



Projects Committee/  
International Coffee Council  
6 March 2014  
London, United Kingdom

**Report of the  
Virtual Screening Subcommittee (VSS)  
on three coffee project proposals**

**Background**

1. This report contains assessments provided by the Virtual Screening Subcommittee (VSS) on the following four project proposals (three new and one revised) which will be considered by the Projects Committee and Council in March 2014:

- Annex I: Improving and protecting coffee production through managed pollination and disseminating biological control agents against pests and diseases**
- Annex II: Improving the participation of women in the coffee value chain in Cameroon**
- Annex III: Promotion of coffee production in Zimbabwe through establishing nurseries, replanting and capacity building of farmers**
- Annex IV: Valorization of the Ethiopian coffee origins for marketing improvement**

2. The VSS is currently composed of Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Guatemala and Indonesia (exporting Members) and Italy, Spain and the USA (importing Members).

3. Two VSS Members completed the assessment forms for the proposals and made specific recommendations about the eligibility of the projects. Comments on the proposals were received from two other Members, which are included in the relevant Annex.

4. In the case of the 'Valorization of the Ethiopian coffee origins for marketing improvement proposal', the proponent has already submitted directly the proposal to the CFC for consideration as it meets the new format of project assessment and financing based on public private partnership.

**Action**

The Projects Committee is requested to consider the report of the VSS and to submit recommendations on the above proposals to the Council.

## REPORT OF THE VIRTUAL SCREENING SUBCOMMITTEE (VSS)

### Summary of VSS screening by technical area

**February 2014**

	Annex I	Annex II	Annex III	Annex IV
<b>RECOMMENDATION OF THE VSS</b>	Improving and protecting coffee production through managed pollination and disseminating biological control agents against pests and diseases	Improving the participation of women in the coffee value chain in Cameroon	Promotion of coffee production in Zimbabwe through establishing nurseries, replanting and capacity building of farmers	Valorization of the Ethiopian coffee origins for marketing improvement [Formerly: Valorization of Ethiopian coffee origins through the European Protected Geographical Identification label (PGI label)]
<b>Project eligible</b>	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 2:</b> see comments <b>Member 3:</b> NO – see comments <b>Member 4:</b> NO	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 2:</b> see comments <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> NO <b>Member 2:</b> see comments <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 2:</b> see comments <b>Member 4:</b> YES
<b>Overall recommendation</b>	<p>The VSS considered the proposal for the first time in Feb 2014.</p> <p><b>Feb 2014:</b> The VSS was split on whether to endorse or reject the proposal.</p>	<p>The VSS considered the proposal for the first time in Feb 2014.</p> <p><b>Feb 2014:</b> The VSS recommended endorsing the proposal taking into consideration technical comments provided.</p>	<p>The VSS considered the proposal for the first time in Feb 2014.</p> <p><b>Feb 2014:</b> The VSS was split on whether to endorse or reject the proposal.</p>	<p>The proposal was considered for the third time by the VSS in Feb 2014.</p> <p><b>February 2013:</b> The VSS recommended endorsing the proposal taking into consideration technical comments provided.</p> <p><b>August 2013:</b> The VSS recommended that the proposal should be revised taking into consideration technical comments provided.</p> <p><b>Feb 2014:</b> The VSS recommended endorsing the proposal taking into consideration technical comments provided.</p>

## VSS ASSESSMENT – NEW PROPOSAL

**Improving and protecting coffee production through managed pollination and disseminating biological control agents against pests and diseases** – Proposal submitted by the Arthur Dobbs Institute. See also project outline in document PJ-64/13 and relevant summary in document PJ-68/14 under Project 1.2.

	Yes/No	To be completed by the VSS
ICO Criteria <sup>1</sup>		<b>Analysis: for each criterion explain why it is adequately met, or why it is not relevant. Please do not cut and paste text from the project document.</b>
1. Country eligibility: Are the intended beneficiaries of the project consistent with the type of beneficiaries described in paragraph 29 of ICC-105-16?	<b>Member 1: YES</b> <b>Member 4: YES</b>	<b>Member 1:</b> The project will DIRECTLY benefit national and regional coffee research institutes and INDIRECTLY a large number of small, medium and big coffee producers and consequently the labour force in producing countries. <b>Member 4:</b> Areas where there are few viable economic alternatives to coffee production and where there is a necessity to improve income of smallholders.
2. Aims and purposes: Are they consistent with the 2007 Agreement and ICC-105-16?	<b>Member 1: YES</b> <b>Member 4: YES</b>	<b>Member 1:</b> The first strategic area of the Development Strategy for Coffee specifically includes the use of environmentally-friendly technologies throughout the production and processing chain, integrated biological pest control, etc. The 6 <sup>th</sup> strategic area includes research and development of technologies to improve conditions for producers assuring the sustainability and development of the coffee sector, together with the necessary capacity building measures and training to ensure the dissemination of the results of such research. <b>Member 4:</b> Aim to improve production and quality reducing costs and improving control of pests and diseases.
3. Is the project consistent with country or regional priorities?	<b>Member 1: YES</b> <b>Member 4: NO</b>	<b>Member 1:</b> Every academic participating partner (and consequently where the R & D project could be implemented) is located in a ICO Member country. <b>Member 4:</b> Management of pollination would not enhance coffee production and synchronism of fruit ripening.
4. Are there critical gaps or problems with the project?	<b>Member 1: NO</b> <b>Member 4: YES</b>	<b>Member 4:</b> Mainly the methodology
5. Is the project likely to have sustainable impacts for project beneficiaries?	<b>Member 1: YES</b> <b>Member 4: NO</b>	<b>Member 1:</b> This pre-proposal is the arranging phase of a long-term initiative. So it should be considered a complete programme. In this first step the application is to involve the local academic and growers around the world. <b>Member 4:</b> It may not reach the results expected.

<sup>1</sup> See 'Development Strategy for coffee' – Document ICC-105-16.

6. Is the scale and scope, including budget, of the project appropriate?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> NO	<b>Member 1:</b> There is a coherence and consistence between scope, goals and costs in the project. <b>Member 4:</b> Same reason as above.
7. Is the timeframe of the project appropriate?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> NO	<b>Member 1:</b> The timeframe for this pre-project is correctly presented and also it is mentioned that the overall long term, R & D programme will last between three to five years. <b>Member 4:</b> Same reason as above.
8. Government commitment: Is the counterpart contribution committed by the government appropriate?	<b>Member 1:</b> THE DOCUMENT DOES NOT REFLECT THIS INFORMATION <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 4:</b> The financing and co-financing costs sought are appropriate.
9. Will this project develop capacity-building in the local community?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> NO	<b>Member 1:</b> As the project needs to be implemented in different areas of the world, researchers, extension staff, growers, etc. will be beneficiaries of capacity-building in this innovative practice. <b>Member 4:</b> It may not reach the results expected.
10. Has a gender analysis been undertaken and its recommendations taken into account <sup>2</sup> ?  If the project has a gender dimension, does the proposal:  – Disaggregate people-level indicators by sex? – Promote equal opportunities for men and women (including youth) to participate in and benefit from the project?	<b>Member 1:</b> NO <b>Member 4:</b> YES  <b>Member 4:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> NO	<b>Member 4:</b> It appears to have been made.  <b>Member 4:</b> Men and women working together. <b>Member 4:</b> The community will be the beneficiaries.
11. Does this project leverage additional resources through private sector, civil society, government, or academic participation?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> The International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS) has already benefited the project with monetary support and there are academic partners committed for the project. <b>Member 4:</b> The project already has a grant of €7,500 per year in hand.

## Comments from Member 2

Recommendation: Priority should be given to educational courses of beekeeping, including the “type” of bee to be used (meek African bees).

<sup>2</sup> See relevant ICO document at: <http://dev.ico.org/documents/pj-35e-gender.pdf>.

### Comments from Member 3

The project could potentially be innovative, if it is proved that the pollination by bees can actually increase the yields, reduce the harvesting periods and contribute to the spread of biological agents against pests and diseases. However, Member 3 considers that serious doubts persist at this stage as to the objectives and the means of this project.

1. A first question arises with respect to the timing and the uniformity of the fruit set; it seems debatable as to whether the very short flowering periods of the coffee bush is enough for the pollinators to have an active role in the timing of the fruit set and to have some impact on the pace of flowering periods which is usually dependent upon climatic factors.

2. Secondly, to promote the beekeeping in coffee producing areas, suitable conditions for the survival of the bees throughout the year should be ensured; the sustenance of the bees after the flowering period, which lasted for approximately one week, is still an open question. We should make sure beforehand that there is a sufficient diversity of flowering plants within a defined area, and possibly intend to combine the planting of other flowering crops with coffee bush. Such a project could whenever necessary include the coffee growing in equatorial zone (for example in Indonesia), where the flowering cycle of the coffee bush is different from the one which prevails in tropical zones.

3. Thirdly, while the project incorporates the concept of biological agents against pests and diseases to be carried by bees, it does not specify what these biological agents are and what their targets are, two key elements to be considered. The project does not name examples of references in the field of coffee growing.

4. More generally, this concept note is not accompanied by any bibliographic reference, and general information stays away from agronomic and phytosanitary issues in the coffee sector. In that regard, it will be imperative to ensure that the project provides stronger and more coherent scientific facts.

5. Lastly, the project intends to include the participation of seven countries (the preliminary budget therefore seems to be a strong underestimation). There is a risk of starting from the very outset to work on so many sites, while no technology has been developed. It would surely be preferable to wait until the results of technical developments on one or two sites, and during two years at least, before any commitment on a multi-site project.

**Therefore, Member 3 considers that it is premature to select the project as it stands today and to seek funding from the Common Fund for Commodities;** clearly, the consistency and the development of the project shall first be strengthened. It is highly important that the handling of the phytosanitary crises which presently impact the coffee growing in various regions of the world (coffee leaf rust in Central America, black coffee berry borer in several countries of Africa) remains a priority in selecting the large range of projects submitted to the ICO, projects designed to provide rapid and lasting supports to the producers.

## VSS ASSESSMENT – NEW PROPOSAL

**Improving the participation of women in the coffee value chain in Cameroon** – proposal submitted by the Government of Cameroon. See also project outline in document PJ-66/14 and relevant summary in document PJ-68/14 under Project 1.3.

	Yes/No	To be completed by the VSS
<b>ICO Criteria<sup>3</sup></b>		<b>Analysis: for each criterion explain why it is adequately met, or why it is not relevant. Please do not cut and paste text from the project document.</b>
1. Country eligibility: Are the intended beneficiaries of the project consistent with the type of beneficiaries described in paragraph 29 of ICC-105-16?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> The project will benefit a majority of women, small producers, more vulnerable to fluctuations in production, prices, demand, etc., as well as the labour force which is mainly integrated by indigenous people. <b>Member 4:</b> Areas with low viable alternatives for coffee and need to provide stable rural employment.
2. Aims and purposes: Are they consistent with the 2007 Agreement and ICC-105-16?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> The project is consistent with strategy No. 7: Rehabilitation of production capacity and No. 5: Improvement of marketing systems. <b>Member 4:</b> It will produce sustainable production and increase income for the smallholders.
3. Is the project consistent with country or regional priorities?	<b>Member 1:</b> THE DOCUMENT DOES NOT MENTION IT <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> There is no comment about policies or country development strategy, although it could be considered a priority taking into account that 3 million people earn their living directly or indirectly through the coffee sector. <b>Member 4:</b> High priority for the country.
4. Are there critical gaps or problems with the project?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> NO	<b>Member 1:</b> The project does not consider the possibility that women cannot return loans if they have losses or if there is another crisis in the coffee sector (pests, market, etc.). I cannot find any mention of capacity building or special treatment of future generations, but young people are emigrating to the cities. <b>Member 4:</b> The project does not present gaps, however it presents high costs.
5. Is the project likely to have sustainable impacts for project beneficiaries?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 4:</b> Improve production and income for the smallholders.
6. Is the scale and scope, including budget, of the project appropriate?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> As it is said in the project, the impact will benefit a big scope of beneficiaries. The budget can be considered appropriate and also the financing system. <b>Member 4:</b> The scale, scope and budget are compatible with the actions.

<sup>3</sup> See 'Development Strategy for coffee' – Document ICC-105-16.

7. Is the timeframe of the project appropriate?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 4:</b> Three years are adequate.
8. Government commitment: Is the counterpart contribution committed by the government appropriate?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> As part of the InterAfrican Coffee Organisation, the government of Cameroon must be committed. <b>Member 4:</b> Co-financing from the ITC and counterpart contribution are adequate.
9. Will this project develop capacity-building in the local community?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> Capacity-building is one of the major and necessary benefit of the project (Component 3). <b>Member 4:</b> Mainly for the participation of women.
10. Has a gender analysis been undertaken and its recommendations taken into account <sup>4</sup> ?  If the project has a gender dimension, does the proposal:  – Disaggregate people-level indicators by sex? – Promote equal opportunities for men and women (including youth) to participate in and benefit from the project?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES  <b>Member 4:</b> NO  <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> Women are the direct beneficiaries of the project. <b>Member 4:</b> High participation of women.  <b>Member 4:</b> Men and women will work together.  <b>Member 4:</b> High participation of women in coffee production and in the international market.
11. Does this project leverage additional resources through private sector, civil society, government, or academic participation?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> There is a large counterpart contribution. <b>Member 4:</b> From the ITC and the counterpart contribution.

### Comments from Member 2

Number of beneficiaries could give a better idea of the expected results. First education (how to manage credit, how to produce the coffee), then investment on the infrastructure. Giving credits/loans without a prior educational course in how to manage the loans, could cause the failure of the project.

<sup>4</sup> See relevant ICO document at: <http://dev.ico.org/documents/pj-35e-gender.pdf>.



## VSS ASSESSMENT – NEW PROPOSAL

**Promotion of coffee production in Zimbabwe through establishing nurseries, replanting and capacity building of farmers** – proposal submitted by the Government of Zimbabwe. See also project outline in document PJ-65/13 and relevant summary in document PJ-68/14 under Project 1.4.

	Yes/No	To be completed by the VSS
<b>ICO Criteria</b> <sup>5</sup>		<b>Analysis: for each criterion explain why it is adequately met, or why it is not relevant. Please do not cut and paste text from the project document.</b>
1. Country eligibility: Are the intended beneficiaries of the project consistent with the type of beneficiaries described in paragraph 29 of ICC-105-16?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES, BUT IT SHOULD BE NECESSARY TO HAVE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONTEXT <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> Although the project will benefit 1,000 existing smallholder farmers and 3,000 new farmers, it is not possible to identify their level of poverty (we can guess that they are poor farmers), dependent on coffee production or if there is any other option or alternative for economic means. <b>Member 4:</b> Low viable alternatives for coffee and need to provide stable rural employment.
2. Aims and purposes: Are they consistent with the 2007 Agreement and ICC-105-16?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> The objective of the project is consistent with strategy No. 7: <i>In cases where producing countries have suffered a large decrease in production.</i> <b>Member 4:</b> It will improve production, quality and income for the smallholders.
3. Is the project consistent with country or regional priorities?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES, BUT IT SHOULD BE NECESSARY TO HAVE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONTEXT <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> In general there is a lack of information in the project document. There is not enough information with details to correctly evaluate this project. There is no context analysis or policies and presentation of country strategies. <b>Member 4:</b> Increase production and quality of coffee.
4. Are there critical gaps or problems with the project?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> NO	<b>Member 1:</b> The document does not provide enough information to evaluate the scope of the project. There is no information about the applicant or the executing agency or the counterpart contribution. There are no details in the budget; no information about government strategies. It cannot be identified if there are any other economic alternatives, considering the reason why many farmers neglected their plantations. I think that this budget needs to be more detailed.

<sup>5</sup> See 'Development Strategy for coffee' – Document ICC-105-16.

5. Is the project likely to have sustainable impacts for project beneficiaries?	<b>Member 1:</b> NOT SURE <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> The project does not consider a complete strategy or programme. What would be the strategy if there is another international coffee crisis? Therefore sustainability cannot be evaluated. <b>Member 4:</b> The nurseries, new plantation and training will improve production and income for the smallholders.
6. Is the scale and scope, including budget, of the project appropriate?	<b>Member 1:</b> CANNOT BE ASSESSED <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> There are no details in the budget. The budget seems to be very high. <b>Member 4:</b> The budget is adequate for the project scale.
7. Is the timeframe of the project appropriate?	<b>Member 1:</b> N/A <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> There is no timeframe, although the project is for 3 years, this seems to be a reasonable timeframe. It should be necessary to think and plan the global strategy (the programme) or give more information about it if there is already one. <b>Member 4:</b> Three years are adequate.
8. Government commitment: Is the counterpart contribution committed by the government appropriate?	<b>Member 1:</b> THE DOCUMENT DOES NOT REFLECT THIS INFORMATION <b>Member 4:</b> NO	<b>Member 4:</b> No information on the counterpart contribution.
9. Will this project develop capacity-building in the local community?	<b>Member 1:</b> YES <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 1:</b> There is a component of capacity building for extension staff and farmers. <b>Member 4:</b> Extension services provided and training for new growers.
10. Has a gender analysis been undertaken and its recommendations taken into account <sup>6</sup> ?  If the project has a gender dimension, does the proposal:  – Disaggregate people-level indicators by sex? – Promote equal opportunities for men and women (including youth) to participate in and benefit from the project?	<b>Member 1:</b> NO <b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 4:</b> New growers.
	<b>Member 4:</b> NO	<b>Member 4:</b> Men and women will work together.
	<b>Member 4:</b> YES	<b>Member 4:</b> The communities will be the beneficiaries.
11. Does this project leverage additional resources through private sector, civil society, government, or academic participation?	<b>Member 1:</b> THE DOCUMENT DOES NOT REFLECT THIS INFORMATION <b>Member 4:</b> NO	<b>Member 4:</b> No information on additional resources.

### Comments by Member 2

To increase the wage of coffee growers, in particular small holders, they have to reach a high quality standard. This is not possible if the coffee is not well processed. Support on the post-harvest equipment should be considered. Seedlings to cover only 0.5 ha, is it enough?

<sup>6</sup> See relevant ICO document at: <http://dev.ico.org/documents/pj-35e-gender.pdf>.

## VSS ASSESSMENT – REVISED PROPOSAL

**Valorization of the Ethiopian coffee origins for marketing improvement** – Proposal submitted by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and Illycaffè. See also project outline in document PJ-46/13 Rev. 1 and relevant summary in document PJ-68/14 under Project 1.1.

	Yes/No	To be completed by the VSS
<b>ICO Criteria<sup>7</sup></b>		Analysis: for each criterion explain why it is adequately met, or why it is not relevant. Please do not cut and paste text from the project document.
1. Country eligibility: Are the intended beneficiaries of the project consistent with the type of beneficiaries described in paragraph 29 of ICC-105-16?	<b>Member 4: YES</b>	<b>Member 4:</b> The valorization of coffee origins will increase marketing, add value to coffee production and will improve producers' life quality.
2. Aims and purposes: Are they consistent with the 2007 Agreement and ICC-105-16?	<b>Member 4: YES</b>	<b>Member 4:</b> It will improve coffee quality and increase income for the smallholders.
3. Is the project consistent with country or regional priorities?	<b>Member 4: YES</b>	<b>Member 4:</b> It is the most important source of foreign currency in Ethiopia.
4. Are there critical gaps or problems with the project?	<b>Member 4: NO</b>	<b>Member 4:</b> The proposal is very clear.
5. Is the project likely to have sustainable impacts for project beneficiaries?	<b>Member 4: YES</b>	<b>Member 4:</b> There will be sustainable impacts for the producers and consumers.
6. Is the scale and scope, including budget, of the project appropriate?	<b>Member 4: YES</b>	<b>Member 4:</b> The estimated scale and scope is adequate. However, it is necessary to guarantee the counterpart contribution.
7. Is the timeframe of the project appropriate?	<b>Member 4: YES</b>	<b>Member 4:</b> The duration of two years seems to be adequate.
8. Government commitment: Is the counterpart contribution committed by the government appropriate?	<b>Member 4: NO</b>	<b>Member 4:</b> It is being sought.
9. Will this project develop capacity-building in the local community?	<b>Member 4: YES</b>	<b>Member 4:</b> Organization of beneficiaries and training.

<sup>7</sup> See 'Development Strategy for coffee' – Document ICC-105-16.

<p>10. Has a gender analysis been undertaken and its recommendations taken into account<sup>8</sup>?</p> <p>If the project has a gender dimension, does the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Disaggregate people-level indicators by sex?</li> <li>– Promote equal opportunities for men and women (including youth) to participate in and benefit from the project?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Member 4:</b> YES</p>	<p><b>Member 4:</b> All the smallholders and consumers will be the beneficiaries.</p>
	<p><b>Member 4:</b> NO</p>	<p><b>Member 4:</b> Men and women will be working together.</p>
	<p><b>Member 4:</b> YES</p>	<p><b>Member 4:</b> The community will be the beneficiaries.</p>
<p>11. Does this project leverage additional resources through private sector, civil society, government, or academic participation?</p>	<p><b>Member 4:</b> no</p>	<p><b>Member 4:</b> It is not clear.</p>

### Comments by Member 2

Already approved by illycaffè.

---

<sup>8</sup> See relevant ICO document at: <http://dev.ico.org/documents/pj-35e-gender.pdf>.