographic database: OCLC Number (WorldCat): 988732114
- Impact Factor: 3.57 (2019-2020) & 1.0 (2020-2021) [CiteFactor]
- Editor-in-Chief: Dr. Subodh Kesharwani
- Frequency: Quarterly
- Published Since: 2009
- Research database: EBSCO <https://www.ebsco.com>
- Review Pedagogy: Single Blind Review/ Double Blind Review/ Triple Blind Review/ Open Review
- Copyright: ©2025 GJEIS and its heirs
- Publishers: Scholastic Seed Inc. and KARAM Society
- Place: New Delhi, India.
- Repository (figshare): 704442/13

GJEIS is an Open access journal which access article under the Creative Commons. This CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>) promotes access and re-use of scientific and scholarly research and publishing.



Introduction

Geographical Indications (GIs) are an important form of intellectual property that protect the identity of products closely linked to a specific place. They help safeguard regional knowledge, preserve cultural traditions, and support economic growth through place-based branding. A Geographical Indication is defined under Article 22.1 of the World Trade Organization's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) as: "Indications which identify a good as originating in the territory of a member, or a region or locality in that territory, where a given quality, reputation or other characteristic of the good is essentially attributable to its geographical origin". Internationally, GIs are protected through various WIPO-administered treaties, like the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883); the Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and their International Registration

(1958); the Geneva Act of the Lisbon Agreement (2015) etc. These treaties/frameworks ensure that producers benefit from the commercial and reputational value of their local heritage and traditional skills.

India is a land of diversity, where every state and region has a unique culture, tradition, and heritage. This diversity is reflected in the various Geographical Indication (GI) products of India - as of 31st March 2025, 683 products have been registered with GI tags across categories such as handicrafts, agriculture, foodstuffs, and textiles. The first Indian product to receive GI status was Darjeeling Tea in 2004. In India, GI tags come under the administrative purview of the Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT), part of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and are recognized and protected under the *Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999*, which came into effect on September 15, 2003.

Table 1: State/UT GI Tag Count (March 2025)

S1 . State/UT No	No. of GI Tags	Major GI Products	
1	Uttar Pradesh	79	Banaras Brocades, Lucknow Chikan, Basmati Rice, etc.
2	Tamil Nadu	71	Kancheepuram Silk, Thanjavur Painting, Malabar Pepper etc.
3	Maharashtra	55	Alphonso Mango, Paithani Sarees, Warli Painting etc.
4	Karnataka	49	Mysore Silk, Bidriware, Dharwad Pedha, Malabar Pepper etc.
5	Assam	42	Assam Tea, Muga Silk, Gamosa of Assam, Singpho Phalap Tea etc.
6	Kerala	41	Aranmula Kannadi, Alleppey Coir, Malabar Pepper etc.
7	West Bengal	35	Darjeeling Tea, Nakshi Kantha, Banglar Rasogolla, Dalle etc.
8	Gujarat	28	Patan Patola, Kutch Embroidery, Warli Painting etc.
9	Odisha	27	Odisha Rasagola, Sambalpuri Saree, Araku Coffee etc.
10	Uttarakhand	27	Aipan Art, Berinag Tea, Basmati Rice etc.
11	Jammu & Kashmir	25	Kashmir Saffron, Pashmina, Walnut Wood Carving, Basmati Rice etc.
12	Madhya Pradesh	24	Chanderi Sarees, Bagh Prints, Ratlami Sev, Mahoba Pan etc.
13	Andhra Pradesh	21	Tirupati Laddu, Uppada Jamdani Sarees, Araku Coffee etc.
14	Arunachal Pradesh	21	Arunachal Orange, Adi Kekir (Ginger), Apatani Textile etc.
15	Rajasthan	21	Blue Pottery of Jaipur, Kota Doria, Phulkari etc.
16	Telangana	19	Pochampally Ikat, Hyderabad Haleem, Banaganapalle Mango etc.
17	Bihar	16	Madhubani Painting, Mithila Makhana, Bhagalpur Silk etc.
18	Himachal Pradesh	11	Kangra Tea, Kulflu Shawl, Chamba Rumal, Basmati Rice etc.
19	Goa	10	Feni, Goa Cashew, Mankurad Mango etc.
20	Meghalaya	8	Lakadong Turmeric, Khasi Mandarin etc.
21	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	7	Karen Musley Rice, Nicobari Canoe, Padauk Wood Craft etc.
22	Chhattisgarh	7	Bastar Dhokra, Champa Silk Saree, Jeeraphool Rice etc.
23	Manipur	7	Kachai Lemon, Tamenglong Orange, Chak Hao Rice etc.
24	Mizoram	7	Tawhlohpuan, Puanchei etc.
25	Nagaland	5	Naga Mircha, Chakhesang Shawl, Chak Hao Rice (shared) etc.
25	Ladakh (UT)	4	Pashmina Wool, Seabuckthorn, Apricot etc.
27	Tripura	4	Queen Pineapple, Risa Textile etc.
28	Puducherry (UT)	2	Villianur Terracotta, Tirukanur Papier Mache etc.
29	Punjab	2	Phulkari, Basmati Rice etc.
30	Sikkim	2	Large Cardamom, Dalle Khursani etc.
31	Chandigarh (UT)	1	Basmati Rice — shared with neighbouring states.
32	(UT)	1	Warli Painting — shared with Maharashtra, Gujarat etc.
33	Delhi (UT)	1	Basmati Rice — shared with neighbouring states
34	Haryana	1	Basmati Rice — shared with neighbouring states
35	Jharkhand	1	Sohrai – Khovar Painting — shared with Bihar etc.
36	Lakshadweep (UT)	0	—

DNHDD- Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu

Sources: GI Registry document (State_wise_Registered_GI_of_India_26_07_2024.pdf); the GI counts have been manually computed from the entries for each State/UT. Some GI tagged products were found common among states sharing territorial borders.



Literature Review

Several scholars have examined Geographical Indications (GIs) from economic, cultural, legal, and also tourism perspectives, emphasizing their role in regional development and place-based branding.

Economic Significance of GI Products

The literature consistently highlights the economic value of GIs for producers and regional economies. GIs protect authenticity, enable niche markets, and function as collective intellectual property that supports rural development (Barham, 2003; Rangnekar, 2004). Das (2011) notes that the success of Indian GI products such as Darjeeling Tea and Kanchipuram Silk depends not only on legal protection but also on effective marketing and integration into regional development strategies. Empirical evidence supports these claims. Suh & Macpherson (2007), in their study of Boseong green tea in South Korea, found that GI recognition led to a price increase of over 90 percent and nearly doubled production within six years. Their findings demonstrate how GIs enhance product value, market performance, and regional economic outcomes. Thus, GIs are market-differentiation tools capable of generating premium pricing and brand loyalty (Anson, 2012) capable of income enhancement and livelihood diversification (Jena & Grote, 2012; Dileep & Das, 2023).

Cultural, Social, and Heritage Value of GIs

Beyond economic benefits, GIs play a significant role in preserving cultural heritage. Belletti et al. (2021) describe GIs as public goods that reinforce territorial identity, cultural authenticity, and community pride, while Pant (2015) links GI protection with heritage-based tourism and the preservation of artisanal skills. Shafi M. (2022) highlight the importance in safeguarding indigenous knowledge and traditional craftsmanship, despite challenges in registration and commercialization.

Legal and Institutional Frameworks Governing GIs

Several studies focus on the legal aspects. Das (2011) stresses the importance of quality control and enforcement, while scholars such as Anson (2012) point out that limited awareness and weak institutional support often constrain the effective use of GI protections, analyze particularly among small-scale producers. Das (2010) India's Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, emphasizing its role in safeguarding region-specific knowledge and authenticity.

GIs as Instruments for Tourism Development

A substantial body of research links GIs with tourism development. Poitras and Getz (2006) show how appellation-based branding—such as Champagne—strengthens destination identity and attracts high-value tourism. Tregear et al. (2007) demonstrate how GI-protected foods in Europe foster gastronomic tourism, while Belletti et al. (2017) illustrate how GIs contribute to rural tourism circuits and agro-tourism experiences. Suh & Macpherson (2007) provide important evidence from Asia, showing that GI recognition of Boseong green tea increased public awareness of the region and significantly boosted tourist footfalls. Indian studies similarly highlight the tourism potential of GIs. GI branding for agricultural products offers opportunities for rural diversification through agro-tourism initiatives such as guided farm visits, harvest festivals, and culinary tourism centred on traditional dishes (Jena and Grote, 2012) and has the potential to enhance sustainable tourism and rural livelihoods (Pant, 2015). Dileep and Das (2023) provide empirical evidence from Kerala showing how GI-tagged products like Aranmula Kannadi have been effectively integrated into regional tourism branding. Emerging research also points to niche forms such as cheese tourism, where GIs enhance experiential and cultural tourism (Baykal, D. & Denk, E (2024).

GIs, Branding, and Market Positioning

Across the literature, GIs are widely recognized as powerful branding instruments that signal authenticity, quality, and geographic origin (Anson, 2012). Empirical cases, including Boseong green tea (Suh & Macpherson, 2007), illustrate how GI branding strengthens product image, regional identity, and tourism appeal. However, scholars consistently note that inadequate marketing, low awareness, and limited institutional support hinder the full realization of GI branding and tourism potential (Belletti et al., 2017).

Research Gap

The unique, place-specific characteristics and authenticity of GI products make them effective tools for promoting tourism, but despite ample research on their impact and linkage to tourism, a clear gap remains in the literature. There is hardly any study done to specifically examine how governments integrate GI-tagged products into tourism policies and promotional strategies. Existing literature tends to focus on case studies, specific product categories, or regional analyses, without providing a comprehensive assessment of policy-level integration.

Given India's vast diversity – with 28 states and 8 union territories, and around 683 registered GI tagged products - there is a need to analyse policy documents, promotional materials,

and state-level initiatives to understand GI integration in tourism strategies.

Research Aims & Objectives:

The overall aim of this study is to understand how GI-tagged products in India are integrated into tourism promotion through existing government tourism policies and strategies. The specific objectives are:

1. Identify and analyse references to GI-tagged products in tourism policies and promotional frameworks across Indian States/Union Territories
2. Determine readiness or potential of GI Integration into tourism promotion for each State/Union Territory and subsequently analyse them with respective tourist footfall data
3. Propose policy recommendations to enhance GI-based tourism development and promotion

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

As the travel and tourism industry matures and tourists become more experienced, expectations for more authentic, unique and culturally-rooted experiences increase. These find reflections in many tourist motivation theories like *Push-Pull Motivation theory* where the pull factors corresponds to destination attributes such as local culture, heritage and authentic cultural products; *MacCannell's Theory of Authenticity* which postulates that tourist seek real, un-staged cultural encounters; *Cultural Capital Theory* which explains tourists' desire for authenticity as well as differentiating themselves from others through experiences that enhances their cultural capital related to knowledge, status, taste or

Pine & Gilmore's Experiential Motivation theory which posit that tourists' increasingly focus on memorable immersive experiences. Geographical Indications (GI) represent products with unique regional identity, heritage value, and cultural authenticity and thus offer or has the potential to offer authentic, place-specific cultural experiences that satisfy tourists' search for genuineness, novelty, and deeper cultural connection.

The relevance of assets like the GI-tagged products as a tool for tourism promotion will manifest only when they are recognized as innovative assets (*Policy Innovation & Diffusion Theory*) and supported by political and institutional support through policy formulation (*Policy Framing Theory*). This in turn will enable GI products to become branding assets that differentiate the region (*Destination Branding Theory*). Branding attracts tourists and reinforces the region's identity. Thus, Tourism becomes a tool for development also.

The conceptual framework adopted for this study (Figure 1) recognises tourists' search for authenticity and positions GI-tagged products as authentic cultural assets that can strengthen Indian tourism promotion and regional development. Tourist motivation theories explain the demand for unique, immersive, and culturally rich experiences, which GI products can provide. From the policy perspective, GI products are effective when recognized as innovative assets (**Policy Innovation & Diffusion Theory**) and supported through institutional frameworks (**Policy Framing Theory**). Once legitimized, these products can be integrated into **destination branding (Destination Branding Theory)**, enhancing visibility, attracting tourists, and generating authentic, memorable experiences that reinforce regional identity and development.



Figure 1: Conceptual Framework of the Study



Research Methodology: Given the exploratory nature of the study and the focus on policy-level integration, a qualitative-descriptive approach is adopted. The study covers all 28 Indian states and 8 Union Territories. The research is conducted in two phases.

In the first phase, official policy documents, official tourism promotional materials and digital platforms for all states/UTs are systematically reviewed to assess:

- whether the GI term and GI tag products are referenced in policy documents and how prominently they are integrated into tourism policy and promotion strategies.
- the existence of GI product-based tourism experiences

For analytical clarity, the states and UTs are grouped based on the number of registered GI-tagged products.

Group 1: States/UTs with 15 or more GI-tagged products

Group 2: States/UTs with less than 15 GI-tagged products

Subsequently, the following hypotheses is raised:

Hypotheses 1: Group 1 (more GI count) exhibit higher integration of GI into tourism promotion than Group 2 (lesser GI count)

Variables and Indicators

The study identifies the following variables and indicators:

I: GI References in Tourism Policies and Promotional Frameworks (Relates to Objective 1)

Variables	Indicators
Presence of GI references and Depth of policy integration	(I a) GI mentioned in Tourism Policy documents (<i>Yes/No</i>) and Level of mention - <i>Low/Moderate/ High</i> based on brief reference / subsection / dedicated section in Tourism Policy or if references given in other policy documents- specific documents to be mentioned
Visibility and presence on official tourism platforms	(I b) GI-related pictures/posts/videos showcased on official tourism website/ brochures/social media/ use of GI-themed campaigns or hashtags (<i>Low/Moderate/ High</i>)

II: GI Integration Readiness/Potential into State/Union Territory tourism promotion (Relates to Objective 2)

Variables	Indicators
Prominence in existing marketing strategies	(II) Availability of GI based Tourism experiences-trails/workshops with or without the GI tag (highlighted/shown on official website and brochures)- (<i>Low/Moderate/ High</i>)
Combination of Findings of: (I a), (I b) and (II)	State/UT classified into Category A/B/C/D A: Ready for GI Integration B: Moderately ready for GI Integration and also have Potential C: Not Ready for GI Integration but have Potential D: Not Ready for GI Integration and Low Potential

To deepen the interpretation of the study’s findings, in the *second phase*, tourism performance data from the Ministry of Tourism—specifically domestic tourist visits, foreign tourist arrivals, and state/UT-rankings—was analysed along with the readiness/potential status of GI product integration observed in state/union territories tourism strategies (Category A/B/C/D).

Research Findings and Analysis: The findings are presented phase-wise.

First Phase

Out of the 28 states and 8 Union Territories (total 36), 17 come under Group I while Group 2 has 18 and thus their numbers are comparable. Lakshwadeep is yet to open its GI registration account and therefore not included. The group wise findings are tabulated below:

Table 2: Group 1- 15 or more GI-tagged products (Total 17 States/UTs)

State/UT & GI Count	(Low/Moderate/High) GI term Mentions in Policy (I a)	(Low/Moderate/High) GI-related pictures/posts/videos showcased on official tourism website/brochures/social media (I b)	(Low/Moderate/ High) Existing GI Product-Based Tourism Experiences (Trails/Workshops) with or without GI tag (II)	Readiness& Potential of State/UT for GI Integration *A/B/C
Uttar Pradesh (79)	(High) ; Yes, GI mention in Tourism Policy Tourism Policy 2022-Dedicated GI section 8.3; page 43 GI tag products promotion through Experiential tourism; ODOP Policy mention GI products like Kalanamak Rice, Chikankari etc; Invest India UPODOP Policy pg.6. gives GI reference; Uttar Pradesh Micro Small Medium Enterprises Policy 2022 mentions GI tags	(Moderate) ; UP Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like handloom, cuisine but without the GI tag Uttar Pradesh tourism official Instagram/facebook pages regularly post about GI tagged products.	High – Banarasi Silk <i>weaving</i> ; Kannauj Ittar Distillation; Craft clusters; GI Mahotsavs supported by ministries like MSME Ministry.	A
Tamil Nadu (71)	(High) ; Yes, GI mention in Tourism Policy Tourism Policy 2023-Thanjavur Paintings (Pg 11) and Thammampatti wood carvings (Pg 17) photographs shown with GI tags mention; Pg 53 mentions use of GI to promote unique tourism products	(Moderate) ; TN Tourism website and brochure showcase GI tagged products like textiles, art, handicrafts but without GI tag Thanjuvar Tourism Promotion Council website and https://tamilnadutourisminfo.com/ has dedicated GI Products section.	High – Kanchipuram Silk weaving demonstrations, Thanjavur Art Plates; Craft Villages	A
Maharashtra (55)	(Low-Moderate) ; No GI mention in Tourism Policy Maharashtra Industrial Policy mentioned GI tags as “The Promotion of GI’s is in line with the Government of India’s “Make in India” Campaign	(Moderate) ; Tourism website mentions GI tagged products in its objective related to identification and development of high-potential tourism circuits. Also showcases GI tagged products like food & folk-art but without the GI tag	High – Alphonso Mango Orchard Visits, Paithani Weaving demonstrations; Warli Art Workshops	B
Karnataka (49)	(Low-Moderate) ; No GI mention in Tourism Policy Karnataka Industrial Policy 2020-25 pg.35 Intellectual Property Rights section, mention GI products promotion	(Moderate) https://kstdc.co/ has a write-up on Karnataka’s Indigenous GI- tagged Crops. Also showcases GI tagged products like silk, handicrafts but without the GI tag	Moderate – Mysore Silk Weaving, Channapatna Toys Workshops	B



State/UT & GI Count	(Low/Moderate/High) GI term Mentions in Policy (I a)	(Low/Moderate/High) GI-related pictures/posts/videos showcased on official tourism website/brochures/social media (I b)	(Low/Moderate/ High) Existing GI Product-Based Tourism Experiences (Trails/Workshops) with or without GI tag (II)	Readiness& Potential of State/UT for GI Integration *A/B/C
Assam (42)	(Low-Moderate); No GI mention in Tourism Policy Assam Handicraft Policy 2022 mentioned GI under Objectives Section as “Conserve traditional knowledge, skills and heritage through use of GI etc”.	(Low); Assam Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Tea, Muga Silk, Gamosa but without GI tag	Moderate – Muga Silk Weaving, Handloom Clusters	C
Kerala (41)	(Low-Moderate); No GI mention in Tourism Policy Kerala Industrial policy report 2023 mentioned GI tags	(Moderate); Tourism Website mention Alleppey coir awarded GI tag by World Trade Organisation. Website and brochures also showcase GI tagged products like Aranmula Kannadi, Malabar Pepper; handicrafts and cultural products but without GI tag.	High – Spice Plantation Trails, Aranmula Kannadi; Responsible Tourism Mission; Craft villages Artisan visits; Heritage trails	B
West Bengal (35)	(Low-Moderate); No-Mention in Tourism Policy West Bengal Export Promotion Policy 2023 mentioned several GI Tagged products	(Low); WB Tourism Website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Darjeeling Tea, Nakshi Kantha, Rasogolla, handicrafts but without the GI tag	High – Darjeeling Tea Tourism, Craft hubs like Shantiniketan Crafts; Rasogolla Festival	C
Gujarat (28)	(Low); No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low); Gujarat Tourism official Website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Patola Sarees, Kutch Embroidery, Gir Kesar Mango, Surat Zari Craft but without the GI tag. Social media (Facebook, Instagram) highlight Rann Utsav and handicrafts, but without GI term	High – Kutch Craft Trails, Patola Weaving; Craft villages;	C
Odisha (27)	(Low); No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Moderate); Odisha Tourism Website under ‘Discover, Shop’ section, Online store Boyonika Sarees mentioned Sarees as ‘Odisha’s GI craft’ with pictures. Website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Pattachitra, Appliqué work, Sambalpuri textiles but without GI tag.	Moderate- Pattachitra Workshops	B

State/UT & GI Count	(Low/Moderate/High) GI term Mentions in Policy (I a)	(Low/Moderate/High) GI-related pictures/posts/videos showcased on official tourism website/brochures/social media (I b)	(Low/Moderate/ High) Existing GI Product-Based Tourism Experiences (Trails/Workshops) with or without GI tag (II)	Readiness& Potential of State/UT for GI Integration *A/B/C
Uttarakhand (27)	(Low-Moderate); No GI mention in Tourism Policy MSME policy mentions GI tags	(Low); Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Aipan Art, Ringal Handicraft, Copper Craft but without the GI tag	Moderate – Ringaal Bamboo Craft	C
Jammu & Kashmir (25)	(Low-Moderate); No GI mention in Tourism Policy J&K Export Policy 2024 mentioned special focus on GI tagged products, identifying scope for GI tourism and inclusion in e brochure.	(Low); J&K Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Pashmina, Papier-Mâché, Walnut Wood Carving, Sozni Embroidery but without the GI tag	High – Pashmina Weaving, Papier-Mâché making workshop; Craft fairs	C
Madhya Pradesh (24)	(Low-Moderate); No GI mention in Tourism Policy Madhya Pradesh Industrial Policy 2025 mentioned GI tags under Trade and Export Promotion.	(Moderate); MP Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Chanderi Sarees, Maheshwari Sarees, Bagh Prints, Tribal Crafts but without the GI tag. MP Tourism Facebook and Instagram official page showcase Khajuraho Stone Craft, Chhatarpur Furniture, Baitul Bhareva etc. Captions explicitly used the term <i>GI</i>	High – Chanderi & Maheshwar Handloom Trails, Jal Mahotsav; Khajuraho Dance Festival; Bagh Print Craft Workshops	B
Andhra Pradesh (21)	(Low); No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low); AP Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Kondapalli Toys, Kalamkari textiles, Uppada Sarees but without the GI tag	High – Araku Coffee Plantation Visits, Kalamkari Workshops; Tirupati ladoo promotion	C
Arunachal Pradesh (21)	(Low-Moderate); No GI mention in Tourism Policy Arunachal Pradesh Industrial Policy 2025, under objectives section, support ODOP program and GI tagged products from the state. Also mentioned the term GI under priority sector,	(Moderate); Tourism website showcase GI Mahotsav in a video clip. The website and brochures do not showcase specific <i>GI tag products</i>	Moderate - Tribal Weaving Village Visits; GI Mahotsav	B



State/UT & GI Count	(Low/Moderate/High) GI term Mentions in Policy (I a)	(Low/Moderate/High) GI-related pictures/posts/videos showcased on official tourism website/brochures/social media (I b)	(Low/Moderate/ High) Existing GI Product-Based Tourism Experiences (Trails/Workshops) with or without GI tag (II)	Readiness& Potential of State/UT for GI Integration *A/B/C
Rajasthan (21)	(Low) ; No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low) ; Rajasthan Tourism website, Facebook and Instagram page and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Blue Pottery, Kota Doria, Kathputli, Molela Terracotta, Bikaneri Bhujia but without the GI tag.	High – Blue Pottery, Block Printing & Craft Trails; Artisan villages	C
Telangana (19)	(Low-Moderate) ; No GI mention in Tourism Policy PIB Oct 2025 report titled “Driving Telangana Forward: GST Powers Industry and Artisans” highlights GI crafts (Nirmal Toys, Pembarthi Metal Craft, Adilabad Dokra, Warangal Durries).	(Moderate) Tourism website explicitly mention GI under ‘Arts and Crafts’- “The silver filigree craft of Karimnagar was awarded the Geographical Indication (GI) tag in 2007.” Website and brochures also showcase GI tagged products like Pochampally Ikat, Gadwal, Narayanpet, Warangal Durries, Nirmal Paintings but without the GI tag	Moderate – Pochampally Ikat Weaving Trails; Hyderabad Haleem Festival	B
Bihar (16)	(Low) ; No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Moderate-High) Bihar Tourism website under “Experiences” page, explicitly lists GI products and their registration years. Showcase GI tag products Madhubani Painting, Sujani Embroidery, Manjusha Art, Bhagalpur Silk, Shahi Litchi,etc but without the GI tag	High – Madhubani Painting Workshops, Mithila Festival; Rajgir Mahotsav; Artisan workshops; Bhagalpur Silk Weaving Demo	B

***A: Ready for GI Integration** (More integration can be planned)

B: Moderately ready for GI Integration and also have Potential (Require Policy integration and implementation)

C: Not Ready for GI Integration but have Potential (Require Policy integration and implementation)

D: Not Ready for GI Integration and have Low Potential (Require Policy integration, implementation and GI-based experience creation)

Table 3: Group 2- less than 15 GI-tagged products (Total 18 States/UTs)

State/UT & GI Count	(Low/Moderate/High) GI term Mentions in Policy (I a)	(Low/Moderate/High) GI-related pictures/posts/videos showcased on official tourism website/brochures/social media (I b)	(Low/Moderate/ High) Existing GI Tag Product-Based Tourism Experiences (Trails/ Workshops) with or without GI tag (II)	Readiness /Potential of State/ UT for GI Integration **A/B/C
Himachal Pradesh (11)	(High) ; Yes, GI mention in Tourism Policy Himachal Tourism Policy 2019 mentioned the term 'GI Tag' under Adopting innovative promotion mechanism & branding techniques	(Low) ; Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Kangra Paintings, Chamba Kalam, Kullu Shawls, Thangka Paintings, but without GI the GI tag	High -Kangra Tea Estate Visits; Kullu Dussehra Festival, Artisan workshops for Kullu weaving, Chamba Rumal embroidery,	B
Goa (10)	(Low) No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Moderate) ; Goa Tourism Website mention, "Feni...got the Geographical Indication (GI) certificate in 2009. The website and brochures also showcase other GI tagged products like Goan Cashews etc but without GI the GI tag	Moderate – Feni Distillation Experience, Kunbi Handloom	B
Meghalaya (8)	(Low) No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low) ; Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Eri Silk, Larnai Black Pottery, Aminda Rangsa Art Village crafts but without the GI tag	High – Bamboo & Cane Craft Workshops; Eri Silk weaving at Umden-Diwon cluster, Black Pottery demonstrations at Larnai, wood/stone carving at Aminda Rangsa Art Village.	C
Andaman & Nicobar Islands (7)	(Low) No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low) ; Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Nicobari Hut, Nicobari Canoe but without the GI tag	Moderate – Shell & Coconut Craft; Tribal heritage visits	C
Chhattisgarh (7)	(Low) No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low) ; Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Bastar Dhokra, Bastar Wooden Craft, Bastar Iron Craft, Kosa Silk, but without GI labelling	Moderate – Bastar Dhokra & Wood Craft Trails; Kosa silk weaving, Bastar wood/iron craft	C
Manipur (7)	(Low-Moderate) Manipur Tourism Policy 2022 mentioned the term GI tag for Kachai Lemon,	(Low) ; Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Chakhua (Black/Purple rice) but without the GI tag product	High – Kauna Grass Craft & Handloom; Sirarakhong Hathei Chilli Festival, Ukhrul; Tamenglong Orange festival; Lemon Festival; Pineapple Festival	C



State/UT & GI Count	(Low/Moderate/High) GI term Mentions in Policy (I a)	(Low/Moderate/High) GI-related pictures/posts/videos showcased on official tourism website/brochures/social media (I b)	(Low/Moderate/ High) Existing GI Tag Product-Based Tourism Experiences (Trails/ Workshops) with or without GI tag (II)	Readiness /Potential of State/ UT for GI Integration **A/B/C
Mizoram (7)	(Low-Moderate); No GI mention in Tourism Policy; <i>Mizoram.pdf (Rising Northeast, May 2025)</i> mention GI registration of Mizo Chilli and Mizo Ginger; <i>Siaha District Export Action Plan.pdf</i> lists GI products with HS codes and export potential.	(Low); GI products not showcased with or without GI tag	Moderate – Traditional Textile Weaving; spice-related experiences; Living Museum at Mizo Typical Village Falkawn	C
Nagaland (5)	(Low-Moderate); No GI mention in Tourism Policy; Nagaland@100: A Vision Document mention branding and marketing of Nagaland's produce under GI and organic certifications of high-demand GI tag spices like Naga king chili	(Low); GI products not showcased with or without GI tag	Moderate – Tribal Shawl & Craft Village Experiences	C
Ladakh (4)	(Low-Moderate); No GI mention in Tourism Policy. Press release on <i>GI tagging to safeguard Ladakh's Heritage</i> confirms official push for GI recognition of Ladakhi products.	(Low); GI products not showcased with or without GI tag	High – Pashmina Goat Rearing Visits; Orchard visits; pashmina weaving; Experiences like Apricot Blossom Festival (Leh, Kargil), Pashmina craft workshops	C
Tripura (4)	(Moderate); Yes- GI mention in Tourism Policy; <i>Tripura Tourism Policy 2020–25</i> mentions GI accreditation for tribal products.	(Low); GI products not showcased with or without GI tag; Instagram and Facebook posts promote Queen Pineapple as GI product;	Moderate – Risa Textile Weaving	B
Pondicherry (2)	(Low); No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low); GI products not showcased with or without GI tag	High – Handmade Paper & Craft Workshops; Crafts Council of Puducherry organizes artisan workshops, exhibitions, and training in GI crafts;	C
Punjab (2)	(Low); No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low); GI products not showcased with or without GI tag. Crafts like (Phulkari) images and text were found in Punjab tourism coffee table and Punjab book brochure pdf	Moderate – Phulkari Embroidery trails	C

State/UT & GI Count	(Low/Moderate/High) GI term Mentions in Policy (I a)	(Low/Moderate/High) GI-related pictures/posts/videos showcased on official tourism website/brochures/social media (I b)	(Low/Moderate/ High) Existing GI Tag Product-Based Tourism Experiences (Trails/ Workshops) with or without GI tag (II)	Readiness /Potential of State/ UT for GI Integration **A/B/C
Sikkim (2)	(Low) ; No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low) ; Website and brochure showcase GI tag products like tea, cardamom, handicrafts, but without GI tag	High – Large Cardamom Farm Visits; Organic farm visits; Sikkim Utsav; Sikkim Rural Tourism Meet (Community-Led)	C
Chandigarh (1)	(Low) ; No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low) ; GI products not showcased with or without GI tag	Low -No GI related Experiences	C
DNHDD (1)	No specific Tourism Policy	(Low) ; GI products not showcased with or without GI tag	Moderate – Warli Art & Bamboo Craft	C
Delhi (1)	(Low) ; No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low) ; GI products not showcased with or without GI tag	Low -No GI related Experiences	D
Haryana (1)	(Low) ; No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low) ; Tourism website and brochures showcase GI tagged products like Phulkari, Basmati rice but without the GI tag	Low -No GI related Experiences	D
Jharkhand (1)	(Low) ; No GI mention in Tourism Policy	(Low) ; Tourism website and brochures showcase the lone GI tagged product, Sohrai paintings but without the GI tag	Moderate – Sohrai & Khovar Art Villages; Tribal village visits,	C

*DNHDD: Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu; ** **A: Ready for GI Integration** (More integration can be planned); **B: Moderately ready for GI Integration and also have Potential** (Require Policy integration and implementation); **C: Not Ready for GI Integration but have Potential** (Require Policy integration and implementation); **D: Not Ready for GI Integration and have Low Potential** (Require Policy integration, implementation and GI-based experience creation)

Group 1 comprises of 16 states and 1 Union Territory (total 17) and accounts for the bulk of India's GI assets while **Group 2** comprises of 12 states and 6 Union Territories.

Policy Integration: Group 1 possess a high number of GI-tagged products however findings show a systemic disconnect between GI abundance and their formal integration into tourism policies. Only two states, *Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu* demonstrate high policy-level recognition of GI-tagged products within their tourism policies with dedicated policy sections mentioning them as tools for experiential tourism, branding or destination differentiation.

For Group 2, integration is generally low with only Himachal Pradesh acknowledging GI tag as an innovative promotion mechanism in its Tourism Policy document. Two other states with GI reference in their tourism policy document are Manipur for Kachai lemon and Tripura mentioning GI accreditation for tribal products. The rest 15 states/UTs has no GI references in their respective tourism policies.

In most Group 1 states like, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Assam, Kerala, West Bengal etc and some in Group 2, the GI references are given not within tourism policies but in industrial, MSME, handicraft, or export policies.

Promotional Visibility: In Group 1, the promotional visibility of GI-tagged products is widely showcased across official tourism websites, brochures, and social media platforms; however, they are showcased as generic popular cultural or craft attractions rather than as authentic legally protected GI assets. Only 10 states somewhat use or mention the GI tag. This results in only an overall moderate visibility score.

For Group 2, the visibility is low, particularly in UTs and smaller northeastern states. Only Goa explicitly mentioned GI tag in the context of Feni getting its GI certification in 2009. Like in Group 1, here also, whenever GI products are displayed on the websites, they are done without mentioning the GI tag. Interesting, 9 states/UT in this group do not even showcase GI products on their official tourism



websites, instead focussing on general promotion of tourism destinations and attractions. This also includes well known GI products like Naga Mircha in Nagaland, Phulkari craft in Punjab etc, suggesting non-realisation of the potential of GI certification. In some states like Tripura, social media is used more effectively than the official website.

However, across both Group1 and 2, findings show the existence of a sizable high GI product-based tourism experiences, even though the GI tag is not highlighted. This is an added advantage in future integration plans of GIs within tourism promotion.

GI Integration Readiness/Potential: Based on the findings given in Table 2 and 3, states/UTs are divided into four categories- Category A (Ready); Category B (Moderately Ready and have potential); Category C (Not Ready but have potential) and Category D (Not Ready and Low Potential). A comparative assessment is given below:

Hypotheses 1 Testing

Only two states- *Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu*- belong to Category A and both are in Group 1. This group also has 8 in Category B (Moderately Ready and have Potential), 7 in Category C (Not Ready but have Potential) and 'Nil' in Category D (Not Ready and have Low Potential). Group 2, on the other hand is dominated by Category C -13 States/UTs in total and also account for 2 in Category D (Not Ready and have Low Potential). The findings clearly support Hypotheses 1 that posits *Group 1 (more GI count) exhibit higher integration of GI into tourism promotion than Group 2 (lesser GI count)*. This may also suggest that a higher proportion of GI products may drive policymakers to acknowledge them as tourism assets, whereas states with fewer GIs may view them as negligible for tourism strategy.

Table 4: Groupwise Categorisation of States/UT (total number) based on Readiness & Potential of State/UT for GI Integration into Tourism promotion

Group	Category A (Ready)	Category B (Moderately Ready and also have Potential)	Category C (Not Ready but have Potential)	Category D (Not Ready and have Low Potential)
Group 1	2	8	7	Nil
Group 2	Nil	3	13	2

Second Phase: Interpretation of GI Integration Findings (from First Phase) with Tourist Footfall Data

The respective domestic tourist visits and international tourist arrivals figures and corresponding GI Integration Category A/B/C/D States/UTs are given below.

Table 5: State/UT-wise Domestic Tourist Visits in India – 2024 (in millions) and the corresponding GI Integration Category (A/B/C/D)

Rank	State/UT- (GI Integration Group, Table 2/3)	Domestic Tourist Arrivals	Rank	State/UT- (GI Integration Group, Table 2/3)	Domestic Tourist Arrivals
1	Uttar Pradesh (A)	646.807	19	Himachal Pradesh (B)	18.042
2	Tamil Nadu (A)	306.842	20	Odisha (B)	10.998
3	Karnataka (B)	304.564	21	Goa (B)	9.941
4	Andhra Pradesh (C)	290.266	22	Assam (C)	7.608
5	Rajasthan (C)	230.084	23	Puducherry (C)	2.120
6	Maharashtra (B)	189.372	24	Haryana (D)	1.892
7	West Bengal (C)	184.476	25	Meghalaya (C)	1.586
8	Gujarat (C)	184.014	26	Sikkim (C)	1.540
9	Madhya Pradesh (B)	133.176	27	DNHDD (C)	1.359
10	Telangana (B)	88.240	28	Chandigarh (C)	0.999
11	Bihar (B)	65.463	29	Arunachal Pradesh (B)	0.870
12	Uttarakhand (C)	60.849	30	Andaman & Nicobar Islands (C)	0.710
13	Jharkhand (C)	54.041	31	Tripura (B)	0.601
14	Delhi (D)	46.257	32	Lakshadweep	0.47
15	Chhattisgarh (C)	31.488	33	Mizoram (C)	0.422
16	Punjab (C)	27.745	34	Ladakh (C)	0.336
17	Jammu & Kashmir (C)	23.013	35	Nagaland (C)	0.126
18	Kerala (B)	22.247	36	Manipur (C)	0.029
India Total: 2948.191					

Table 6: State/UT-wise International Tourist Arrivals in India 2024 (in millions) and the corresponding GI Integration Category (A/B/C/D)

Rank	State/UT	International Tourist Arrivals	Rank	State/UT	International Tourist Arrivals
1	Maharashtra (B)	3.705	19	Sikkim (C)	0.085
2	West Bengal (C)	3.124	20	Himachal Pradesh (B)	0.083
3	Gujarat (C)	2.274	21	Jammu & Kashmir (C)	0.065
4	Uttar Pradesh (A)	2.269	22	Jharkhand (C)	0.045
5	Rajasthan (C)	2.072	23	Ladakh (C)	0.0397
6	Delhi (D)	1.999	24	Chandigarh (C)	0.039
7	Tamil Nadu (A)	1.161	25	Assam (C)	0.027
8	Kerala (B)	0.738	26	Meghalaya (C)	0.023
9	Bihar (B)	0.737	27	Puducherry (C)	0.018
10	Punjab (C)	0.542	28	Andaman & Nicobar Islands (C)	0.011
11	Karnataka (B)	0.485	29	Nagaland (C)	0.006
12	Goa (B)	0.468	30	Arunachal Pradesh (B)	0.005
13	Andhra Pradesh (C)	0.262	31	Mizoram (C)	0.005
14	Madhya Pradesh (B)	0.168	32	DNHDD (C)	0.003
15	Telangana (B)	0.155	33	Chhattisgarh (C)	0.003
16	Uttarakhand (C)	0.139	34	Manipur (C)	0.003
17	Tripura (B)	0.091	35	Haryana (D)	0.001
18	Odisha (B)	0.087	36	Lakshadweep	0.001
India Total: 20.942					

Source: States/UTs Tourism Department. *2024 data is estimated by applying all India growth rate for 2024/23 on 2023 data

An analysis of the GI Integration Findings (Categories A/B/C/D depicted in Tables 2 and 3) with the 2024 Tourist Footfall Data (Domestic Tourist Visits and International Tourist Arrivals, Table 5 and 6 respectively) was carried out. As seen from Table 5 and 6, in India, the Domestic tourism data (over 2948 million in 2024) far outclass the International Tourism data (20.9 million). Moreover, individual State/UT rankings in Domestic and International footfall vary drastically and thus only a very generalised categorisation can

be done. In this study, for ease and convenience, the top 20 rankings are considered as High footfalls. This corresponds to 10 million and above for the Domestic visits (Rank 1 UP to Rank 20 Odisha; Goa at Rank 21 with 9.9 million is also considered) and 0.08 million and above for the international arrivals (Rank 1 Maharashtra to Rank 20 Himachal Pradesh)

As per the analysis, the States/UTs are broadly categorised into the following 7 types:



Table 7: Types and GI Integration Status Descriptor of States\UTs with recommendation

Types	States/UTs and (GI Count)	Status Descriptor	Remarks & Action recommended
Type 1: High Tourist Footfall & Category A (High GI Integration Ready)	Uttar Pradesh (79) and Tamil Nadu (71)	'Aligned' States (Total 2)	Scale and showcase GI-tourism integration
Type 2: High Tourist Footfall & Category B (High GI Integration Moderately Ready and with Potential)	Maharashtra (55), Karnataka (49), Kerala (41), Madhya Pradesh (24), Odisha (21), Telangana (19), Bihar (16), Himachal Pradesh (11), Goa (10)	'Missed Opportunity' States (Total 9)	Fast-track GI integration through targeted policy support and partnerships.
Type 3: High Tourist Footfall & Category C (GI Integration not Ready but with Potential)	West Bengal (35), Gujarat (28), Uttarakhand (27), J&K (25), Andhra Pradesh (21), Rajasthan (21), Chhattisgarh (7), Punjab (2), Jharkhand (1)	'Emerging Opportunity' States/UT (Total 9)	Invest in capacity building and institutional readiness to unlock GI potential.
Type 4: High Tourist Footfall & Category D (GI Integration not Ready and low Potential)	Delhi (1)	'Misaligned' State (Total 1)	Proactive step for more GI product registration and development role as a national GI tourism facilitator
Type 5: Low Tourist Footfall & Category B	Arunachal Pradesh (21); Tripura (4)	'Untapped Potential' States (Total 2)	Take advantage of GI strengths to drive niche and destination-led tourism growth.
Type 6: Low Tourist Footfall & Category C	Assam (42), Meghalaya (8), Andaman & Nicobar (7), Manipur (7), Mizoram (7), Nagaland (5), Ladakh (4), Puducherry (2), Sikkim (2), Chandigarh (1), DNHDD (1)	'Development Priority' States (Total 11)	
Type 7: Low Tourist Footfall & Category D	Haryana (1)	'Sleeper' State (Total 1)	Monitor and plan for long-term opportunities

Type 1: *Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu* stand out as the 'Ready' (Category A) states, showing a strong alignment between their massive tourist numbers and GI strategy. Uttar Pradesh is ranked #1 in Domestic Tourism (646.8 million visits) and #4 in International Arrivals (2.269 million) and has successfully integrated its 79 GI products (highest in India) into its tourism policy and One District One Product (ODOP) schemes. Tamil Nadu is ranked #2 in Domestic Tourism (306.8 million visits) and #7 in Foreign Arrivals (1.16 million) and links its 71 GIs (e.g., Kancheepuram Silk) to tourism promotion, reinforcing its market position.

Type 2: Consist of several tourism powerhouses attracting millions of tourists. Moreover, each of them has moderate to high number of registered GI tag products with moderately ready GI integration and ample potential. However, they all fail to utilise their GI assets in policy or branding, relying instead on general destination appeal; thus, the descriptor 'Missed Opportunity'. For example, Maharashtra despite

being Rank #1 in International Arrivals (3.7 million) and #6 in Domestic Tourism (189.3 million), and possessing 55 GI products (3rd highest count), has "No GI mention" in its tourism policy. The state is missing a massive opportunity to market premium GI products (Alphonso Mango, Paithani Sarees) to its high volume of high-spending international tourists.

Type 3: In terms of GI count, this is a mix group. Out of 9 states/UT, 6 of them have high GI count while Chhattisgarh has moderate count and Punjab and Jharkhand have low GI count. These states/UTs should take advantage of the high tourist footfall and the potential for GI integration to invest in GI based capacity building.

Type 4: This is a unique type. Delhi's status as the national capital and boasting a plethora of tourist attractions including World Heritage sites ensure exceptionally high tourist footfall. Although it currently possesses only one registered GI and lacks ready integration, its role as a strategic venue for national GI

events transforms it into a vital promotional gateway for the entire country's GI tourism potential.

Type 5 and Type 6: Tripura at Rank 17 among international tourists' arrival, as per criteria adopted in this study is a high tourist footfall state but considering the modest figure of 0.09 million domestic visit (31st rank) and low GI count, the state is placed along with Arunachal Pradesh under Type 5. These two along with other northeastern states and UTs under Type 6 possess distinct GI products like Chakhua (black rice), Naga mircha, Lakadong Turmeric etc. Thus, they can differentiate and position themselves as niche tourism destinations. Two states Assam (42) and Arunachal Pradesh (21) already have high number of registered GI products.

Type 7: Haryana is the least proactive state and requires maximum effort

Discussion

Every state and Union Territory in India possesses a range of distinctive products that reflect its local culture, traditions, and artisanal expertise. Many of these products have historically served as attractions for visitors. Through initiatives led by local communities, producer groups, or state agencies—often outside the tourism sector—a number of these products have secured Geographical Indication (GI) recognition, thereby giving legal status as authenticated cultural and economic assets.

The findings of the study directly address the research objectives and bring out several key insights that help us better understand the relationship between GI products and tourism in India.

1. A Clear Gap Between GI Abundance and Real Use in Tourism

While the number of registered GIs continues to grow and their economic value is widely acknowledged, most States and Union Territories still view them mainly as trade, MSME, or export assets. Their potential as cultural and experiential tourism resources remain largely untapped. This indicates that the use of GI tag is still limited to its traditional perception of an economic or trade asset and yet to be recognized as cultural, experiential, and place-branding assets capable of contributing meaningfully to tourism development and destination differentiation. Only **Uttar Pradesh** and **Tamil Nadu** have successfully achieved the 'Policy Innovation' mentioned in the conceptual framework, having dedicated sections in their tourism policies linking GI products to experiential tourism. This alignment also correlates with their high tourist footfall, being the top two states for domestic visits and among the top 7 in international tourists' arrivals.

2. Visibility Without Emphasis on Authenticity

Literature review has identified GIs as powerful branding tools that indicate authenticity. However, the findings of the study reveal 'low' to 'moderate' promotional visibility across Indian states/UTs including the two GI aligned states of Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. Many GI-certified products including widely popular products like Pashmina (J&K), Muga Silk (Assam), Madhubani Paintings (Bihar) or Alphonso Mango (Maharashtra) are showcased on official tourism websites and promotional materials. However, they are usually presented as general cultural highlights rather than as legally protected, authenticity-certified products. This creates a situation where visibility exists, but the unique value of the GI tag is not clearly communicated to visitors. Ironically, in the case of 9 states/UTs, GI products are not featured at all on the official tourism websites. Thus, there is limited strategic use of GI products in tourism promotion and in the process, states/UTs miss the opportunity to satisfy the tourist's search for genuineness described in tourism theories.

3. Uneven Preparedness Across States/UTs for GI-Tourism Integration but with a silver lining

The classification of States/UTs into readiness categories (A–D) reveals significant disparities. Only the two states of Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu are found to be institutionally and strategically prepared to integrate GIs into tourism, while others are still at a very early stage. However, in spite of the disparities, the positive outcome from the assessment of existing GI tagged product experiences demonstrate that most states/UTs possess 'moderate' to 'high' potential for GI-based tourism. This finding that local-level practices—craft villages, festivals, GI Mahotsavs, and experiential trails—are widespread is testimony to the strength of India's tourism resources and present a strong foundation for utilizing the value-added opportunities of GI tag into developing a unique type of tourism in the country-GI Tourism.

The subsequent integration of readiness levels with tourist footfall data led to the identification of seven state/UT types (1-7), ranging from 'Aligned' and high-performing models to 'Missed' and 'Emerging' opportunity categories and even a misaligned 'Sleeper' state. This identification is the main outcome of the study and enabled specific recommendations as per the type (Table 7).

4. Missed Opportunities in High-Tourist Footfall Destinations

Some of India's tourism powerhouses like Maharashtra (Rank 1 in International Arrivals), Karnataka and West Bengal possess a rich portfolio of GI products (55, 49 and 35 respectively) but have not incorporated



them into tourism policy or positioned them adequately in branding strategies. This suggests a missed opportunity to enhance destination appeal through authentic, place-based experiences that today’s travelers increasingly seek.

5. Scope for Niche Positioning in Specific Low-Footfall Regions

Several states with lower tourist arrivals but unique GI products like the northeastern states have a valuable opportunity to carve out a niche identity. With the right policy support and promotional focus, GI-based experiences could become a pathway for more balanced regional development.

6. National Facilitation

A unique finding for **Delhi** (Type 4) suggests that even with low GI counts, being the country’s national capital and a transit hub, it can serve as “national GI tourism facilitator” or promotional gateway for the entire country.

Overall, the findings suggest that simply registering GI products is not enough. Their real impact on tourism depends on how thoughtfully they are integrated into policy, how clearly their authenticity is communicated, and how strategically they are aligned with broader tourism development goals. The findings also validate the **Policy Innovation & Diffusion Theory**, which posits that assets like GIs only become effective promotional tools when supported by political and institutional frameworks as in the case of Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu.

A Way Forward

To bridge the gap between GI registration and tourism promotion, the following policy-level actions are proposed for the Ministry of Tourism and tourism departments of all states/UTs:

Specific Inclusion of GI Products in Tourism Policies	Introduce dedicated GI tourism sections in the national and state tourism policies
GI-Based Destination Branding	Use GI logos, tags, and narratives consistently on tourism websites and campaigns Develop “GI Identity Maps” linking products to destinations
Development of GI Tourism Circuits and Trails	Promote GI-specific trails (textile trails, tea/coffee routes, craft villages). Integrate GI experiences into existing circuits (heritage, rural).
Inter-Departmental Convergence	Foster collaboration between Tourism, MSME, Handicrafts, Agriculture, and GI Registry.
Capacity Building and Community Participation	Train artisans and farmers as cultural interpreters and hosts. Support homestays, workshops, and GI experience centers.
Digital Promotion and Storytelling	Create GI-focused digital content, virtual tours, and influencer collaborations.
Monitoring and Impact Assessment	Track tourist footfall, income generation, and artisan participation linked to GI tourism initiatives.

Figure 2: Policy recommendations for GI Tourism Development and Promotion

Limitations of the Study

While providing a broad assessment of policy integration, this study acknowledges the following constraints:

- The study is based on policy documents, websites, and promotional materials. The absence of interviews with policymakers, tourism officials, artisans, and tourists limits insights into implementation challenges and perceptions.
- Tourism websites and social media platforms are frequently updated; findings reflect the status during the data collection period.
- The analysis primarily covers official government policy documents and websites; it does not account for private-sector GI tourism initiatives or unofficial social media influencers.
- The GI counts were manually computed from the GI Registry, which is subject to periodic updates and may change as new products are registered.

Conclusion

This study set out to examine how GI-tagged products are integrated into tourism promotion through government policies, frameworks, and platforms across Indian states and Union Territories. The study concludes that while GI-tagged products are extensively present in India's tourism landscape, their integration into tourism promotion is largely informal, inconsistent, and under-strategized. The absence of explicit GI branding across tourism platforms undermines India's ability to capitalize on GI products as authentic cultural capital. Bridging this gap requires reframing GI products from being merely protected goods to being strategic tourism assets capable of enhancing destination competitiveness, rural livelihoods, and sustainable development.

References

- Barham, E. (2003). Translating terroir: Global change and real localities. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19(1), 127–138.
- Belletti, G., Marescotti, A., & Touzard, J.-M. (2017). Geographical indications, public goods, and sustainable development: A European perspective. *World Development*, 145, 105–127.
- Das, K. (2011). Protection of geographical indications in Asia: Case studies and policy lessons. *Asian Journal of WTO & International Health Law and Policy*, 6 (2), 325–357.
- Das, K. (2010) Prospects and challenges of geographical indications in India. *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 13(2), 148–201.
- Dileep, S., & Das, S. (2023). Cultural heritage, GIs, and regional development: Evidence from Kerala. *Tourism Review*, 78(3), 562–580.
- Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT). (2024). *Geographical Indications Annual Report*.
- Government of India. (1999). *Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999*. Ministry of Commerce and Industry.
- Jena, P. R., & Grote, U. (2012). Impact of geographical indication protection on agricultural products: Evidence from Basmati rice in India. *Journal of International Food & Agribusiness Marketing*, 24(3), 198–211.
- Jose, A. c. J. (2012). Marketing Flexibilities in Geographical Indications (GI) and Trademark: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of Marketing, Financial Services and Management Research*.
- Ministry of Tourism, Government of India. (2025). *India Tourism Data Compendium 2025* (66th ed.). https://tourism.gov.in/sites/default/files/2025-09/India%20Tourism%20Data%20Compendium%202025_0.pdf
- Pant, R. (2015). Traditional knowledge, GIs, and tourism linkages: An Indian perspective. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 10(1), 21–35.
- Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1999). *The experience economy: Work is theatre & every business a stage*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Poitras, L., & Getz, D. (2006). Sustainable wine tourism: Appellation branding and visitor experience. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 146–158.
- Rangnekar, D. (2004). The socio-economics of geographical indications: A review of empirical evidence from Europe. *UNCTAD–ICTSD Project on IPRs and Sustainable Development*.
- Shafi, M. (2022). Geographical indications and sustainable development of handicraft communities in developing countries. *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*.
- Suh, J., & Macpherson, A. (2007). The impact of geographical indication on the revitalisation of a regional economy: a case study of 'Boseong' green tea. *Area*, 39(4), 518–527.
- Tregear, A., Arfini, F., Belletti, G., & Marescotti, A. (2007). Regional foods and rural development: The role of geographical indications. *Appetite*, 49(2), 357–367.
- WTO. (1994). *Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)*. World Trade Organization.
- World Intellectual Property Organization. (n.d.). *Geographical indications*. Retrieved from <https://www.wipo.int>
<https://karnatakaturism.org/department/#tourism-policy>
- Nayyar, M., Invest India, & Ernst & Young LLP. (2021). Transforming at the grassroots scheme [Report]. <https://www.library.up.gov.in/assets/front/img/InvestIndiaUPODOP.pdf>
- All applications | Geographical Indications | Intellectual Property India. (n.d.). <https://search.ipindia.gov.in/GIRPublic/>
- Nagaland@100. (n.d.). Nagaland@100: a vision document for the state. https://indiaat100foundation.com/assets/uploads/national_state/1748241565_Nagaland%20at%20100.pdf
- Geographical Indications. (n.d.). Status of GI applications. <https://ipindia.gov.in/writereaddata/images/pdf/01-details-of-gi-applications.pdf>
- Sangma, C. K., Government of Meghalaya, & Dhar, S. (2024). Meghalaya Industrial and Investment Promotion Policy 2024. In Government of Meghalaya (pp. 1–7). <https://investmeghalaya.gov.in/resources/homePage/17/megeodb/policies/mipp2024.pdf>
- Government of Karnataka. (2025). *Karnataka Industrial Policy 2025*. https://investkarnataka.co.in/wpcontent/uploads/2025/02/IndustrialPolicy2025_PrintPagesSingle_.pdf



- Government of Tamil Nadu. (n.d.). *Tamil Nadu Industrial Policy*. <https://investingintamilnadu.com/DIGIGOV/TN-pages/industrial-policy.jsp?pagedisp=static>
 - Government of Himachal Pradesh. (2019). Industrial investment policy 2019 and rules regarding grant of incentives, concessions and facilities (with amendments up to December 2023).
 - Government of Chhattisgarh. (2024). *Industrial development policy 2024-30 (Brief)*. [https://industries.cg.gov.in/pdf/policy2024-30/IDP_2024-30\(Brief\).pdf](https://industries.cg.gov.in/pdf/policy2024-30/IDP_2024-30(Brief).pdf)
 - Government of Assam. (2023). *Industrial and investment policy of Assam (Amendment) 2023*. Government of Assam. <https://thanjavurtourism.org/gi-products/>
 - Geographical Indications of Northeast States of India [https://www.ciiipr.in/pdf/North-East-Booklet-\(without%20certificate\).pdf](https://www.ciiipr.in/pdf/North-East-Booklet-(without%20certificate).pdf)
- State/UT Tourism Website and Tourism Policy/Plan**
- <https://andamantourism.gov.in>; Andaman Tourism Policy 2010
<https://arunachaltourism.com>; Arunachal Pradesh Tourism Policy 2020
<https://assamtourism.gov.in>; Assam Tourism Policy 2022
<https://bihartourism.gov.in>; Bihar Tourism Policy 2019
<https://chandigarhtourism.gov.in>; 20 Year Perspective Tourism Master Plan 2003
<https://dnhddtourism.in>
<https://goatourism.gov.in>; Goa Tourism Policy 2020
<https://gujarattourism.com>; Gujarat Tourism Policy 2021–2025
<https://haryanattourism.gov.in>; Haryana Tourism Policy 2008
<https://himachaltourism.gov.in>; Himachal Pradesh Tourism Policy 2019
<https://jharkhandtourism.gov.in>; Jharkhand Tourism Policy 2021
<https://jktourism.jk.gov.in>; J&K Export Policy 2019
<https://karnatakaturism.org>; Karnataka Tourism Policy 2020–2025
<https://keralatourism.org>; Kerala Tourism Policy 2017
<https://ladakh.nic.in/tourism>; Ladakh Tourism Vision 2025
<https://maharashtratourism.gov.in>; Maharashtra Tourism Policy 2024
<https://manipur tourism.gov.in>; Manipur Tourism Policy 2022
<https://megtourism.gov.in>; Meghalaya Tourism Policy 2023
<https://mptourism.com>; Madhya Pradesh Tourism Policy 2020
<https://odishatourism.gov.in>; Odisha Tourism Policy 2021
<https://punjabtourism.punjab.gov.in>; Punjab Tourism Policy 2017
<https://sikkimtourism.gov.in>; Sikkim Tourism Policy 2018
<https://tamilnadutourism.tn.gov.in>; Tamil Nadu Tourism Policy 2023
<https://telanganatourism.gov.in>; Telangana Tourism Policy 2015
<https://tourism.ap.gov.in>; Andhra Pradesh Tourism Policy 2020-25
<https://tourism.cgstate.gov.in>; Chhattisgarh Tourism Policy/ Framework 2020
<https://tourism.delhi.gov.in>; Twenty Years Tourism Perspective Plan 2003
<https://tourism.mizoram.gov.in>; Mizoram Tourism Policy 2020
<https://tourism.nagaland.gov.in>; Nagaland Tourism Policy 2016
<https://tourism.py.gov.in>; Puducherry Tourism Policy
<https://tourism.rajasthan.gov.in>; Rajasthan Tourism Policy 2020
<https://tripuratourism.gov.in>; Tripura Tourism Policy 2020
<https://uptourism.gov.in>; Uttar Pradesh Tourism Policy 2022-32
<https://uttarakhandtourism.gov.in>; Uttarakhand Tourism Policy 2018
<https://wbtourism.gov.in>; West Bengal Tourism Policy 2019

GJEIS Prevent Plagiarism in Publication

DELNET-Developing Library Network, New Delhi in collaboration with BIPL has launched “DrillBit : Plagiarism Detection Software for Academic Integrity” for the member institutions of DELNET. It is a sophisticated plagiarism detection software which is currently used by 700+ Institutions in India and outside. DrillBit is a global checker that uses the most advanced technology to catch the most sophisticated forms of plagiarism, plays a critical function for students and instructors and tag on a fully-automatic machine learning text- recognition system made for detecting, preventing and handling plagiarism and trusted by thousands of institutions across worldwide. DrillBit - Plagiarism Detection Software has been preferred for empanelment with AICTE and NEAT 3.0 (National Education Alliance for Technology) and contributing towards enhanced learning outcomes in India. On the other hand software uses a number of methods to detect AI-generated content, including, checking for repetitive phrases or sentences and AI-generated writing. As part of a larger global organization GJEIS (www.gjeis.com) and DrillBit better equipped to anticipate the foster an environment of academic integrity for educators and students around the globe. DrillBit is GDPR compliant with privacy by design and an uptime of 99.9% and have trust to be the partner in academic integrity (<https://www.drillbitplagiarism.com>) tool to check the originality and further affixed the similarity index which is {01%} in this case (See below Annexure 17.4.12). Thus, the reviewers and editors are of view to find it suitable to publish in this Volume 17, Issue-4, Oct-Dec 2025.

Annexure 17.4.12

Submission Date	Submission Id	Word Count	Character Count
08-Oct-2025	5346604 (DrillBit)	8680	59664

Analyzed Document	Submitter email	Submitted by	Similarity
4.5 RoL5_Tangjakhombi_GJEIS Oct-Dec 2025.docx	akojjam@ignou.ac.in	Tangjakhombi Akoijam	01%

1	4	A	2	3	4		
SIMILARITY %	MATCHED SOURCES	GRADE	LOCATION	MATCHED DOMAIN	% SOURCE TYPE		
1	4	A	2	3	4		
1	www.slideshare.net	1	Internet Data	2	himachalservices.nic.in	<1	Publication
			3	igmlnet.uohyd.ac.in	<1	Publication	
			4	www.ijrar.org	<1	Publication	

A-Satisfactory (0-10%)
 B-Upgrade (11-40%)
 C-Poor (41-60%)
 D-Unacceptable (61-100%)

Reviewers Memorandum



Reviewer's Comment 1: The manuscript addresses a highly relevant and underexplored area by examining the integration of GI-tagged products into tourism promotion across Indian states and Union Territories. The study offers a comprehensive national-level perspective and successfully highlights the gap between the abundance of GI products and their limited policy-level utilization in tourism strategies. The clear linkage established between GI products, destination branding, and experiential tourism enhances the overall significance of the study for both policymakers and academic researchers.

Reviewer Comment 2: The study adopts a structured and systematic research approach by analyzing tourism policies, promotional platforms, and experiential offerings across all states and UTs. The use of well-defined indicators such as policy references, promotional visibility, and tourism experiences contributes to the clarity of the analysis. Furthermore, the classification of states into different readiness categories provides a useful framework for understanding the varying levels of GI integration and offers practical insights for policy formulation.

Reviewer Comment 3: A notable strength of the manuscript lies in its development of a typology of states based on GI integration and tourist footfall, which adds analytical depth and enhances the practical relevance of the study. The discussion effectively connects empirical findings with broader tourism and branding perspectives, and the policy recommendations are actionable and well aligned with the study's objectives. Overall, the manuscript is coherent, informative, and makes a meaningful contribution to the emerging discourse on GI-based tourism development in India.



Tangjakhombi Akoijam and Shivani Singh
 "Integration of GI-Tagged Products into Indian
 Tourism Promotion: An Analysis of Government
 Policies, Frameworks, and Platforms"
 Volume-17, Issue 4, Oct-Dec 2025. (www.gjeis.com)

<https://doi.org/10.18311/gjeis/2025>

Volume-17, Issue 4, Oct-Dec 2025

Online iSSN : 0975-1432, Print iSSN : 0975-153X

Frequency : Quarterly, Published Since : 2009

Google Citations: Since 2009

H-Index = 96

i10-Index: 964

Source: <https://scholar.google.co.in/citations?user=S47TtNkAAAAJ&hl=en>



Conflict of Interest: Author of a Paper had no conflict neither financially nor academically.

Editorial Excerpt



The article has 1% of plagiarism which is the accepted percentage as per the norms and standards of the journal for publication. As per the editorial board's observations and blind reviewers' remarks the paper had some minor revisions which were communicated on a timely basis to the authors (Tangjakhombi and Shivani), and accordingly, all the corrections had been incorporated as and when directed and required to do so. The comments related to this manuscript are closely aligned with the theme "Integration of GI-Tagged Products into Indian Tourism Promotion: An Analysis of Government Policies, Frameworks, and Platforms" both subject-wise and research-wise. The manuscript is clearly written and well structured, reflecting a sound understanding of the subject area related to GI-tagged products and their role in tourism promotion. The arguments are presented in a logical and coherent manner, supported by a systematic examination of policy documents, promotional platforms, and experiential offerings across states and Union Territories. The comprehensive coverage and synthesis of information at a national level add substantial academic and practical value, enhancing the overall clarity and relevance of the study. In light of the reviewers' evaluations and the editorial assessment, the manuscript has been adequately revised and is considered suitable for publication under the **Review of Literature** category.

**Acknowledgement**

The acknowledgement section is an essential part of all academic research papers. It provides appropriate recognition to all contributors for their hard work and effort taken while writing a paper. The data presented and analyzed in this paper by (Tangjakhombi and Shivani) were collected first handily and wherever it has been taken the proper acknowledgment and endorsement depicts. The authors are highly indebted to others who facilitated accomplishing the research. Last but not least, endorse all reviewers and editors of GJEIS in publishing in the present issue.

Disclaimer

All views expressed in this paper are my/our own. Some of the content is taken from open-source websites & some are copyright free for the purpose of disseminating knowledge. Those some we/I had mentioned above in the references section and acknowledged/cited as when and where required. The author/s have cited their joint own work mostly, and tables/data from other referenced sources in this particular paper with the narrative & endorsement have been presented within quotes and reference at the bottom of the article accordingly & appropriately. Finally, some of the contents are taken or overlapped from open-source websites for knowledge purposes. Those some of i/we had mentioned above in the references section. On the other hand, opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not reflect the views of the GJEIS. The authors have made every effort to ensure that the information in this paper is correct, any remaining errors and deficiencies are solely their responsibility.

