

**Report on the 7th meeting of the Working
Group for the Entry into Force of the
International Coffee Agreement 2022**

Item 1: Adoption of the agenda	2
Item 2: Report of the 6 th meeting of the Working Group held on 13 May 2024.....	2
Item 3: Terms of Reference (ToRs) of the Economics Committee.....	2
Item 4: Participation of non-governmental stakeholders in the activities of the Organization..	2
Item 5: Date of next meeting.....	5
Item 6: Other business.....	5

1. The Working Group for the Entry into Force of the International Coffee Agreement 2022 (WGEF) met for the seventh time on 3 June 2024. The Chair of the Group, Mr Michael Wheeler of Papua New Guinea, welcomed all participants and thanked delegates for their presence.

2. Representatives of the following Members were present online using Zoom software: Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, European Union (including EU-Italy and EU-Sweden), India, Japan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Russian Federation, and Togo.

Item 1: Adoption of the agenda

3. The agenda contained in document [WGEF-21/24](#) was adopted.

Item 2: Report of the 6th meeting of the Working Group held on 13 May 2024

4. The Chair presented the report of the previous meeting, contained in document [WGEF-20/24](#).

5. In response to a request from Brazil to make a correction to paragraph 16 of the document in question, the Secretariat informed Members that the necessary amendments would be made after bilateral consultations with Brazil.

6. The WGEF took note of the report.

Item 3: Terms of Reference (ToRs) of the Economics Committee

7. The Chair noted that, at the previous WGEF meeting, he had put forward a proposal to reduce the number of seats for each subregional group on the producing side, with 10 seats (two per subregion) for exporting Members and three seats for importing Members.

8. The WGEF approved the proposal submitted by the Chair.

Item 4: Participation of non-governmental stakeholders in the activities of the Organization

9. With reference to the Board of Affiliate Members (BAM), the following set of pending questions was shared on the screen:

- (a) Should the BAM maintain the standard categories of exporting and importing countries and a balance between the two, to maintain geographical representation?
- (b) Should there be a balance between the number of private sector entities and NGOs?

- (c) Should there be a balance among the different private sector entities based on their size?
- (d) Should an ICO Member be in charge of checking that eligibility criteria are met for same-nationality entities? Should an Evaluation Committee be in charge of assessing applications?
- (e) What should be the modalities for the review of affiliate member status?
- (f) How could potential conflicts of interest between the activities of an affiliate member and the objectives of the ICO be assessed?
- (g) What could be the criteria for the suspension of affiliate member status?
- (h) Should the BAM have a maximum number of affiliate members?
- (i) What should be the criteria upon which the Council reviews affiliate member status annually?
- (j) Should a Member that has previously endorsed an entity be able to withdraw its endorsement?

10. The delegate of Brazil noted that, as already mentioned by the delegate of India, questions (a), (b), and (c) would be relevant only if there was an agreement to identify a fixed number of affiliate members. He clarified that matters related to balance would in fact make sense only once the number in question had been agreed.

11. The delegate of EU-Italy emphasized that the BAM's priority should be to be as inclusive as possible at the beginning in order to get stakeholders involved and not limit their participation. He noted that defining rules about geographical representation, balance between categories and exporting and importing countries without knowing who would express their interest in participating was premature.

12. The delegate of Brazil reiterated that its national coffee sector was in favour of an equilibrium between importing and exporting countries, as well as a limit on the number of members in the BAM in order to ensure active participation. He then suggested that the BAM start with a conservative approach and consider expanding membership if there was real interest from stakeholders. He noted that the participation of non-governmental stakeholders in international organizations of a different nature to that of the ICO (such as the ITU) should not be taken into account. Finally, he suggested that Members compile a list of associations and stakeholders representing the sector that they would like to see become part of the BAM, in order to then check if they were interested in joining said Board.

13. The Chair noted that some membership-based associations would struggle to become members of the BAM as it would likely go against their own rules and, in this sense, Members should think of possible solutions – such as exempting them from paying contributions to the BAM – in order to enable their participation in the activities of the Organization

14. Although he did not have a final opinion on the questions at hand, the delegate of India stressed that a compromise between the positions expressed by Brazil and EU-Italy could be

identified. He suggested that the BAM could have limited membership for the first three years after its establishment as this would allow Members to monitor the evolution of stakeholders' engagement and their participation. He then shared a table containing proposed percentages of representation for each category of private sector and civil society stakeholders contained in his original proposal, stressing that discussions on balance between producing and consuming countries could only take place once Members had agreed on the abovementioned percentages. He finally reiterated the importance of encouraging meaningful participation of non-governmental stakeholders in the activities of the Organization.

15. The delegate of EU-Italy expressed that he was in favour of a step-by-step approach that would allow Members to identify limits and criteria for categorizing stakeholders once they had actually showed their willingness and interest in getting involved in the activities of the BAM. He also stressed that an initial restriction could pose risks and prevent participation of the private sector and civil society.

16. The Chair emphasized that non-governmental stakeholders would join the BAM only if they saw the real benefits of getting involved. With reference to the intervention of India, he supported the suggestion of identifying balance among the different categories of private sector and civil society stakeholders first, before considering setting number limits on membership.

17. Given the advisory role of the BAM, as provided for in the ICA 2022, the delegate of Brazil noted that ensuring equal representation (50:50) between exporting and importing countries was essential in order to guarantee that the interests of both groups would be taken into account equally. He also noted that the Private Sector Consultative Board, which had a fixed number of members, still had vacant seats at the time.

18. Noting that several delegations had not yet expressed their opinion on the important questions at hand, the Chair instructed the Secretariat to prepare a questionnaire to be circulated to ICO Members in order to gather inputs and make further progress in discussions. He stressed that the information collected would be shared anonymously and would not represent the official final position of delegations.

19. With reference to the questionnaire, the Secretariat clarified that only one submission per Member would be accepted.

20. The delegate of Brazil suggested that Members request their national associations and relevant bodies to provide a list of potential non-governmental entities that could be interested in becoming members of the BAM.

21. Regarding the question on who should be responsible for the assessment of applications for the BAM, the Chair noted that leaving it to Members could create diplomatic tension among countries, whereas establishing an Evaluation Committee could reduce this risk.

22. In response to the Chair, the delegate of Brazil noted that an existing committee such as the Economics Committee could be assigned the task of assessing applications, thus avoiding the need for the creation of a new body. He also stressed how delicate it would be for the Chair of the Council to vet applications during Council sessions given the impact this could have on the reputation of applicants.

23. With reference to the intervention of Brazil, the delegate of Papua New Guinea noted that having applications assessed by an existing committee would make the whole process and its outcomes public, compromising confidentiality.

24. In order to avoid the rejection of applications at the Council, the delegate of India suggested that all applications be circulated to Members so that they could verify whether they would have any objection to a given application.

25. The delegate of EU-Italy endorsed the creation of an Evaluation Committee to streamline the assessment process.

26. The Head of Operations noted that a potential committee should be in charge of checking compliance with eligibility criteria only, as any application would need to be endorsed by an ICO Member according to the provisions of the ICA 2022.

27. The delegate of Brazil pointed out that, as the Council would be in charge of accepting or rejecting applications, as provided for in Article 6 of the ICA 2022, applications would eventually need to be circulated to all ICO Members.

28. The Chair noted that Members would need to carefully consider and identify a way to avoid embarrassment at Council sessions taking into account the Council's role in the process at hand according to the 2022 Agreement.

Item 5: Date of next meeting

29. The dates of future meetings were shared on screen for Members' reference, with the following meeting having been scheduled for 15 July 2024.

Item 6: Other business

30. With no further topics to address, the Chair thanked Members for their active participation.

LIST OF PENDING QUESTIONS**Board of Affiliate Members (BAM)**

- (a) Should the BAM maintain the standard categories of exporting and importing countries and a balance between the two, to maintain geographical representation?
- (b) Should there be a balance between the number of private sector entities and NGOs?
- (c) Should there be a balance among the different private sector entities based on their size?
- (d) Should an ICO Member be in charge of checking that eligibility criteria are met for same-nationality entities? Should an Evaluation Committee be in charge of assessing applications?
- (e) What should be the modalities for the review of affiliate member status?
- (f) How could potential conflicts of interest between the activities of an affiliate member and the objectives of the ICO be assessed?
- (g) What could be the criteria for the suspension of affiliate member status?
- (h) Should the BAM have a maximum number of affiliate members?
- (i) What should be the criteria upon which the Council reviews affiliate member status annually?
- (j) Should a Member that has previously endorsed an entity be able to withdraw its endorsement?