INTERNATIONAL COFFEE ORGANIZATION

JC 17/25

29 August 2025
Original: English

E

Report of the 4th meeting of the Joint Committee

1. The Joint Committee (JC) met for the fourth time in London, United Kingdom, on 19 August 2025. The meeting was presided by the Chair of the Committee, Mr Zoltan Agaï of the EU-European Commission.

2. Representatives of the following Members were present online using the Zoom software:

   (a) Exporting Members: Brazil, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Panama, Philippines, and Togo; and

   (b) Importing Members: European Union (including EU representative, EU-Italy and EU-Sweden), Norway and Switzerland.

3. The Executive Director welcomed all delegates and provided a summary of the progress made so far on the seven initiatives proposed in March 2025 at the 2nd meeting of the JC. She mentioned that four had been discussed in June during the 3rd meeting, while another three (Initiatives 5, 6, and 7) remained pending. The Executive Director added that several Members, including Brazil and Colombia, had provided written feedback on these, with comments from the former received on 15 August 2025.

4. The Executive Director clarified that the 4th meeting would be focused exclusively on the aforementioned three initiatives and the procedures for proposing future projects or reviews. She mentioned that the reports from the 3rd and 4th meetings would be circulated together, alongside the revised report of the 2nd meeting, incorporating recent comments from Brazil.

5. The Executive Director mentioned that, to avoid confusion, the documents being used as the basis for discussions were the same as those circulated ahead of the June meeting. She added that all suggestions would be integrated into the final reports following the meeting and suggested that a further virtual JC meeting be held in September, before the meetings of the International Coffee

Council (ICC), due to take place in October in Honduras. The Executive Director clarified that this would enable discussions to be finalized beforehand, while noting that there would be additional space for discussions in Honduras, if necessary.

6. At the request of the Chair, the Head of Operations informed those present that a quorum had been reached.

7. The delegate of El Salvador proposed, subject to the agreement of all present, that each intervention be limited to a maximum of five minutes. He suggested that this would help avoid the monopolization of discussions and ensure that all Members had the opportunity to speak, while also allowing the meeting to address the full agenda in a timely manner. With the agreement of Members, he requested that this be duly noted in the record so that it could serve as a guiding rule for the present and future meetings of the JC.

8. The delegate of Brazil made two observations in response to statements made by the Executive Director and delegate of El Salvador:

(a) First, according to the terms of reference of the JC, that all decisions and all recommendations should be prepared three weeks before the ICC. The delegate of Brazil noted that there was a reason for the three-week deadline, which was that the ICC should receive all the decisions of the JC in advance. He added that the suggestion proposed by the Executive Director to hold a meeting of the JC during the Council sessions in Honduras would go against terms of reference of the JC, and as such it could not be approved. The delegate of Brazil clarified, however, that there could be as many meetings as necessary three weeks prior to the Council in San Pedro Sula, Honduras.

(b) Second, the delegate of Brazil observed that his country did not agree to any time limit on the expressions of Members. He added that the JC was created to stimulate dialogue, and that there was no rule either in the rules of the International Coffee Organization (ICO) or the terms of reference of the JC limiting observations to five minutes. The delegate of Brazil clarified that the substance and the message provided by Members to other countries, the Secretariat and Executive Director were more important than time limits, and noted that Brazil did not agree with the proposal of El Salvador. The delegate of Brazil further elaborated that he had many observations to make, some of which would last more than five minutes. He also observed that there would be opportunities to have further meetings with less crowded agendas up to three weeks prior to the meeting in San Pedro Sula, Honduras.

9. The Executive Director explained that the idea behind holding a JC meeting during the Council in Honduras was to take advantage of Members' physical presence and convene an in-person meeting that would allow for more detailed discussions and consideration of future decisions. However, she added that the decisions of such a meeting would not be presented to the Council in Honduras. Instead, decisions to be presented to the Council would be discussed and finalized in September, on a

date to be approved during the present meeting, most likely during the third week of September, three or four weeks prior to the Council meeting in Honduras.

10. The delegate of Brazil emphasized that any talks in San Pedro Sula could not be classified or characterized as meetings of the JC, since its terms of reference stipulate that recommendations of the Committee should be closed and finished three weeks prior to Council sessions. Furthermore, he added that Members would have many topics to discuss, informally or formally, but that no decision on a report from a JC meeting in Honduras would be possible. Again, he clarified that the terms of reference agreed upon by Member States stipulated that recommendations to be submitted to the Council should be prepared three weeks prior to the Session. The delegate of Brazil informed those present that this topic was very important to Brazil, adding that the rules that Members had unanimously adopted not so long ago could not start to be bent or changed.

11. The Executive Director agreed with the delegate of Brazil on both points: (i) that the terms of reference of the JC allowed for as many meetings as necessary; and (ii) that decisions of any JC meeting held in Honduras would not be presented at the 140th Session of the Council. She added that any decision stemming from a JC meeting held in Honduras would be applicable only to the Council meeting to be held in March 2026.

12. The Chair summarized that, while a meeting could be held in Honduras if Members so wished, no recommendations arising therefrom could be submitted to the Council**.** With the quorum confirmed, the Chair reminded delegates of the extensive agenda to be covered and encouraged brief interventions. The Chair noted that the 4th meeting would continue discussions from the 3rd JC meeting (three of the seven initiatives, plus procedures for submissions of proposals). He added that further written comments had been received from Brazil and Colombia, and that Members had had the chance to review these and react.

13. The Chair also reminded Members that the reports of the 3rd and 4th meetings would be circulated afterwards.

Item 1: Draft Agenda – ***to adopt***

14. The Chair invited Members to adopt the draft agenda (document JC-16/25 Rev. 1) or propose amendments/other business.

15. The delegate of Brazil sought clarification on whether the item "Status of Implementation of the Five-Year Action Plan", as outlined in document JC 14/25, dated 6 June 2025, was open for comments from Member delegations.

16. The Executive Director confirmed that the item was open for comments. However, given the limited time (10 minutes) allocated to this agenda item, it was suggested that an extensive list of comments be submitted in writing, as was done with the initiatives. She explained that this would allow for circulation among Member delegations for prior review and ensure a more productive and focused discussion later. The Executive Director emphasized that the Secretariat remained open to suggestions for improving this exercise.

17. The delegate of Brazil observed that the aforementioned document presented, for the first time in seven years, or more precisely, since September 2018, a report on the ongoing implementation of the Five-Year Action Plan. He added that this was a valuable opportunity for Members to offer their assessment of the Organization's work, but that a productive dialogue would not be feasible due to the time constraints imposed by an overloaded agenda. As such, the delegate of Brazil respectfully suggested that the Secretariat's presentation and Members' comments on the progress of the Five-Year Action Plan be postponed to the next JC meeting, three weeks prior to the 140th Session of the Council. Noting that, in Brazil's view, the significance of this topic warranted a thorough and substantive discussion among Members, which would be impossible in the 10-minute slot that was allowed for both the presentation of the Secretariat and the comments from Members, he proposed the deletion of this item from the Agenda.

18. The Chair agreed that the "Status of implementation of the Five-Year Action Plan" was a strategically important item, which in any case should be discussed by the Council itself. The Committee agreed to delete the item from the agenda.

19. The delegate of Brazil then observed that the proposed Agenda seemed to be missing an item, specifically regarding the document JC-09/25, entitled "Report of the 2nd Meeting of the Joint Committee", to be considered and, if appropriate, approved. He recalled that during the 3rd meeting of the JC, the delegation of Brazil had indicated its intention to submit corrections and amendments to the text proposed by the Secretariat, particularly concerning the dialogue it had maintained with the former ICO Head of Operations, Mr Gerardo Patacconi, regarding the submission of proposals for studies, surveys, documents and projects which were among the core activities under discussion within the JC. The delegate of Brazil highlighted that these amendments and comments had been formally presented to the Secretariat the previous week and that they should be reported and circulated to Member States, adding that this procedure was needed for transparency and information on the positions and opinions on the matters being discussed. Finally, he kindly requested that either the Executive Director or the Secretariat explain the procedure to be followed for the approval of the Report of the 2nd meeting of the Joint Committee.

20. The Executive Director replied that very late arrival of comments had left insufficient time to translate and circulate the revised Report of the 2nd meeting of the Joint Committee in time for the 4th meeting. She reiterated that any comments and meeting reports would be circulated and presented for approval during the following meeting. Specifically, she referred to the Report of the 2nd meeting, which would be revised to reflect the comments of Brazil (available in **Annex I**); the Report of the 3rd meeting; and the Report of the 4th meeting, all of which would be submitted ahead of the proposed meeting in September 2025.

21. The delegate of Brazil thanked the Executive Director for the clarifications, and requested to take the floor under Item 5 in order to address three matters of particular interest to the Brazilian delegation: (i) the Organization's website; (ii) the report to be submitted to the Council three weeks prior to the session in San Pedro Sula; and (iii) the scope and impact of the work currently being undertaken by the JC.

22. The Chair asked for final comments on the agenda. With no objections, the agenda was adopted.

Item 2 **Proposed initiatives and reports 2024/25: Initiatives 5, 6 and 7 only** - *to consider and, if appropriate, to recommend for approval*

23. Given that some Members, including Brazil, Colombia and the EU, had already submitted written contributions via SharePoint, the Chair requested short interventions that focused on priorities and next steps in order to avoid repetition. He announced that the Head of Operations would present the remaining Initiatives 5, 6 and 7, with conclusions drawn after each, reflecting Members' written inputs.

24. The delegate of Brazil requested that, instead of bundling together all the initiatives as was done at the last meeting, the Secretariat explain the Executive Director's initiatives one by one, for the sake of practicality, followed by Members' discussions on each. Furthermore, he requested that any observations made by the delegation of Brazil, as well as all previously submitted written explanations, be inserted in the report of the present meeting in their entirety in order to ensure they are fully reflected and properly recorded. The delegate of Brazil noted that failure to do so would require delegations to repeat these points in order for them to be officially registered.

25. The Chair confirmed that the meeting would proceed initiative by initiative, with a conclusion after each one. He added that the relevant comments from Members were already available on SharePoint and could be incorporated in the report. The Chair welcomed the delegate of Brazil's constructive proposal and requested that the Secretariat reflect these comments in writing.

26. The Head of Operations presented Initiative 5 "Widening variables of the ICO Database." She highlighted that the delegation of Brazil had submitted written responses on Initiatives 5-7 and that Colombia had submitted written responses on Initiatives 3 & 5-7, which were distributed to Members on 14 August 2025. The EU submitted responses to Initiatives 1-7. All comments are attached as **Annexes II**, **III** and **IV**.

27. The delegate of Brazil commented that his country had repeatedly stressed the importance of the statistical services provided by the International Coffee Organization, and that no agreement could be given to the Executive Director's proposal under Initiative 5. He highlighted that, in the opinion of the Brazilian government and the producing segments of its coffee value chain, if the International Coffee Organization were to become the world's most respected statistical authority in coffee, comparable to other London-based international commodity organizations such as the International Sugar Organization and the International Grains Council, which are held in high regard for their respective sectors, it would need to focus on its basic services, which had not yet been duly supplied. The delegate of Brazil recommended that the Executive Director examine the report prepared by H.E. Ambassador Aly Toure, of Côte d'Ivoire, in 2015, which led to the approval of the Five-Year Plan, in which the same topics discussed at the present meeting had been referred to. Furthermore, he expressed that the Organization should "do its homework" on an effective and efficient basis, but noted that in 2025 this was still not the case. He therefore encouraged the Secretariat to concentrate on the basics and stated that once it was in a state-of-the-art situation, other avenues could be considered.

28. The delegate of EU-Italy expressed agreement on the need to strengthen data collection, noting that the ICO should aim to be the global reference for coffee statistics. However, he added that the Organization's leadership in statistics could be limited if it did not expand its coverage of certain variables within the coffee sector. The delegate of EU-Italy argued that strengthening data collection and broadening variables were not incompatible, and that benchmarking with third-party data was also important.

29. The delegate of Brazil thanked the delegate of EU-Italy for his observations of regarding the widening of new variables, but did not endorse this view, stating that the Organization's implementation of priorities regarding statistics was very low. He added that, for some years, the funds proposed by the Secretariat for this strategic activity amounted, in reality, to a disinvestment, implying that the suggested allocation was lower than the revenue generated by the Organization's statistical services. The delegate of Brazil asserted that this situation demonstrated a clear insufficiency on the part of the ICO in performing this core function and delivering the output expected by Members. He emphasized that before expanding services, data or other references, the Organization should first focus on the basics in terms of investments, equipment, and most of all, the personnel dedicated to this core activity. The delegate of Brazil highlighted that statistical data collection had been considered in all ICO documents since 2007 as the first and foremost important activity of the Organization, but that this was not being reflected in its actions, particularly with respect to budgetary actions. For this reason, he stated that the delegation of Brazil could not agree to Initiative 5 at the present time or allow the Organization to concentrate its efforts on activities other than its core services which should be perfectly delivered in the desired manner. That said, the delegate of Brazil clarified that the initiative could be reconsidered in the future, once the Organization's core functions are fully established.

30. The delegate of EU-Italy agreed on the importance of considering the timeframe for implementation, highlighting that while timely and robust data collection was essential, widening the range of variables—alongside benchmarking with third-party data—could make ICO statistics more valuable. He added that this, in turn, would strengthen the ICO's position as the global reference point for coffee statistics.

31. While indicating that there was general agreement with the overall goals of Initiative 5, the delegate of El Salvador echoed the delegate of Brazil's position, stressing that before expanding the scope of variables in the ICO database, priority should be given to ensuring Members' full compliance with the basic statistical requirements already requested.

32. With no additional interventions, the Chair concluded discussions on Initiative 5, noting that it would not be adopted**.** Instead, he noted that the focus should remain on strengthening the basics of data collection and Member compliance**.**

33. The Head of Operations presented Initiative 6 "Linking database of standardized georeferences of coffee plots to aggregated national Certificates of Origin".

34. The delegate of Brazil considered Initiative 6 an extremely acritical suggestion, noting that by linking geo-references of coffee plots the International Coffee Organization would effectively be

promoting the global application of national and regional regulations governing coffee trade. He pointed out that those regulations applied only to the countries and regions that approved them, and that the Committee was not discussing the rights, feasibility or applicability of such regulations. What was important, he emphasized, was that the Organization, without any critical thinking, would be adopting the initiative and acting as an agent to effectively promote regional or national trade barriers, which he described as a very important yet very deceiving and disappointing aspect of the proposal.

35. The delegate of El Salvador sought clarification regarding the permissions for use of the information that would be collected across exporting countries and incorporated into the ICO Certificates of Origin database. Specifically, he asked whether the permissions in place would also cover the Organization. He stated that El Salvador considered the protection of this very sensitive information essential at both the national and internationals level, highlighting the importance of respecting national laws, regulations, procedures and the rights of all actors involved. Additionally, he noted that since the Secretariat had mentioned that this work had already been initiated in some countries, it would be helpful to receive feedback on the work carried out and on how beneficial the initiative had been in those countries.

36. The Head of Operations clarified that Initiative 6 built on ongoing national dialogues rather than being imposed by the ICO. For example, she explained that work was underway with Costa Rica to explore linking its system and the national geo-referenced coffee plot database with Certificates of Origin, including assessing feasibility and legal aspects. She also mentioned that Kenya had shown interest and had restarted discussions on this initiative.

37. The Chair, seeing no further comments or questions, concluded that Initiative 6 had not been adopted**.**

38. The Head of Operations presented Initiative 7 "Climate change resilience of coffee", noting that contributions had been received from Brazil and Colombia, both stressing that the ICO did not have the authority to qualify, assess, or evaluate national policies, schemes, operations, or strategies. She further noted that Brazil and Colombia had stated that the ICO should not make judgments about the adequacy or potential of specific regions, but that the EU had welcomed the study and the process on climate change.

39. The Chair noted that, although there was broad negative consensus on the proposal, there might still be some openings for further discussion and encouraged the Committee members to provide additional comments.

40. The delegate of Brazil, however, stated that there was in fact no opening regarding Initiative 7. He argued that, of all the initiatives proposed by the Executive Director, this was the most damaging and the most pernicious suggestion that had been proposed to Members. He stated that it reminded the delegation of Brazil of a "Soviet-style" discussion in which some members of the Secretariat might decide, by no clear parameters or objectives, which areas of coffee growing were adequate or not. He further noted that, more importantly, the initiative reminded the delegation of Brazil of the "infamous" study proposed by the International Coffee Organization, in 2023, in cooperation with the University of Wageningen, which clearly stated that coffee growing was a vector of deforestation, and that

Arabica coffee in Latin America was responsible for deforestation. He added that such projects, which had been repeatedly presented by the Organization, shared a common quality which was that, despite coffee being a tropical crop, the ICO Secretariat had established collaborative projects and programmes exclusively with institutions from non-producing countries. He recalled that, as previously expressed by the delegation of Brazil during the last JC meeting, the decisions taken since 2019 appeared to reflect a historically skewed approach to knowledge validation in the Organization, resembling a colonial mindset that implicitly denied the possibility of high-quality knowledge and expertise being generated in institutions in developing countries, suggesting a persistent bias against intellectual contributions from producing nations. The delegate of Brazil emphasized that this was the sad aspect of Initiative 7, and expressed hope that the Executive Director and the Secretariat would take note that developing countries and, most specifically, producing countries have expertise on the matter and should be duly consulted.

41. The delegate of Brazil confirmed that, in the opinion of his country, neither Initiative 7 nor any variable thereof could be undertaken. He stated that the only aspect of the initiative that could be carried out was the discussion of experiences, which could take place either within the JC or during sessions of the Council, noting that it was not necessary to carry out projects for countries to report on and exchange their experiences. He added that his delegation had had the opportunity to raise, during the last meeting of the Coffee Public-Private Task Force, that when discussing initiatives proposed by countries, the floor was not granted to producing countries, and that the reporting of experiences was often edited or not fully reflected in the documents of the Organization. The delegate of Brazil reiterated that Initiative 7 could not be undertaken, and that the exchange of experiences, inputs, and projects could largely take place within the Organization's existing fora.

42. The delegate of EU-Italy noted that downgrading Initiative 7 to focus on data collection and benchmarking of good practices might be an interesting and useful exercise for all. He added that this approach could take into account ongoing activities on climate change in producing countries and collaborations with private associations, such as World Coffee Research, which was conducting significant work on the issue. He emphasized that his intention was to be constructive and to explore how the exercise could be beneficial for everyone, particularly for producing countries.

43. The delegate of the European Union clarified that that he fully understood the delegation of Brazil's point and acknowledged that his own understanding had been more naive. He explained that he had perceived the proposal as a neutral one, with no intention to be judgmental or reflect a colonial spirit, noting that it would be implemented by the Secretariat itself, not by a university or research centre from an importing country.

44. The delegate of El Salvador welcomed Initiative 7 on climate change and coffee resilience, but raised questions about the criteria for selecting focus countries in the study. She emphasized that the initiative should take into account the cultural, geographic, and social distinctions of each country and, in some cases, of specific regions.

45. The Head of Operations responded to El Salvador's question, explaining that the study was designed as one case study per region, with criteria for country selection to be agreed jointly with ICO Members. Importantly, she added, the work would be carried out in partnership with universities in

producing countries, ensuring local involvement and sensitivity to social and cultural contexts, with the aim of making the study relevant and representative. The Head of Operations acknowledged Brazil's concern, noting that while the initial methodology had been developed by a research institution in France for IFAD and FAO, under the ICO it would be implemented in a way that reflects the diversity and realities of Member countries.

46. The Chair concluded discussions on Initiative 7, noting there was no consensus to recommend it to the Council**.** He further summarized that none of the three pending initiatives (5, 6, and 7) would be recommended, and thanked the Secretariat, as well as Brazil, Colombia, and the EU, for their extensive written and oral contributions. He requested that all written comments be included in the Secretariat's report.

Item 3: **Procedures for the submission and evaluation of proposals for ICO initiatives –** ***to consider and, if appropriate, to recommend for approval***

47. The Chair recalled that at the 2nd meeting of the JC, which took place in March 2025, the absence of clear procedures had been noted, leading to a six-week ad hoc consultation process prior to the 3rd meeting. He noted that the Committee needed to now decide on a permanent approach.

48. The Chair suggested focusing on two key considerations from document JC-13/25:

(a) Establishing consultation procedures for proposals of initiatives.

(b) Reaching consensus on how these procedures should be recommended to the International Coffee Council.

49. Referencing the written comments shared by Brazil and distributed to Members on 14 August 2025 (see **Annex V**), the Chair then invited Members to share their comments and asked the Head of Operations to provide further explanations.

50. The Head of Operations outlined Brazil's proposed revisions to the procedures, highlighting how they would make the process clearer, more aligned with ICO rules, and more pragmatic. Key elements include:

(a) **Annual work programme** – Proposals become part of an annual programme, ensuring predictability.

(b) **Submission of initiatives** – Both Members and the Executive Director may propose initiatives during ICC or Joint Committee sessions, setting a clear starting point.

(c) **Translation and consultation** – Translation occurs first, followed by a full six-week consultation period**,** ensuring all members have equal time to consult stakeholders.

(d) **Compilation of Inputs** – Member comments must be compiled, translated, and distributed (not just shared individually).

(e) **Approval flow** – Consensus is reached in the Joint Committee, then forwarded to the ICC three weeks before the session.

(f) **Two-stage review**:

(i) **Stage 1 ("What"):** General proposal is reviewed and, if approved by ICC, becomes part of the work plan.

(ii) **Stage 2 ("How"):** Detailed methodology and implementation plan undergo translation, a six-week consultation, and Joint Committee approval before moving forward.

(g) **Final Results** – Any resulting project or report must be approved by the Joint Committee before dissemination.

51. The Head of Operations presented a proposed timeline, based on the delegation of Brazil's proposal, as follows:

(a) **Spring ICC/JC sessions (March/April):** Proposals submitted.

(b) **April–June:** Translation + six-week consultation, compilation of inputs.

(c) **Autumn ICC (Sept/Oct):** Approval of proposals ("what").

(d) **Post-ICC:** Development of detailed methods, translation, six-week consultation.

(e) **January JC session:** Approval of implementation details ("how").

52. She clarified that this cycle would take about 10 months, ensuring transparency, inclusiveness (via multiple translation rounds), and clear distinctions between the objectives and the methods.

53. The Chair thanked the Secretariat and Brazil for their extensive input, noting that while the revised procedures might appear complex, they were fully consistent with the rules, provided clarity on timeframes, and ensured proper translation and circulation in all official languages**.**

54. He proposed that the Secretariat prepare a revised version of document JC-13/25 for the next meeting, rather than seeking immediate consensus. With no further comments from Members, the Chair moved to the next sub-item: agreeing on the timing for submission of procedures, stressing that delays were already affecting the current coffee year and carried implications for the following one.

55. The Head of Operations noted that if the Committee were to follow the procedures exactly as proposed by the delegation of Brazil, proposals from the Executive Director and Members should have already been submitted during the Spring 2025 ICC/Joint Committee sessions, meaning that the process was now very delayed for the 2025/26 cycle**.**

56. To address this, the Head of Operations proposed a one-time exception, as follows:

(a) Hold a Joint Committee meeting in December 2025, where Members and the Executive Director can submit initiatives.

(b) After translation, begin a consultation round by 15 January 2026.

(c) Hold a Joint Committee in late February/early March 2026 to allow recommendations to be provided in time for the Spring 2026 Session of the Council.

(d) Simultaneously prepare proposals for 2026/27, to be submitted at the Spring 2026 Session of the Council.

57. The Head of Operations clarified that this adjustment would allow the 2025/26 process to move forward despite delays, while aligning future cycles with the standard annual timeline.

58. The delegate of Brazil stated that his delegation considered that several initiatives were already scheduled to be presented to the Council this year. He noted that, in other London-based commodity organizations, typically only one or two initiatives were produced per year. He emphasized that the delegation of Brazil considered it better for the Organization to have consensually agreed initiatives that are continuously monitored by Members prior to wider dissemination. Regarding the suggested temporary proposal, he indicated that his delegation did not see a need to accelerate the procedure as suggested. However, if approved by the Council in Honduras, he added that the work could begin the following year according to the calendar to avoid overlapping with procedures already agreed by Member States. The delegate of Brazil concluded by stating that the focus should be on very few initiatives with good results and consensus, rather than multiplying analyses that have little impact and which are ultimately not appreciated by the producing segments of the value chain.

59. Referring to Brazil's earlier remarks, the Chair clarified that the Committee would await a revised version of document JC-13/25 from the Secretariat and that, if approved, this would then be proposed to the Council for adoption. He added that, once adopted, the Committee would follow the formal timeframe set out in the procedures. For the current cycle, he noted that the temporary timing exception could serve as a practical way forward**,** without needing to formally write it into the rules. He indicated that, from the following cycle onward, the Committee was expected to operate strictly under the adopted procedures.

60. The delegate of Brazil stated that if the revised version of JC-13/25 were accepted, the Committee should start the procedures outlined within the document and not adopt any temporary calendar suggested by the Secretariat. He emphasized that Brazil would not be prepared to join a consensus on temporary measures once the suggestion were approved.

61. The Chair concluded Agenda item 3, noting that the Committee had requested that the Secretariat present a revised version of document JC-13/25 at the next JC meeting.

Item 5: Other updates and other business – *to consider*

62. The Chair invited Brazil to elaborate on the three additional points raised under Agenda item 1.

63. The delegate of Brazil stated that first item concerned the Mandatory Reports page of the Organization's website, which still included Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs). He noted that the Brazilian government, as well as the producing segments of the coffee chain in Brazil, did not consider MRL reports to be a mandatory action for the Organization. Thus, the delegate of Brazil kindly

requested that the Organization delete this section of the page, as well as the three links listed thereon.

64. The delegate of Brazil stated that his second observation referred to how the report of the JC would be considered for submission to the Council in San Pedro Sula. He asked the Executive Director and the Secretariat how the next steps regarding the report, which must be submitted to the Council three weeks in advance, would be dealt with.

65. The third observation of the delegate of Brazil was that his country considered the scope and impact of the work currently being undertaken and discussed by Members in the JC to also apply to all fora of the Organization, including the Coffee Public-Private Task Force (CPPTF). He noted that this observation had arisen from a recent disappointing experience where topics presented within the Joint Committee that had faced opposition from Members were reintroduced again within the CPPTF, which he likened to a "whack-a-mole" situation. He acknowledged that the primary objective of the CPPTF was public, due to the presence of ICO Members who could endorse or reject initiatives, adding that otherwise initiatives could be promoted outside the Organization by the private entities that make up the Task Force. He concluded that this was an important observation his delegation wished to make and have recorded concerning the scope and reach of the current work being undertaken.

66. The Executive Director explained that website updates would be implemented after the meeting. Regarding the report of the meeting, she reiterated that the Secretariat was open to Brazil's suggestions and proposed either to discuss it during the present meeting or to meet in London the following week to draft a structure together. She clarified that the JC and CPPTF were separate entities, each acting according to their own terms of reference, and both reporting to the Council, with no transfer of responsibilities between them. The Executive Director reiterated that she aimed to correct any gaps and improve procedures, thanked the delegate of Brazil for his feedback, and invited him to provide further suggestions.

67. The delegate of Brazil stated that his country considered transparency should be the guiding principle of the Organization and that it should not deal with the Brazilian delegation or any specific delegation in isolation. He added that documents containing the conclusions of the committees should be circulated beforehand so that all Member countries could forward their observations, not just Brazil. Regarding the CPPTF, he emphasized that it is part of the Organization and not independent, and that decisions taken by Members should be followed by the Task Force; otherwise, the public aspect of the public-private duality would be missing. He recalled that Initiative 7 had moved back and forth between the CPPTF and the JC, which should not happen, as it doubled the efforts of ICO Member States and implied that the Secretariat and the Organization did not answer to Member States. He stressed that the ICO Secretariat was mandated by Member States and that the latter were collectively present within the Organization for the purpose of identifying consensual initiatives or to find initiatives that receive consensus.

Item 6: Next steps and next meeting – *to note*

68. The Committee agreed that its next meeting would be held during the week of 15 September 2025, with the official invitation to follow. The Chair thanked the Secretariat and Members for their contributions and declared the fourth meeting of the JC closed.

The Representation of Brazil respectfully submits to the Joint Committee the following amendments and proposed additions to the draft text presented by the Secretariat of the International Coffee Organization, concerning the report of the 2nd meeting of the Joint Committee, as outlined in document JC 09/25, dated 1 May 2025.

2. As underscored by the Brazilian delegation during the third meeting of the Joint Committee, a detailed account of the discussion held during the second meeting between Brazil's representative and the then Head of Operations of the ICO -- regarding the mechanisms and procedures for achieving consensual agreement among Members on the formulation, appraisal, approval, evaluation, and wide dissemination of studies, surveys, reports, and projects --, should be properly recorded for future consultation and reference.

3. As repeatedly emphasized by the Brazilian delegation during the meetings of the Joint Committee -- as well in the sessions of the Public-Private Task Force --, the endorsement and agreement of Members on initiatives to be implemented by the Organization are essential to ensure that the actions taken by the ICO and its subsidiary bodies genuinely reflect and respond to the common objectives shared by participating Members.

4. At stake is the principle of representativeness: the extent to which the Organization's initiatives are shaped by and for its Members, reflecting the desired transparency, accountability, and responsiveness to their shared objectives, and thereby ensuring its institutional legitimacy and sound governance.

5. The following chart is included to facilitate visual comparison and enable structured analysis between the draft text proposed by the ICO Secretariat and the amendments and additions presented by Brazil. Additions are highlighted in yellow, while deletions are marked in red strikethrough.

London, 15 August 2025

ORIGINAL DRAFT TEXT ITEM 5.3 DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS PARAGRAPH 25	CORRECTIONS BY THE BRAZILIAN DELEGATION
The delegate of Brazil made the following observations. The delegate referred to the observation of the Head of Operations about not having received any indication from countries for projects or topics of interest. The delegate explained that he did not have any knowledge of the Secretariat circulating inquiries to Member states about any priority or project of their preference. The delegate referred to the International Sugar Organization, where traditionally countries were consulted about their topics of interest The delegate stressed that proposals for studies and projects needed to be circulated beforehand so that Members could analyse and evaluate the proposals together with the stakeholders of the value chain in their respective countries.	The delegate of Brazil made the following observations. The delegate referred to the observation of the Head of Operations about not having received any indication from countries for projects or topics of interest. The delegate of Brazil explained that his delegation did not have any knowledge of the Secretariat circulating inquiries to Member states about any priority or project of their preference. The delegate referred to the International Sugar Organization, where traditionally countries were consulted about topics of interest for projects to be developed by that organization. The delegate stressed that proposals for studies and projects needed to be circulated beforehand, so that Members could duly analyse and evaluate the proposals together with the stakeholders of the value chain in their respective countries.

ORIGINAL DRAFT TEXT ITEM 5.3 DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS PARAGRAPH 28	CORRECTIONS BY THE BRAZILIAN DELEGATION
The Head of Operations clarified that there was no procedure for submissions of project proposals by Members, however a formal process could be developed at the request of the Committee.	The Head of Operations expressed his appreciation for the three points raised by the delegate of Brazil and responded to each of them to the best of his knowledge. Regarding the context in which Members might submit project proposals, the Head of Operations explained that since he joined the Organization in 2018, this has not been standard practice. Nonetheless, he acknowledged that both the Committee and the Council could consider formalising such a process in the future. The Head of Operations recalled that prior to his arrival -- particularly during the period when the Common Fund for Commodities (CFC) was active --, a dedicated committee was responsible for reviewing project proposals. He stated that, following the dismantling of that system, however, only a limited number of proposals have been submitted by Members. Notably, he referred to proposals from Kenya and Uganda, as well as a joint submission from Honduras and Nicaragua addressing the impacts of hurricanes.

	The Head of Operations also noted that the Organization had been operating in line with the established procedures of the International Coffee Organization. He stressed, however, that Members remain fully empowered to determine whether a specific mechanism should be created for the development of project proposals and technical cooperation initiatives. With reference to the current presentation and its associated report, the Head of Operations indicated that the Secretariat would explore ways to share relevant information with Members in advance, following practices used in other contexts. The Head of Operations concluded by stating that the summary presented reflected his understanding and experience. While acknowledging his limited time with the Organization, he affirmed that existing procedures had remained largely unchanged during his tenure and expressed confidence that the Secretariat would remain open and responsive to the evolving needs and requests of Members.

ORIGINAL DRAFT TEXT ITEM 5.3 DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS PARAGRAPH 36	CORRECTIONS BY THE BRAZILIAN DELEGATION
The delegate of Brazil asked again for more details of all proposed projects and studies and insisted to have time for detailed analysis by Members of the proposals made by the Secretariat. The description should include the objectives to be achieved, and the methodologies used. The delegate explained that no study or report can be published and stamped by the ICO without prior consultation of the Members on the relevance of the study and on the draft reports of the study. The delegate referred bad experiences in the last two years with two reports by the ICO that made statements that were not in line with the goals and priorities of coffee producing countries. This needed to be avoided in the future.	The delegate of Brazil reiterated the request ~~asked again~~ for more details of all proposed projects and studies and insisted that Members should be granted appropriate time for detailed analysis of the proposals made. The delegate insisted that the descriptions should include the objectives to be achieved, and the methodologies used, as well as a clear explanation of how the studies align with the strategic priorities and mandate of the Organization, as outlined in document ICC.136.11. The delegate of Brazil also explained that no study or report shall be published and stamped by the ICO without prior consultation of the Members on the relevance of the study and on the draft reports of the study. The delegate referred to previous negative experiences ~~bad experiences~~ in the last two years with two studies ~~reports~~ by the ICO that made statements that were not in line with the goals and priorities of coffee producing countries. ~~This needed to be avoided in the future~~. To prevent the recurrence of such situations, the delegate of Brazil proposed that the Secretariat should prepare a comprehensive and detailed explanation for each study, which should be circulated to Members before any further discussion or approval.

INITIATIVE 5 - WIDENING VARIABLES OF THE ICO DATABASE

The entities within Brazil's national coffee sector consider the production of accurate, high-quality statistics to be a priority for the organization. This activity is regarded as the most important service provided by the International Coffee Organization (ICO) to both coffee-producing and importing countries.

2. Whether in the Joint Committee meetings, budget discussions, or in contacts with the Executive Director, Head of Operations, or the Secretariat, the Brazilian Delegation has repeatedly emphasized the importance of universal and timely collection of statistical data, as mandated by the organization's regulations.

3. In its most recent document on compliance with statistical reporting rules -- JC 02/24, dated 22 August 2024 -- the ICO acknowledges that only 28.4% of producing countries submit the required data on time. This figure represents less than one-third of exporting members.

4. In light of the above, Brazil considers that before expanding the variables in the organization's database or implementing predictive models -- as suggested by the initiative led by the Executive Director -- the ICO should first focus on strengthening the procedures for collecting statistical data currently required from member countries. It would also be beneficial for the organization to broaden the involvement of exporting countries in these efforts, thereby ensuring that the core statistical functions -- which are essential to the national coffee sectors of Member States -- are delivered in a timely and effective manner.

5. In this context, Brazil believes that, before considering the expansion of variables within the organization's database or implementing predictive models -- as outlined in the initiative proposed by the Executive Director -- the ICO should first prioritize strengthening the procedures for collecting the statistical data currently required from member countries. Additionally, Brazil considers it essential that the organization take active steps to engage and support exporting countries in these efforts, thereby ensuring that its core statistical functions are delivered in a timely and efficient manner to the national coffee sectors of Member States.

6. In an ongoing scenario in which the ICO faces challenges in fulfilling its core responsibility of compiling statistical data on coffee -- as set forth in documents approved by member countries, including the Statistics Regulations (ICC 102-10) -- and has not consistently undertaken efforts or invested in measures to support the basic provision of such information, Brazil considers it more prudent and beneficial for all Member States that the Organization focus its attention on resolving the structural issues affecting the compilation and dissemination of the data currently required, rather than prioritizing the expansion of variables or the enlargement of data collected or even supplying estimating services on future scenarios.

7. Specifically, with regard to the suggestion in Initiative 5 to establish APIs between the ICO database and those of Member States -- which Brazil considers instrumental in accelerating the supply and processing of information currently required from producing and importing countries, and which Brazil understands does not entail any increase in the number of variables in the data presently supplied -- Brazil proposes the establishment of an ad hoc Working Group, composed of representatives from the statistical bodies and entities of Member States, to discuss and evaluate the most appropriate and technically sound procedures.

INITIATIVE 6 - LINKING DATABASE TO AGGREGATED NATIONAL CERTIFICATES OF ORIGIN

8. Brazil does not support the initiative proposed by the Executive Director, which would entail substantial changes to the purpose, scope, and regulations governing the issuance of "Certificates of Origin" by Member States, as established under Article 33 of the International Coffee Agreement (2007)..

9. Brazil also maintains that Initiative 6, proposed by the Executive Director, would significantly modify and expand the responsibilities assigned to national "Certifying Agencies" of exporting Member States, as outlined in document ICC 102-9, Rev. 5, dated 7 October 2022.

10. The proposition would further introduce overlapping requirements that are already addressed through established national frameworks and private systems, developed in response to forthcoming regulatory measures in certain coffee markets.

11. It is worth emphasizing that the use of georeferenced information for coffee plots -- mandated by recent regulatory frameworks, such as the EUDR --, is not a globally adopted practice. On the contrary. Key coffee markets have yet to implement such non-tariff requirements, which remain absent from their current trade protocols.

12. Brazil deems it neither appropriate nor necessary for the International Coffee Organization (ICO) to alter the objective and functions of the "Certificate of Origin", which underpin the global coffee trade, for the purpose of accommodating or integrating specific national or regional import requirements -- thereby effectively extending the scope and influence of those legislations beyond their intended jurisdictions and flux of commerce.

13. The current format of the "Certificates of Origin" constitutes a vital element of global coffee trade. Their issuance for coffee exports by Member Staters of ICO stands out as a unique feature among agricultural commodities. These certificates enable the international coffee supply and demand chain to access reliable data on exports from those countries which are members of ICO, including origin, type, quantity, and destination.

14. By linking them to georeferenced coffee plots -- as proposed in the initiative 6 by the Executive Director --, the International Coffee Organization would effectively promote the global application of national and regional regulations governing coffee trade.

15. Furthermore, the suggested introduction of a "global standard" for geo-information on coffee plots -- as outlined in the initiative led by the Executive Director --, is not regarded by Brazil as an appropriate measure, nor is it considered a priority.

17. Given the aforementioned circumstances and explanations, Brazil deems proposed Initiative 6 — as submitted by the Executive Director — to be unacceptable.

INITIATIVE 7 - CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENCE OF COFFEE

18. Brazil believes that the Executive Director's proposed initiative should be limited strictly to mapping relevant existing best practices in climate change resilience -- from

both ICO member countries and the private sector --, without any form of appraisal or judgment.

19. The ICO has not been granted any mandate by Member States to evaluate, appraise, or review national policies, practices, or initiatives concerning the enhancement of climate resilience in coffee cultivation, nor to assess the "suitability" of coffee growing areas.

20. Brazil has been at the forefront of efforts to address the impacts of climate change on coffee production. A concerted and sustained commitment by the Brazilian coffee sector has led to a steady stream of innovations, including the development of scientific studies on new resistant varieties that promote sustainable farming practices, improvements in water management across coffee-growing regions, the increased use of bio-inputs, and support for farmer engagement in sustainable protocols. Brazil views climate resilience in coffee production as a collaborative endeavour, encompassing all facets of coffee production -- from farm management to market access -- and involving both public and private stakeholders.

21. Rather than aiming to compile or describe the various successful national policies and programs developed by governments of producing countries, coffee sector entities, cooperatives, and producers, the Executive Director's proposed Initiative 7 instead sets out a fundamentally different objective:
to assume the authority to qualify and analyse these national schemes, operations, and undertakings, evaluating and interpreting them through what is described as "adequacy analysis, adaptation options, and mitigation potential" of coffee production areas.

22. The information and description surrounding Initiative 7 expose several technical inconsistencies and give rise to multiple concerns. Of particular note is the declared intent to assign the exercise a potential evaluative role -- judging the suitability of regions for coffee cultivation --, which raises the possibility that its results may be used to negatively impact coffee production in certain areas.

23. It remains unclear why the study intends to determine a supposed "production potential" as a reference for the "suitability" of coffee-growing regions. It is unnecessary to reiterate that coffee can be cultivated in most producing countries according to prevailing market conditions and is not subject to externally imposed restrictions or standardized

parameters. Where such parameters do exist, they are sovereign prerogatives of national governments and policy frameworks, and are not subject to appraisal by a commodity-based organization such as the ICO.

24. Equally unclear is the rationale for establishing a recommended reference yield of 90% as a benchmark for local climatic conditions deemed suitable for coffee production. No credible evidence from specialized research institutions in coffee-producing countries has been presented to support this threshold, nor has any exporting Member State been formally consulted on the matter.

25. Attention is also drawn to the emphasis placed on establishing so-called "adequacy" of water and rainfall conditions within coffee-producing regions. Rather than highlighting successful programs related to water use in coffee cultivation, the initiative led by the Executive Director appears to focus on assessing and qualifying regions -- potentially introducing evaluative judgments rather than showcasing practical achievements.

26. Furthermore, Brazil has repeatedly signalled that the ICO has consistently disregarded the scientific output and technical expertise developed by research institutions and representative entities across the coffee chain in producing countries -- as well as the practices of national governments and the firsthand experience of growers in exporting nations.

27. Despite coffee being a tropical crop, the initiatives proposed by the Executive Director of ICO continue to centre on university institutions located in non-coffee-producing countries, relying on references and studies that are often disconnected from the realities of coffee-growing nations. In this context, the secondary role assigned to coffee research institutions -- as outlined in the initiative, where they are merely invited to endorse a pre-formulated research model developed without their participation -- is particularly concerning.

28. Finally, it is worth noting that one of the stated objectives of the project presented by the Executive Director -- namely, to obtain insights and promote dialogue on existing impact mitigation and adaptation strategies among ICO Members --, appears to undermine the very need for the proposed research.

29. Such dialogue could be more effectively pursued through existing forums, such as the plenary meetings of the

ICO Council or the sessions of its various committees, where Member participation and the exchange of views are already well established.

30. A similar assessment applies to another of the project's stated objectives -- mapping existing initiatives -- which could be effectively undertaken by the ICO Secretariat. This task, grounded in literature reviews from producing countries, online research, national coffee chain inputs, and stakeholder interviews in exporting nations, falls well within the Secretariat’s current scope and expertise. The results could then be reviewed by Member countries and private sector representatives. As these activities are largely informative in nature, they could be integrated into the ICO’s ongoing operations, utilizing existing staff and current budget resources, without the need to pursue Initiative 7 as proposed, with the hiring of external experts.

Comments to the Proposed initiatives and mandatory reports 2024/25
JC 12/25 1 May 2025
Initiatives 3, 5, 6 and 7

According to your request to provide written input regarding the proposed initiatives and mandatory reports submitted in document JC 12/25 regarding Initiatives 3, 5, 6 and 7, we have the following recommendations:

INITIATIVE 3: Annual market report

Overall Goal

Provide reference analysis and overview of the past coffee year to Members and wider coffee community

R/: In today's context, market information has become increasingly critical, requiring accuracy and timeliness. Accordingly, the annual market report should be issued within the first quarter of each year. Furthermore, harvest forecasts from all member countries should be provided to enhance the precision of the available data.

INITIATIVE 5: Widening variables of the ICO Database

Overall Goal

Increase services provided to Members and coffee sector, by expanding accuracy, scope and depth of data available on World Coffee Statistics Database (WCSD)

R/: Regarding the proposal to increase the volume of statistical information requested, it is essential to first ensure that all members submit the required data before expanding the scope of the databases. According to document JC 02/24, dated 22 August 2024, the ICO notes that only 28.4% of producing countries provide the required data on time. Therefore, the procedures for collecting statistical data must be strengthened, and it should be required that not only producing members, but also importing members, submit their information.

INITIATIVE 6: Linking database of standardized georeferences of coffee plots to aggregated national Certificates of Origin

Overall Goals

Calle 73 n.° 8-13 Bogotá, Colombia
PBX: (60+1) 313 6600 - 313 6700
NIT: 860.007.538-2
federaciondecafeteros.org

Increased preparedness and efficiency of the coffee sector for inclusive transparency and due diligence in the value chain by coffee producing countries globally having standardised, accurate georeferences for coffee plots.
Empowerment of all coffee farmers with digital data on their coffee plots.
Improved countries' capacity of having and governing georeference data of coffee plots (unique, updated, accurate and standardised geo ID for each coffee plot) through national georeference databases. Such geo ID could then be linked to ICO's Certificates of Origin (CoO), either in an aggregated yearly, standardised way or in an individual format and could become a part of the data rules of the ICO.

R/: The proposed initiative would not only substantially alter the purpose of the Certificate of Origin, but would also introduce additional obligations and responsibilities that fall outside the scope of such certification. The Certificate of Origin serves as a reliable instrument for the international coffee market, certifying exports from ICO member countries. Moreover, the proposal could lead to increased operational costs and disrupt the logistics chain. That said, with the implementation of the EUDR georeferenced databases, this initiative is, to some extent, already underway. Instead, the ICO should focus on acting as a facilitator for all member countries by providing tools to assist them in adapting to new regulatory frameworks governing international trade.

INITIATIVE 7: Climate change resilience of coffee

Overall Goal
Promotion and valorisation of proven approaches taken by ICO Member countries to improve the resilience of coffee production under the threat of climate change in different contexts

R/: Each member country should promote and implement initiatives aimed at enhancing the resilience of its coffee production in the face of climate change. This is a responsibility that lies with each country, which should develop its own approach, taking into account geographical, demographic, and economic differences, among other factors. In that sense, examining successful cases from different coffee-growing regions may be useful as valuable examples of how to effectively address the challenges posed by climate change.

Calle 73 n.° 8-13 Bogotá, Colombia
PBX: (60+1) 313 6600 - 313 6700
NIT: 860.007.538-2
federaciondecafeteros.org

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Directorate-General for International Partnerships

Green Deal, Digital Agenda
Sustainable Agri-Food systems and Fisheries

Brussels, 13.06.2025
intpa.f.3(2025)

To: Veronica Ottelli, International Coffee Organization

Subject: Proposed initiatives and mandatory reports 2024/25, Joint Committee – JC 12/25

General remarks

Agreement on all proposals.

Compliments to the Secretariat for the detailed document JC 12/25. It is much appreciated that Members can have a clear view on the content of the projected reports, with methodology and rationale.

Initiatives 1,2 and 3 should be clearly identified as mandatory as per the ICA 2007.

Initiatives 5, 6 and 7 are particularly welcome.

An additional brief / study on the recent increase of coffee prices and the actual remuneration of farmers / farmgate prices would be welcome as well.

Specific remarks / questions

Initiative 1: is it foreseeable to apply same methodology as in Initiative 2, i.e. that data collection starts with existing secondary information and then validated by Members?

[E-signed]

Zoltán ÁGAI
Policy officer

The Representation of Brazil respectfully submits to the Joint Committee the following amendments and proposed additions to the draft text presented by the Secretariat of the International Coffee Organization, concerning the procedures for the submission and evaluation of proposals for studies, surveys, reports, and projects, as outlined in document JC 13/25, dated 16 May 2025.

2. The proposed amendments and supplementary texts are based on the following reference documents:

. The International Coffee Agreement (2007);

. The Rules of the International Coffee Organization (document ICC 102-7, dated 27 April 2009), and

. The Terms of Reference of the Joint Committee (document ICC 136-11, dated 16 October 2023).

3. The amendments and additional texts put forward by Brazil also aim to clearly delineate the sequence of actions expected during the appraisal, approval, and evaluation processes for proposals submitted by ICO Members and the Executive Director.

4. The following chart is included to facilitate visual comparison and enable a structured analysis between the draft text proposed by the ICO Secretariat and the amendments and additions suggested by Brazil.

London, 11 August 2025

SUGGESTED TEXT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ANNEX I	PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT BY BRAZIL
1. The ICO Secretariat will organize an annual consultation with Members to identify priority areas for specific statistical analysis, research, reports and activities (hereinafter referred to as 'initiatives'). Members will be requested to submit the following: i) Feedback on initiatives within the mandate of the JC proposed by the ICO Secretariat; ii) Proposals for new initiatives submitted by the Members.	1. The ICO Secretariat shall organize an annual consultation with Members with a view to adopting a yearly work programme of studies, surveys, reports, and projects (hereinafter referred to as 'initiatives'). 2. Members and the Executive Director may submit proposals for new initiatives falling within the mandate of the Joint Committee, either during the sessions of the International Coffee Council or at the meetings of the Joint Committee, for assessment and review by Members of the Joint Committee.
2. The consultation process shall begin after the Spring Session of the Council and refer to initiatives to be approved at the Autumn Session of the Council and implemented in the following coffee year. The consultation process shall start at least six weeks before the next JC meeting at which the proposals will be discussed and their levels of priority will be determined.	3. The consultation process shall commence following the Spring Session of the Council and shall focus on initiatives to be submitted for deliberation and decision regarding their approval during the Autumn Session, with a view to implementation in the subsequent coffee year. 4. The consultation process shall begin at least six weeks prior to the Joint Committee meeting when the proposals will be initially discussed and evaluated.

SUGGESTED TEXT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ANNEX I	PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT BY BRAZIL
3. Translations into all ICO official languages of potential proposals from the ICO Secretariat and of other relevant documents shall be made available at least four weeks before the JC meeting. 4. All proposals from the Members or comments on proposals from the ICO Secretariat shall be submitted to the ICO Secretariat. Submissions will be made available to all Members via a SharePoint link or alternative format. Only written comments shared by the agreed deadline will be taken into account.	5. Documents containing translations into all official languages of the Organization, of proposals submitted by Members or the Executive Director, as well as other relevant information, shall be published and made available by the ICO Secretariat at least six weeks prior to the first Joint Committee meeting convened to analyse them.
5. Based on the proposals and written comments received, the ICO Secretariat will prepare an overview, and the JC will be asked to reach a consensus on the proposed initiatives and/or to determine their levels of priority. If appropriate, said initiatives will then be recommended for the approval of the ICC.	6. Prior to the scheduled meetings of the Joint Committee, members will be invited to provide comments on the proposals presented. The ICO Secretariat will compile and circulate an additional document containing all received observations in the official languages. 7. The Joint Committee shall be requested to reach consensus on the proposed initiatives, with a view to submitting recommendations for the Council's consideration and approval no later than three weeks prior to the Autumn Session.

SUGGESTED TEXT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ANNEX I	PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT BY BRAZIL
6. Based on the initiatives approved by the ICC, the ICO Secretariat shall elaborate a detailed description of the objectives, purpose, activities, methodology, resources needed, partners, timeline and performance indicators for each initiative. All of the foregoing shall be approved by the JC before implementation commences.	8. Following the adoption of the annual work programme by the International Coffee Council, the ICO Secretariat shall prepare a detailed description for each approved initiative, outlining its objectives, purposes, planned activities, methodology, estimated resource requirements, timeline, and performance indicators. 9. The detailed descriptions of each initiative approved by the Council, prepared by the ICO Secretariat, shall be circulated to Members in a document published in the official languages at least six weeks prior to the next Joint Committee meeting. This will allow sufficient time for Members to conduct the necessary consultations with the national coffee chain entities. 10. The Joint Committee shall convene to appraise, review, and approve the detailed suggested plans submitted by the ICO Secretariat prior to the commencement of implementation. 11. Once prepared, the results of approved studies, surveys, technical reports, and other documents shall be submitted by the ICO Secretariat to the Joint Committee for appraisal, prior to their broad dissemination.