Annotated Agenda for the 4th Meeting of the Coffee Public-Private Task Force to be held on 4 February 2021

1. The Executive Director presents his compliments and wishes to invite ICO Members and members of the Private Sector Consultative Board to the 4th Meeting of the Coffee Public-Private Task Force that will take place virtually on 4 February 2021. The annotated Agenda and pre-reading material is attached to this document.

2. ICO Members who wish to participate in this meeting will have to register using the link provided in the Annotated Agenda. A confirmation email with a link to access the meeting will then be sent only to those Members who have registered.
Participants join the Zoom online platform (from 13:00 GMT)

All invited attendees will be able to join the online meeting of the Coffee Public-Private Task Force by connecting via their computers, tablet or phone using this registration link which will then provide you with an access link for the meeting.

The meeting will start at 13:00 GMT.

**Item 1: Purpose of the day & welcome**

The purpose of this Session is to

PART 1 OPEN SESSION
- provide background on ICO Vision & topics for 2021,
- reach agreements on decision-making process proposal, on process for updating TF Roadmap 2021 & role of Sherpas, on proposal on ICO Producer countries lead role on national level discussion of the CPPTF; amendment to the Terms of Reference
- agreement on Task Force funding draft proposal (follow up action Nov 12)

PART 2 CLOSED SESSION
- agreement on Proposal TW2 Market Transparency Diversity of Origin: go/no-go

Sherpas will be requested to consider and adopt the Agenda of the meeting or suggest changes and additional issues.

**PART 1 Item 2: Agreements on CPPTF**

a. Proposal Decision process (Pre-read 1)

b. Proposal Process Updating Roadmap/ role of Sherpas (Pre-read 2)

c. Proposal ICO Producer countries lead role to initiate national/regional discussions (Pre-read 3)

d. Proposal Amendment Terms of Reference CPPTF (Pre-read 4)

Sherpas are asked to discuss the matter and consider the submission of the different proposals

**PART 1 Item 3: Follow up from Nov 12: Draft proposal Funding of TF**

Draft Proposal CPPTF Funding – Mr. G. Patacconi/ Head of Operations ICO (Pre-read 5)

Sherpas are asked to discuss the matter and consider the submission of the proposal
PART 1 Item 4: Next events & closure PART 1

- Meeting CPPTF: Thursday March 25 14:00 – 15:30 GMT (for ICC April session): proposals from TWS for consideration
- TW1 Living-Prosperous Income: Feb 17 15:00-16:00 GMT; TW2 Market Transparency: Feb 12 14:00-15:30 GMT; TW4 Sust Production: Feb 25 tbc; TW5 Sector Coordination: March 04 14:00 – 15:00 GMT
- Observers/ non-sherpas asked to leave the meeting

PART 2 Item 5: CLOSED SESSION: TW2 Market Transparency proposal

Proposal Diversity of Origin initiative – Mr. David Browning/ Mr Samuel Riou – Enveritas (Pre-read 6)

**Sherpas are asked to discuss the matter and consider the submission of the proposal**

PART 2 Item 6: Closure
Proposal
Task Force
Decision process
Roles and responsibilities of the Task Force

(From TF Terms of Reference: approved July 2020)

STARTING POINT: The Terms already outline in rough terms the different decision levels between the ICC/ CGLF and CPPTF

Maintaining the public-private dialogue and tracking of commitments in Resolution 465/London Declaration

Driving the further development and operationalization of commitments and building consensus

Developing a shared agenda for public-private dialogue in line with Resolution 465/London Declaration

Providing directional guidance to the Technical Workstreams

Reviewing outputs and recommendations of the Technical Workstreams

Recommending actions, commitments and resource requirements that will be shaped in a communiqué to be discussed and considered by the CGLF and the ICC

Provide inputs for ICA current revision and engage in negotiations regarding role/membership of private sector
Proposal Decision levels CGLF- ICC versus CPPTF

OUTLINING DETAILS: Examples of decisions that should correspond to each level applying the subsidiarity principle

STRATEGIC DECISIONS: CGLF & ICC level

- Fundamental decisions e.g.
  - Evaluation of results/outcomes
  - Roadmap updates, commitments, actions and resource requirements
  - Joint Communiques
  - Objective, Vision and Mission of the CPPTF
  - Assessment of proposals by CPPTF that require a policy/strategic decision

OPERATIONAL DECISIONS: CPPTF- Task Force level

- All matters of Technical Workstreams e.g.
  - Review & decide on proposals & outputs regarding operationalization of Roadmap
  - Set up new TWS, merge/end existing ones etc.
  - Directional guidance of TWS and review of outputs

- All matters of Task Force Coordination & Administration e.g.
  - Terms of Reference/way of working of TF
  - Supervision of work
Proposal CGLF decisions

STARTING POINT: ICC and CPPTF already have decision making guidelines established but not CGLF

CURRENT SITUATION

- Annual CGLF meeting of CEOs/senior management of 12 signatories of London Declaration + SCC, GCP and PSCB Sherpas *(back-to-back to the ICC session)*
- Meeting facilitated by ICO/external facilitator
- No guidelines regarding decision making process
- However, ICC and CPPTF do have guidelines established

PROPOSAL

- Ideally, the decision process of the CGLF should parallel the one of the Task Force & ICC, namely that *once quorum is met decisions take place when consensus is reached* (≠ absence of sustained opposition)
  
  *Quorum CGLF:* minimum of 10 Sherpas (out of 16) attending, at least 4 Sherpas representing roasters and at least 4 Sherpas representing traders

- **WHO GUARDIANS THE PROCESS:**
  Task Force Secretariat and/or Facilitator of CGLF event
Is there ambition to “upgrade” the current informal CGLF group to a more formal setting?

Forum of coffee industry CEOs:
- More inclusive and wider as TF membership eg including CEO and Leaders of the other coffee roasters/traders and retailers
- More permanent setting and forum such (like the Global Summit of the Consumer Good Forum?)

12 CEOs and/or senior management of signatories of London Declaration meeting informally once a year, together with SCC, GCP and PSCB Sherpas of Task Force ahead of the ICO Council session in September
Expected results & next steps

• More agile way of working
• Subsidiarity principle applied: decision taken at lowest level possible/ empowerment of Task Force
• Decision process aligned between Task Force, CGLF and ICC

Next steps:
• Rolled out & applied
• CGLF to start discussing a more ambitious future set up
Updating Roadmap – Role of Sherpas

What’s the issue - current way of working

• Experience from the 2020 Roadmap development & approval process indicates that a consensus at CPPTF level does not translate smoothly to a ICC & CGLF sign off

• Whilst private sector Sherpas have a clear line of sign off within their respective companies, the public sector Sherpas are representing not their country but a region

• It is not clear how much consultation is and can happen in between Task Force meetings between ICO member countries on Task Force proposals coming to the ICC for decision

• So far there is also just one CGLF session scheduled per year, in September, to coincide with the annual ICC session, providing only one opportunity per year to get strategic Task Force proposals concerning Roadmap, Task Force strategy, resource allocation etc. signed off
Proposal - way forward

- more time to reach a CPPTF consensus decision is needed between Draft Proposal submission and CPPTF meeting = introduction of a consultation loop + pre CGLF & ICC ‘buy-in’ push
- Both ICC session – April & September – should be used to deliberate TF matters if necessary
- This would mean that in case of an April proposal submission, a short ‘CGLF’, maybe only on level of the 16 private sector Sherpas, is scheduled
- Proposed run–through of steps: overall 3-4 weeks / new steps marked yellow
  - CPPTF draft proposal submitted, many from TWS
  - Consultation loop by Sherpas
    - within their companies/organisations
    - across ICO members
  - Feedback collected & send back to TF Coordination: if general positive with/without amendments –goes as final proposal to CCPT; if sustained objection, goes back to TW for further review
- CPPTF Final proposal submitted
- CPPTF session to find consensus and approve
- Sherpas reach out again to get buy-in
- ICC & CGLF sessions for sign off
Proposal - way forward

What does that mean in terms of timelines and actions for next ICC session April 2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>CPPTF draft proposals submitted to Sherpas</td>
<td>March 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2)   | Consultation by Sherpas  
   a. within their companies/ organisations  
   b. across ICO members | March 12- 18 |
| 3)   | Feedback received.....positive but comments or sustained objection | March 18 |
| 4)   | CPPTF Final proposals submitted to Sherpas | March 23 |
| 5)   | CPPTF session to find consensus and approve | March 25 |
| 6)   | Sherpas reach out again to obtain buy-in | March 26 – April 09 |
| 7)   | ICC & CGLF sessions/calls for sign off | April 12-16 |
How can ICO Secretariat support the process

1. Provide all documentation on time

2. Schedule additional information meetings with public sector Sherpas for further explanations & details regarding proposals presented

3. Schedule additional consultation meetings for public sector Sherpas with other ICO countries in their region

4.
Expected results & next steps

- Secure more ownership of TF across all ICO member countries
- Smoother sign off process at ICC/ CGLF level
- Strengthened role of public sector Sherpas
- Quicker turnaround of strategic decisions of TF – twice instead of once yearly
What’s the issue-

- The 2020 Roadmap has a commitment to promote & ensure that the results/proposals of the Task Force are shared & discussed on national/ regional levels across public & private coffee sector
- Task Force has limited coffee producer representation & participation
- Many actions & interventions of TF are directed towards national/regional producer countries level, not global
Proposal - way forward

- ICO producer countries take ownership of national/ regional discussion regarding ICO Task Force matters and implications

- Focus on TWS, not theoretical discussion on theory-of-change, but the concrete proposals coming out from the Technical Workstreams that affect and are directed towards producer level

- Use, and adapt, already existing public-private forums and spaces where stakeholders, and crucially coffee producer organisations, meet, like:
  - Sistema Producto Café in Mexico
  - GCP National Platforms in various producer countries
  - Potentially regional bodies like IACO/ Africa and PROMECAFE/ Mesoamerica
  - UNDP.....
How can ICO Secretariat support the process

1. Provide all necessary documents and information to national/regional bodies

2. Schedule TF presentations with these bodies on TF matters

3. Provide linkages & connections to/with existing national public-private coffee bodies
Expected results & next steps

• TF plans/proposals are known & debated where it matters: on national/regional level
• Two-way traffic: not only ‘download’ information but ‘upload’ feedback to TF and, above all, TWS to enrich the proposals further
• Secure more & better coffee producer participation in the TF
• Strengthen the ownership of ICO member countries of TF process & outcomes

NEXT STEPS IF ADOPTED:
• ICO Secretariat will reach out to all public sector Sherpas to assess interest & willingness
• Further outreach, together with Sherpas, to other ICO producer countries not members of Task Force for interest
• Liaison with any national/regional public-private space to provide support
Purpose:

To clarify procedures regarding

- Public Sector Sherpas rotation
- joining the Task Force as a member, an observer or participant in a Technical Workstream

Proposed amendments (highlighted in red):

4.1 Membership of the Task Force

Public Sector Sherpas [16]:

- The representation of ICO Member countries in the Task Force matching the number of private sector sherpas:
  - Regional grouping of exporting Members (Africa, Asia, Central America & Mexico, South America) with 2/4 countries per group. Exporting Members through sub-regional representation (Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Central America, Caribbean & Mexico, South America) with 2/4 countries per group. A regular cycle of appointment/re-appointment of Sherpas at sub-regional level can be discussed within the ICC.
  - Importing Members represented by 3/4 countries.

Expanding the Task Force / Becoming a signatory to the London Declaration

- Organizations interested in supporting the work of the Task Force and the Sector Dialogue by participating in Technical Workstreams can do so without becoming a signatory to the London Declaration.

The Task Force welcomes additional technical expertise in the Technical Workstreams -TWS and this should be a very open and flexible process. Any Task Force member or TWS Facilitator or ICO Secretariat can propose to invite relevant external organisations and/or individuals to join a Technical Workstream as a participant.

New participants are expected to acknowledge and subscribe to the CPPTF Theory of Change with problem & vision statement and the overall Roadmap.
• Becoming a signatory or co-signatory to the London Declaration is a public demonstration of the organization’s support for the Sector-wide Dialogue. It does not automatically imply the organization will become part of the Task Force and nominate a Sherpa.

Any new signatory or co-signatory is expected to acknowledge and subscribe to the CPPTF Theory of Change with problem & vision statement and the overall Roadmap.

• Organizations interested to join as a member or observer of the Task Force or participant in the Technical Workstreams will be discussed as follows: on an ad-hoc basis.

1) Join as member of CPPTF:
   a. In case of private sector: present formal letter to the ICO Executive Director and ex-officio Chairperson of the CPPTF; sign London Declaration; acknowledge and subscribe to the CPPTF Theory of Change with problem & vision statement and the overall Roadmap; Assign a Sherpa
   b. In case of ICO members: internal ICO selection procedure through regional consultations to nominate new member, who acknowledges and subscribes to the CPPTF Theory of Change with problem & vision statement and the overall Roadmap and assign a Sherpa;
   c. In both cases: proposal presented to CPPTF for discussion and approval will be reviewed to ensure overall public and private sector balance and ratio of CPPTF membership is maintained

2) Join as Observer: ICO Members and Secretariat, as well as CPPTF members, have the authority to invite like-minded and interested external organisations/individuals as Observers to extend the reach & coverage of the Task Force.

3) Join a TWS: The Task Force welcomes additional technical expertise in the Technical Workstreams -TWS and this should be a very open and flexible process. Any Task Force member or TWS Facilitator or ICO Members or Secretariat can propose to invite relevant external organisations and/or individuals to join a Technical Workstream as a participant.

New participants are expected to acknowledge and subscribe to the CPPTF Theory of Change with problem & vision statement and the overall Roadmap.
Resources for the Sector Dialogue and the Coffee Public-Private Task Force process
The Process

- **ICO Res 465**
  - Coffee price level

- **Sector Dialogue**
  - 5 events
  - 80+ experts
  - 2500+ attendees

- **London Declaration**

- **Establishment of the Coffee Public-Private Task Force**

- **1st Task Force meeting**

- **Start-up CPPTF-2 and -3 TWS QWs**

- **1st Public-Private Joint Communiqué Roadmap**

- **TWS QWs**

- **4th Task Force meeting**

- **09/2018**
- **09/2019**
- **June 2020**
- **09/2020**
- **02/2021**
Resources Required/available

FIXED COSTS

- OVERALL Management (ICO)
- CPPTF coordination
- Development and facilitation TWS
- CGLF (planning/execution)
- M&E and audit
- Communication, online platforms/tools, Miscellaneous

ACTION-SPECIFIC

- Consultancies to produce outputs by TWS and Quick Wins
- Implementation of specific/ad-hoc projects
- Fund raising
**Resources Required/available - Blending**

- **ICO budget**
  - ICO HR
  - Operation/infrastructure

- **ICO members (donors)**
  - In-kind BMZ-GIZ SECO (Consultants, Secondment)
  - In-Cash

- **Private sector**
  - Direct Contribution to ICO/CPPTF
  - Contributions via GCP
  - In-Kind Contributions

- **IGOs NGOs**
  - In-kind (GCP, SCC, Enveritas, UNDP....)

---

**2018-20 ±£670k**

**Total Resource 2018-20**

- ICO Members: 11%
- ICO Donors: 42%
- Private sector: 47%

---
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### Public and private sector funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ICO budget</th>
<th>ICO Donors</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>IGOs/NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL Management (ICO)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPTF coordination</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and facilitation TWS</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGLF (planning/execution)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E and audit</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, online platforms/tools, Miscellaneous</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancies to produce outputs by TWS and Quick Wins</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of specific/ad-hoc projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund raising</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Public and private sector funding requirements 2021 - GBP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main items</th>
<th>TOTAL. 2021</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL Management (ICO)</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPTF coordination</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and facilitation TWS</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>In kind partially available TWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGLF (planning/execution)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>partially available ICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E and audit</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>partially available ICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, online platforms/tools, Miscellaneous</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>partially available ICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancies to produce outputs by TWS and Quick Wins</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>partially available (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/fund raising/Implementation of projects</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,070,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transparency and visibility

ICO Budget

Donors cash

Donors in kind

PS/IGOs/NGOs in-kind

PS/IGOs/NGOs in-cash (direct/indirect)
Transparency and visibility

ICO members - **Cash**
- ICO Budget
- Donors fund a specific activity

ICO members - **In-kind**
- Donor provide service/expertise for a specific activity

PS/IGOs/NGOs – **Cash**
- To cover overall costs
- To fund a specific activity

PS/IGOs/NGOs - **In-kind**
- Provide expertise
- Provide other in-kind resources
Transparency and visibility

• All funds channel through the ICO for services/expertise selection process open to all and reported to the TWS/TF

• Funds channelled through the ICO could be general pool or allocated for a specific event/service/TWS/consultancy/project

• Funds can be provided directly or through associations

• In-kind contributions by Donors and PS/IGOs/NGOs follow their internal procedures (bidding, selection..) and inform TWS/TF

• Overall funding for CPPTF transparent and audited (ICO)
THANKS
TW2 Proposal: Sharing of roaster purchases by origin –

Why is it viewed as important?

- Market Transparency workstream launched 01 January
- Gathered views and opinions from participants on important gaps in data transparency and aligned on these gaps
- Began identifying initiatives
- One of these initiatives concerns the sharing of roaster purchases by origin, viewed as a possible driver of diversity of origins, a core component of the long-term vision of the CPPTF
- In the next two slides we lay out the theory of change and high level implementation path for this initiative
- We seek the Task Force’s perspective on this first initiative
What’s the issue-

What is the issue?

- Coffee is increasingly concentrated in two origins (60% of production in 2018 vs 45% in 2000¹)
- Farmers most in need of livelihood improvement reside outside those two origins
- Roaster purchase behaviour by origin is not transparent

How could it be solved?

- Individual roaster purchases by origin are made available publicly
- This transparency encourages roasters to diversify their sourcing to include a much wider number of origins

What is the outcome?

- Increased demand will raise price at these origins
- Increased prices at FOB level will flow back to increase in farm gate price
- Farmer at these origins will benefit from improved farmer livelihood
- Reduces origin concentration risk for the roaster supply chain
How do we get there- next steps?

**Gain agreement / Approval**
- Gain approval at Task Force level (including regarding any antitrust concerns)
- Obtain legal advice to define contours of acceptable sharing process
- Roasters agree to undertake this process

**Define the framework**
- Agree on common metrics to be shared (e.g. level of aggregation of purchases, timing)
- Agree on neutral repository of data

**Secure funding**
- Estimate budget required (depends on extent of activities)
- Identify possible sources of funding
- Assign responsibility for funding application