



**Working Group for the Entry into Force (WGEF)
of the International Coffee Agreement 2022**

5th Meeting

8 April 2024

London, United Kingdom

**Comparison of compositions
considered for the Economics
Committee**

Background

1. As requested by the delegation of Japan, the Secretariat has prepared the attached comparison summarizing the perceived advantages and disadvantages of the different compositions considered for the Economics Committee. Members are kindly requested to note that these do not reflect the views of the Secretariat, but rather are those previously expressed by participants in meetings of the WGEF.

2. This follows the circulation of the draft Terms of Reference contained in documents [WGEF-07/24](#) and [WGEF-10/24 Rev. 1](#), as well as subsequent discussions.

Action

The WGEF is requested to consider the comparison.

**ECONOMICS COMMITTEE
COMPARISON OF COMPOSITIONS CONSIDERED**

A) Fixed system – The Committee is composed of a fixed number of exporting and importing Members, with all others participating as observers

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision-making may be easier and more effective. • Ensures a balance between importing/exporting Members. • Ensures a more balanced geographical representation of the different regions. • All other Members can participate as observers. • The admission of observers and creation of ad-hoc working groups may still allow all Members' views to be collected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members would have to nominate Committee members through their respective spokespersons for the consideration and approval of the Council. • The nomination process would have to be carried out every year unless the proposed length of mandate and decision-making process were amended.

B) Open system – All Members participate in the Committee

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables the participation of all Members • Does not require any nomination process • Members participating in Committee discussions would be the same as those participating in the Council, potentially enabling continuity and streamlining decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be an imbalance between importing/ exporting Members. • In-depth discussions and reaching consensus may be difficult with broader participation. • Members participating in the Committee discussions would be the same as those participating in the Council, which could lead to repetition/duplication

C) Core group – Nomination of a core group

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be a compromise between the other two systems. • May ensure a balance between importing/exporting Members. • May ensure geographical representation of the different regions. • Overall membership would be open to all countries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as option (A) but formally all ICO Members would be members of the Committee. • Members would still have to nominate Committee members through their respective spokespersons for the consideration and approval of the Council. • Unclear distinction between the role and responsibilities of all members versus those of the core group • In-depth discussions and reaching consensus may be difficult with broader participation if the distinction between the core group and other members is not clear