



**Report of the 5th meeting of the Joint
Committee held on 17 September 2025**

Item 1: Draft Agenda	1
Item 2: Procedures for submission and evaluation of proposals for ICO Initiatives	2
Item 3: Reports of the 2 nd , 3 rd and 4 th meetings of the Joint Committee.....	5
Item 4: Report on statistical compliance	6
Item 5: Proposal to improve the statistical capacity of ICO Members.....	8
Item 6: Status of implementation of the Five-Year Action Plan	14
Item 7: Other updates and other business	17
Item 8: Next steps and next meeting.....	17

**REPORT OF THE 5TH MEETING
OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE HELD ON 17 SEPTEMBER 2025**

1. This report presents the discussions and recommendations of the 5th Meeting of the Joint Committee (JC), presided by the Chair, Mr Zoltan Agai of the EU-European Commission, and held virtually on 17 September 2025.
2. Representatives of the following Members were present online using the Zoom software:
 - (a) Exporting Members: Brazil, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Honduras, Madagascar, Mexico, the Philippines and Togo; and
 - (b) Importing Members: European Union and Switzerland.
3. The Chair opened the meeting by thanking the Secretariat and welcoming all delegates. He then invited the Executive Director of the International Coffee Organization (ICO), Dr Vanúsia Nogueira, to deliver her opening remarks.
4. The Executive Director welcomed all participants, noting the extensive agenda, which included several topics that had already been discussed in previous meetings and for which conclusions were expected, as well as the reports that would be considered and noted during the meeting.
5. The Executive Director thanked the Chair for presiding over the JC throughout the year. She also expressed gratitude to the Chair of the International Coffee Council (ICC), Mr Tom Fabozzi, for attending the meeting, and acknowledged the presence of former Chairs of the ICC, including HE Ambassador Ivan Romero and Mr Max Fabian. She thanked them all for their continued support and collaboration.
6. The Chair thanked the Executive Director for her remarks and requested confirmation of the quorum.
7. The Head of Operations confirmed that the quorum had been met, with two importing Members – the European Union and Switzerland – and more than two exporting Members.
8. The Chair asked delegates to keep their interventions as brief as possible due to the extensive agenda and noted that all documents had been circulated in advance, giving Members the opportunity to consult them and to review each other's written contributions. The Chair expressed gratitude to all distinguished Members who had submitted contributions in advance.

Item 1: Draft Agenda

9. The Chair introduced the Draft Agenda (document [JC-18/25](#)), which included: three reports on the previous meetings; the report on statistical compliance; the proposal to improve the statistical capacity of ICO Members; the procedures for submission and evaluation of proposals; and the status of the Five-Year Action Plan. He mentioned that this latter item had

appeared on the previous meeting's agenda but had not yet been discussed due to time constraints.

10. The Chair invited Members to adopt the agenda or to comment if they had remarks.

11. The delegate of Brazil proposed that the JC move item 5 ("Procedures for submission and evaluation of proposals for ICO initiatives") to the top of the agenda, as this topic had been under consideration since the second meeting of the JC and the text had already been reviewed multiple times. The delegate of Brazil stated that it would be highly beneficial to conclude the appraisal of this topic at the present meeting.

12. The Chair thanked the delegate of Brazil and asked whether any other delegates had objections to this proposal. Seeing no hands raised, the Chair confirmed that the JC had adopted the modified agenda. He clarified that item 5 would therefore be moved up to become the second point on the agenda.

Item 2: Procedures for submission and evaluation of proposals for ICO Initiatives

13. The Chair recalled that the procedures had already been discussed at the 4th meeting of the JC based on previous written inputs, notably from the delegation of Brazil. He invited the Head of Operations to introduce document [JC-13/25 Rev. 1](#) and to provide a short presentation of the revisions.

14. The Head of Operations thanked the Chair and stated that the document had evolved, and that it was no longer to be "noted", but to be "recommended" to the Council, if appropriate. She began the presentation with the following outline of the process and stated that the procedures had been adapted to reflect the inputs and feedback received from Members:

- (a) Proposals would be made by the Executive Director and by Members.
- (b) Once submitted, there would be a period for all Members to review the translated content of each proposal and for the JC to determine whether the proposal aligned with the thematic area(s) to be addressed.
- (c) Based on the review, the proposal would be submitted for approval by the ICC at the autumn session. If approved, a detailed plan would be elaborated to be approved by the JC.
- (d) Finally, results would be produced, which could take the form of a report, review, or product which would need to be approved again before dissemination.

15. The Head of Operations then provided further details in relation to the spring session of the ICC:

- (a) All proposals submitted to the JC or to the spring session of the ICC would enter a consultation process.
- (b) Following submission, the proposals would firstly be sent for translation, with a separate timeframe allocated to ensure high quality.
- (c) A six-week consultation period would then take place, lasting until the end of May, allowing all delegates and Members to consult stakeholders in their respective countries.
- (d) The Secretariat would then compile all comments received on the proposals and translate them, so that all Members would again have the same access to comments and to allow a good dialogue.
- (e) Subsequently, the proposals, together with the comments, would be discussed within the JC, either in one or several meetings. This phase would occur between the end of June and no later than three weeks before the autumn session of the ICC.

16. The Head of Operations then provided the following details in relation to the autumn session of the ICC:

- (a) The Secretariat would submit a work plan reflecting the initiative(s) and the thematic areas proposed by the JC. At that stage, ICC approval would be sought on “what” would be undertaken.
- (b) The focus would then move to the “how.” The Secretariat, under the leadership of the Executive Director, would elaborate on the details of implementation. This would include the objectives, budgetary implications, and the practical approach to be taken for the initiative(s).
- (c) These detailed proposals would then be submitted to the JC in all four official languages.
- (d) A further six-week consultation period would follow, again ensuring the same access, time, and opportunity for Members to consult stakeholders.
- (e) In January, the JC would then hold discussions to determine whether there had been an agreement on how the initiative(s) would be implemented.
- (f) Once this agreement had been reached, implementation of the initiative(s)

would begin.

17. The Head of Operations reiterated that before any dissemination or external discussion of any product, approval by the JC would be required.

18. The Chair thanked the Head of Operations and expressed appreciation to the Secretariat for preparing the revised document. He noted that while the procedures appeared somewhat lengthy, they were also extremely well-framed and precise in various steps. He expressed hope that these provided a good basis for approval. The Chair then opened the floor for comments from Members.

19. The delegate of Brazil thanked the Chair and requested that the Secretariat show document [JC-13/25, Rev. 1](#) on the screen to facilitate the observations that he intended to make. The delegate of Brazil stated that the Brazilian delegation wished to propose three small changes to the text of the document:

- (a) First and second, the delegate of Brazil suggested including specific references to the relevant paragraphs of the Terms of Reference (ToRs) of the Joint Committee and Article 34 of the International Coffee Agreement (ICA) 2007. The delegate noted that the first paragraph should read "*Pursuant to **paragraph 2 of the Terms of Reference...***" and that the second paragraph should read "*Pursuant to **paragraph 4 of Article 34 of the International Coffee Agreement (ICA) 2007.***" He explained that these additions would, in the delegation of Brazil's view, help readers identify the specific sources being referenced.
- (b) Third, the delegate of Brazil proposed the deletion of the last sentence of the first paragraph, which read: "*In this context, when translated into concrete actions, such matters shall be referred to as initiatives.*" He stated that, in the view of the Brazilian delegation, this sentence introduced a definition that was not found in either the ICA 2007 or the ToRs of the JC (document [ICC-136-11](#)). Specifically, the delegate of Brazil further noted that the term "initiative" did not appear in those documents, nor in the ToRs of the ICO's committees and advisory bodies (document [ICC-115-13](#)). Furthermore, he indicated that the delegation of Brazil was not prepared to agree to the proposed affirmation, as it reduced the scope and possible interpretations of the term "matters". The delegate of Brazil noted that the expression "all matters", found in the ToRs of the JC and negotiated by Members, could be understood as encompassing comments, recommendations, motions, censures, démarches and other possible actions or alternatives, and could also include themes and topics that Member States considered to be of interest to the coffee sector. In this context, he noted that the "reductionist"

definition of “all matters” as merely “initiatives” appeared to conflict with the interpretation provided in the first paragraph of Annex I of document [JC-13/25 Rev. 1](#), which states “*studies, surveys, reports, and projects (hereinafter referred to as “initiatives”)*”. The delegate of Brazil expressed that removing the proposed definition would not affect the purpose or outcomes of the exercise aimed at defining procedures for the submission and evaluation of proposals by the JC.

20. The Secretariat displayed the Word version of the document, with the revisions highlighted in red for transparency.

21. The Chair asked whether the delegation of Brazil’s amendments extended to the definition in Annex I of document [JC-13/25 Rev.1](#).

22. The delegate of Brazil confirmed that his delegation agreed with the definition in Annex I, which should remain as written, and clarified that only the final sentence of the first paragraph should be deleted.

23. The delegate of El Salvador welcomed the proposal and considered it a good step towards giving Members’ contributions and initiatives greater importance, thus allowing the Organization to focus its resources on priority areas identified by its own Members. She added that El Salvador agreed with the proposals made by the Brazilian delegation.

24. The Chair thanked the delegate of El Salvador and, observing no objections, concluded that a consensus had been reached. He announced that the Committee would put forward the revised version of the document for the Council’s approval¹. The Chair congratulated the Secretariat and Members for reaching an agreement, noting that the procedures had been under review since the second meeting of the JC.

Item 3: Reports of the 2nd, 3rd and 4th meetings of the Joint Committee

25. The Chair introduced the next item and thanked Members for providing comments on the reports, which had been incorporated in the revised versions. The Chair asked the Secretariat to clarify which documents were being discussed, given that multiple references were being shown on the screen.

26. The Executive Director confirmed that the revised versions of the reports, documents [JC-09/25 Rev. 1](#), [JC-15/25 Rev. 1](#) and [JC-17/25 Rev. 1](#), incorporated all the comments that had been

¹ The revised version was subsequently circulated as document [JC-13/25 Rev. 2](#).

received from the delegation of Brazil and could be approved if there were no objections.

27. The Chair thanked the Executive Director for the clarification. Since no objections were raised, he approved the reports on behalf of the Committee.

28. The Chair once again thanked the delegation of Brazil for their comments on the reports.

Item 4: Report on statistical compliance

29. The Chair noted that the report on statistical compliance ([JC-19/25](#)) had to be reviewed by the Committee before being recommended to the Council for approval. He recalled that the previous report dated back to February 2024 and that the compliance scores followed a certain methodology. The Chair invited the Head of Operations to present the report.

30. The Head of Operations thanked the Chair and explained that the compliance scores reflected the rules and requirements set out in the Rules of Statistics on Certificates of Origin ([ICC-102-9 Rev. 5](#)) and Statistical Reports ([ICC-102-10](#)). She clarified that the scores were used to assess the extent to which countries complied with those requirements.

31. The Head of Operations stated that the scores measured the timeliness and completeness of the information submitted by Members. She explained that each importing and exporting Member was required to submit information on several categories (11 for exporting countries and five for importing countries). The Head of Operations added that these included information related to certificates of origin, imports, exports, and area under production.

32. The Head of Operations stated that for each category, each country received a score, depending on whether the information had been submitted on time or not. For instance, if the information was submitted on time, the score was “one” for timeliness; if it was not submitted or was submitted late, the score was “zero”. Based on this methodology, she explained that monthly scores could be calculated per category and per country, and that scores were then aggregated to calculate an average score per country. The Head of Operations also noted that scores could be aggregated across all Members to calculate an average score for a given month or year, and that the final score was calculated as an average and then multiplied by 100.

33. The Head of Operations stated that one of the challenges was that year-to-year comparisons were difficult, as the number of Members submitting information could vary from one year to another. She explained that this should therefore be noted when comparing compliance scores across years, although the Secretariat could cope with this in its analysis.

34. The Head of Operations referred to the reporting period covered in the document, namely from 1 August 2024 to 1 August 2025. She explained that the average scores included countries that had not submitted any information, which therefore received a score of “zero” and lowered

the overall average. The Head of Operations noted that, for exporting countries, the average score had decreased from 28.4 to 27.1, while the average score for importing countries was 68 for all countries and all categories of information for the year.

35. The Head of Operations noted that higher scores had been observed for information related to imports and exports, while some other categories had shown very low scores and, in some cases, decreased. She also noted that, of the 19 exporting countries that had submitted information, five had provided incoherent data that could not be reconciled and which was not useful.

36. The Head of Operations showed the number of Members that had submitted information. For exporting Members, information had been received from 19 countries, an increase from 17 in the previous period. For importing Members, information had been received from 34 countries, including the Member States of the European Union, compared to 33 previously.

37. The Head of Operations explained that if the analysis were limited only to Members that had submitted information—thereby excluding “zeros”—the scores would increase to an average score of 63.1 for exporting countries and 70 for importing countries. She again noted that compliance for the categories of imports and exports was much higher, reaching 80 to 85 for exporting countries that had submitted information.

38. The Head of Operations further noted that while more Members were submitting information, including more major exporting countries, the overall compliance score had still decreased because new Members sending information and existing senders were submitting their data in a less timely or regular manner, and were also omitting some of the categories that they had previously reported.

39. The Head of Operations referred to compliance methods, while noting that this was not the main focus of the presentation. She explained that some of the information requested was sensitive and linked to competition, adding that this used to be less sensitive in the past when the coffee sector was more regulated. She further noted that the compliance methodology was highly binary, meaning that information submitted even one day late led to the country being considered as non-compliant and receiving a score of “zero”. In addition, she explained that data quality was not currently reflected in the compliance score, the omission of which could also partially explain lower scores.

40. The Chair thanked the Head of Operations for the presentation and opened the floor for questions or comments. He concluded that the Committee had agreed to recommend the report for approval at the 140th Session of the ICC.

Item 5: Proposal to improve the statistical capacity of ICO Members

41. The Chair introduced the next agenda item on the improvement of the statistical capacity of ICO Members (document [JC-20/25](#)). He noted that this was the only initiative retained from the set of seven initially proposed by the Executive Director, and that the revised version incorporated feedback received from Members during previous meetings. The Chair invited the Head of Operations to present the document.

42. The Head of Operations stated that, given the low compliance scores and Members' requests to focus on statistics and the collection and dissemination of basic data, the Secretariat had elaborated on the original initiative on supporting the capacity of Members. She noted that the initiative was now being referred to as "initiative 4, version 2".

43. The Head of Operations explained that, like other commodity organizations, the ICO used external data sources, particularly for trade statistics, i.e. imports and exports. In addition to these external sources, she noted that the Organization had a specific asset, namely monthly statistical information provided by Members. She added that other commodity organizations also collected such information, but that the ICO had comparatively more access to Member data, particularly due to the Certificates of Origin system.

44. The Head of Operations stated that data were provided to Members and subscribers through reports and the live World Coffee Statistics Database. She noted that compliance remained low, and as a result this additional asset was not being sufficiently utilized and could be enhanced.

45. The Head of Operations explained that the average annual revenues from statistical products over the past three years amounted to approximately £20,800 and that, for the current coffee year, the revenue could reach around £30,000. She noted that the ICO had 56 paying subscribers to ICO publications and around 100 subscribers paying for access to the statistical database, in addition to Members who also had access.

46. The Head of Operations added that the tardiness of exporters in providing the required information was one of the reasons for low compliance. Furthermore, she noted that exchanges with Members had also revealed the following issues:

- (a) In some countries, the governance of data systems was complex, with the authority for statistical reporting resting with ministries or agencies other than those responsible for coffee.
- (b) Staffing levels in some of the relevant institutions were limited, with officials facing multiple responsibilities.

- (c) In several exporting countries, technical capacity needed to be strengthened, particularly in relation to measurement, data reconciliation, and balancing of information.
- (d) There was a need for greater digitalization. Some exporting countries consolidated data only every six months, whereas ICO statistical rules required monthly reporting, which is also considered the most useful frequency for Members and the private sector.
- (e) Some data points were sensitive in nature and therefore often underreported by Members.

47. The Head of Operations then turned to the priority actions proposed to increase compliance and identified “support to Members for timely and accurate data collection and sending” as the most substantial pillar of the initiative. She explained that three regional workshops on statistics were being organized and that an important “side effect” was improved contact with the individuals and institutions responsible for providing statistical data. The Head of Operations noted that the impact of the two completed workshops (Asia and Africa) could already be seen and cited recent updates from Cameroon, Ethiopia, and Tanzania, as well as improved information from Papua New Guinea and engagements with India, Thailand, Nepal and Timor-Leste. She added that the Secretariat intended to continue these efforts by establishing regional communities of practice, including webinars and workshops which would focus on topics requested by Members, including, for example, exchanges on infrastructure requirements.

48. The Head of Operations referred to the “bilateral support” being provided to Member countries and noted that this would be expanded in such a way that all Members would be contacted at least once per year, while those in the lowest quartile in terms of data quality or compliance would be contacted monthly. She explained that, for these Members, structured work plans would be developed and implemented to improve reporting performance.

49. The Head of Operations explained that the Secretariat wished to take up a suggestion made by a delegate during discussions on the previous version of the initiative, namely the establishment of an ad hoc working group that would examine the possibility of technical procedures, including the possible installation of interfaces or applications that could allow monthly data extraction from national systems, even where countries currently consolidated data only every six months. She acknowledged that such solutions might not resolve all issues and would need to be assessed for feasibility.

50. The Head of Operations explained the importance of timely compilation and dissemination of data in a format that was accessible and useful for Members and stakeholders. She further noted that the Secretariat had begun distributing daily coffee prices to Members in

addition to subscribers, and that the monthly Coffee Market Report would be improved to include enhanced analysis of available import data, clarifying that efforts would be made to present this information in a more accessible manner. With regard to the World Coffee Statistics Database, the Head of Operations also noted that access would be improved through the development of clearer menus, recognizing that it could be complex for users who did not work with databases on a daily basis. Finally, she outlined plans to develop a dashboard on the ICO website with an appropriate time delay, so that subscribers and Members would continue to have priority access to the most recent data.

51. The Head of Operations then addressed the internal capacity of the Secretariat and reported that all statistical activities would be carried out by ICO staff. She noted that the number of full-time staff working on statistics had increased from two to 3.6, including the newly-appointed Chief Economist, who had already begun engaging with statistics. She also noted that the budget for statistics had been increased to cover equipment, additional statistical software and services, interface development, and the organization of statistical workshops, and explained that these activities required higher budget allocations, which were reflected in the budget proposal to be presented to Members.

52. Finally, the Head of Operations stated that the Secretariat would strengthen internal monitoring to better steer actions aimed at improving capacity and compliance. She emphasized that such monitoring could be requested by any Member at any time.

53. The Chair thanked the Head of Operations and the Secretariat, and opened the floor for comments and questions.

54. The delegate of Brazil thanked the Chair and the Secretariat for the explanations given and began by proposing several textual amendments to document [JC-20/25](#). The delegate of Brazil suggested that, as done for the previous documents, explicit references to the relevant paragraphs of Article 34 of the ICA 2007 and the ToRs of the JC be included in the first two paragraphs. Specifically, the delegate of Brazil proposed the insertion of the phrases “*Pursuant to **paragraph 4 of Article 34 of the International Coffee Agreement 2007***” and “*Pursuant to **paragraph 2 of the Terms of Reference of the Joint Committee***” to clarify the sources cited.

55. Having requested that the document be shown on screen, the delegate of Brazil referred to paragraph 4, proposing the deletion of the phrase “*While none of the proposed initiatives received full approval*”. The delegate of Brazil explained that, in the view of the Brazilian delegation, the sentence did not accurately reflect the outcomes or dynamics of the discussions held, since certain proposals had not been accepted at all. He explained that the deletion was considered appropriate by the delegation of Brazil in order to prevent potential misinterpretations or suggestions that there had been partial agreement with the proposals. The

delegate of Brazil added that the deletion would not compromise the clarity of the paragraph or the main objective of the point being made, namely the expression of some Members' support for prioritizing actions to enhance and upgrade the statistical services provided by the Organization.

56. The delegate of Brazil then referred to the last sentence of paragraph 6 on page 2, which stated: "*Submissions will be made available to all Members via email and saved in the relevant SharePoint folder.*" The delegate of Brazil explained that his delegation had an observation not related to the text itself, but rather to the principle that it contained. He reiterated the previous positions expressed in relation to the procedures for the presentation and circulation of documents, information and communications in intergovernmental organizations, adding that the delegation of Brazil considered it essential that observations, comments and information provided by Members be circulated through official ICO documents and published as working papers available in all four languages. The delegate of Brazil indicated that the manner in which information is disseminated among Members was equally as important and that, for Brazil, distribution through official documents and working papers remained an effective means of ensuring transparency, accessibility, permanence, ease of reference and equal-treatment actions in all official languages of Members. He added that the registration of Members' positions through working documents would enable future referencing and informed decision-making by the coffee chain.

57. The delegate of Brazil further explained that electronic platforms such as SharePoint were often restricted to registered users and not consistently available, adding that they were not considered an efficient repository for positions and comments.

58. To guarantee equal treatment of all Members, the delegate of Brazil proposed that the aforementioned sentence be replaced with: "*Observations, comments and information provided by Members will be circulated through official documents of the Organization and published in all four official languages.*"

59. The Secretariat displayed the proposed revision on screen for all delegates' review. The delegate of Brazil confirmed that the wording accurately reflected his delegation's suggestions.

60. The delegate of Brazil thanked the Secretariat for supplying detailed information regarding the rendering of statistical services by the Organization in document [JC-20/25](#), then requested further clarifications:

- (a) First, referring to the first and second proposed actions – the regional workshops on statistics and creation of "communities of practice" based on the results of the meetings held – the delegate of Brazil mentioned the workshop held in Indonesia on 14 May 2025 as part of the World of Coffee event. The delegate of Brazil

observed that, although four months had passed since the event, no document or presentation outlining the results had been made available to Members. Given that this activity represented the Secretariat's central proposal to address low compliance and deficiencies in collecting statistical information, the delegate of Brazil requested that the Secretariat inform Members about any results, challenges, and follow-up actions and asked whether a document would be circulated in that regard.

- (b) Second, the delegate of Brazil pointed out that document [JC-20/25](#) did not include any reference to automation of statistical data collection. He asked the Executive Director or a member of the Secretariat to clarify this omission in the context of the revised initiative 4 and whether the Secretariat had envisaged or considered other possible measures to tackle the challenges alluded to by the Head of Operations during the 4th meeting of the JC in order to enhance the quality of the information supplied by the Organization to its Members.
- (c) Third, the delegate of Brazil commented on the fourth proposed action entitled "*Establish and continuously improve a monitoring mechanism to evaluate the basic statistical function of the ICO.*" The delegate of Brazil stated that his delegation did not consider it appropriate for the Organization to implement a new compliance scoring system at this stage, indicating that any change to the measurement method could lead to potential misinterpretations of the results obtained. He added that while parallel consultations on the satisfaction of Members and subscribers were very useful and could generate valuable suggestions and insights about the services provided, the Brazilian delegation was not prepared to endorse any modification to the existing compliance measurement approach and considered that the Organization should instead focus its attention and efforts on addressing the challenges of improving its services.

61. The Chair thanked the delegate of Brazil and confirmed that paragraph 4(i) would be deleted. The change was shown on screen, and the Chair invited the Secretariat to respond.

62. The Head of Operations confirmed that the report from the Indonesia workshop had been finalized and would be distributed within the week. She apologized for the delay, explaining that translation bottlenecks had caused a short postponement. She also informed Members that the report for the workshop in Ethiopia was nearly complete and awaiting final validation by the Inter-African Coffee Organization, with which the ICO had jointly organized the event.

63. The Statistical Coordinator responded to the question regarding automation. He explained that the Secretariat had begun bilateral discussions with Members to explore

automated data exchange through application programming interfaces (APIs). However, he noted that the infrastructure for such integrations varied greatly among Members. He informed the JC that the ICO was currently conducting a pilot project with the Coffee Institute of Costa Rica (ICAFFE) to enable seamless real-time synchronization between ICAFFE's database and the ICO's system. He stated that the integration was expected to be complete within one or two weeks and would serve as a model for expansion to other countries once the process had been tested and verified.

64. The Head of Operations added that the Secretariat could not expand such measures to all Members until a temporary ad-hoc working group on automation had been established to discuss all implications, including legal aspects, as proposed by a delegate at a previous meeting. She clarified that automation could not be rolled out just because it worked for one Member and explained that there were procedures and costs to be looked into and that therefore a technical, ad-hoc working group was warranted.

65. The delegate of Brazil thanked the Secretariat for the clarifications and, in response to the observations made, suggested that the Secretariat forward information to Members on the actions being undertaken by the Organization in that regard. He referred to the suggestion contained in the document that would require holding "practically weekly" meetings with Member countries (at least one per year for each exporting Member) and stated that it would be beneficial for all concerned, both importers and exporters, if the Organization were to inform Members and report on the outcomes of those meetings.

66. The delegate of El Salvador thanked the Chair as well as the Secretariat for the work undertaken to prepare the document and for listening to the various comments and preferences expressed by Members during the recent meetings. She stated that El Salvador considered the initiative to be an important first step towards building a proposed statistical database to guide Members on how to supply their data to the Organization. The delegate of El Salvador appreciated the emphasis placed on increasing engagement with the statistical sections of each Member country in order to increase compliance with basic statistical obligations, particularly in light of the downward trend in compliance observed in 2025 compared with 2024. The delegate of El Salvador concluded by stating that her country looked forward to participating in the upcoming workshop in Honduras.

67. With no further comments from the floor, the Chair noted that there was a consensus among Members to approve the proposal, incorporating the amendments introduced by Brazil. He thanked the delegate of Brazil and confirmed that the revised version would be circulated as document [JC-20/25 Rev. 1](#) and submitted to the Council for approval.

Item 6: Status of implementation of the Five-Year Action Plan

68. The Chair introduced the agenda item and reminded Members that this was a long-awaited report. He invited the Head of Operations to present document [JC-14/25](#).

69. The Head of Operations explained that the document reported on the Five-Year Action Plan and the status of progress since its approval by the ICC in 2017. She noted that the document had been submitted to the JC because new matters and initiatives had been proposed, adding that it would be impossible to examine them without contextual information regarding the status of the Five-Year Action Plan. She stated that it was very important to note that there were key performance indicators (KPIs) and clear priority actions in the original Plan centred around the three strategic goals relating to statistics, the convening role of the ICO, and projects and promotion.

70. The Head of Operations noted that the KPIs had last been reported in September 2018 and had subsequently been discontinued, mainly due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Given the lack of monitoring since then, she explained that efforts had been made to reconstruct the information based on the 16 KPIs used in 2018, which did not encompass all the KPIs originally indicated in the Plan. The Head of Operations further stated that a narrative table had been prepared outlining activities named under the priority actions of the Five-Year Action Plan.

71. The Head of Operations stated it was important to note that progress on the Five-Year Action Plan was normally submitted to the ICC to be “noted”. She explained that the progress report had previously been approved by the ICC without involvement of the committees and concluded by indicating the Secretariat’s willingness to go through the KPIs, while noting that delegates might prefer a discussion rather than a presentation on them.

72. The Chair invited comments from the floor.

73. The delegate of Brazil congratulated the Secretariat for preparing, for the first time since September 2018, an updated report on the ongoing implementation of the Five-Year Action Plan, which had been approved by the ICC eight years earlier under document [ICC-120-11](#). He recalled that the conditions and context that led to the adoption of [Resolution 457](#) in September 2015 – mandating the creation of a working group to better define the long-term priorities of the Organization and its Members, and to provide adequate guidance to the Secretariat – had since changed significantly. The delegate of Brazil added that one of the key conclusions of that working group, chaired by Ambassador Aly Touré and culminating in the approval of the Five-Year Action Plan, was that the Organization’s top priority should be to place greater emphasis on its statistical services. He explained that statistics had been considered the Organization’s most essential and impactful contribution, and that it had been “enshrined” since 2015 that the Organization should have the capacity to collect, systematize and disseminate reliable statistics

on coffee production and trade. In this context, the delegate of Brazil noted that it was unfortunate that, almost 10 years later, Members were still discussing how to implement the delivery of world-class data analysis and statistical information to the industry as a core function of the Organization.

74. The delegate of Brazil further observed that the report failed to inform Members about the investments made toward this strategic goal. He also recalled that, in recent years, the budget allocations and staffing levels proposed for statistical functions had not reflected the importance of this objective, despite repeated indications from several Members, including the Brazilian delegation. The delegate of Brazil also indicated that, in some budget cycles, the funds proposed by the Secretariat for this strategic goal had amounted, in reality, to a disinvestment, meaning that the suggested allocation was lower than the revenue the service generated for the Organization.

75. The delegate of Brazil stated that this situation demonstrated an ongoing insufficiency on the part of the Organization to perform one of its core functions and to deliver the outputs expected by its Members, and in particular the private sector.

76. Turning to specific points in the report, the delegate of Brazil referred to the section addressing collaboration with coffee research institutes, stating that his delegation wished to make an amendment to the following paragraph:

In 2022-23, Wageningen University was involved in the ICO/CPPTF independent policy brief “Deforestation and forest degradation in coffee supply chains” on the EUDR and coffee. After its initial publication online, Members decided to remove it from the ICO website and not to disseminate it.

77. The delegate of Brazil recalled that there had been many reasons for the removal of the “now infamous study” from the ICO website and that those reasons should be clearly stated in the report in the interest of transparency and institutional accountability. The delegate of Brazil therefore proposed that the section be amended as follows:

The study wrongly indicated that coffee growing is a vector of deforestation. It erroneously linked Latin American coffee production to the risk of deforestation. It failed to integrate existing scientific literature and the work conducted by experts in producing countries with solid knowledge in the field. It systematically omitted the inputs of institutions from producing countries and it did not properly conduct consultations with exporting nations, disregarding the distinct characteristics of each producing country’s coffee sector. In sum, the document produced was detrimental to coffee-growing activities.

78. The delegate of Brazil concluded that the inclusion of this explanation would inform the reader of why the aforementioned document was not circulated or distributed.

79. The Chair, speaking as the delegate of the European Union, thanked the delegate of Brazil for his intervention but indicated that he had some reservations. He acknowledged that while the comments could be inserted as Brazil's concerns, it might not be possible to present the proposed text as the Organization's or Members' comments, because this had not been the case. The delegate of the European Union explained that he was not defending the conclusions or some of the aspects of the study, and noted that it was an independent piece of work that did not reflect the Organization's views or those of its Members. He acknowledged that a decision had been taken to remove the study from the website, but explained that the suggested text could only be included as Brazil's comments.

80. The delegate of Brazil thanked the Chair and stated that the document had been deleted by consensus for the aforementioned reasons. He added that if the European Union was against including the proposed text, the delegation of Brazil would appreciate it if it could be inserted together with an explanation beginning "*The delegation of Brazil reminded [Members of] the reasons that led to the elimination of this document...*".

81. The Executive Director thanked the delegation of Brazil for the feedback and kindly requested that they send the text in writing to the Secretariat.

82. The delegate of Brazil clarified that the proposed paragraph had already been made available in the meeting chat box.

83. The Chair noted that he still had reservations about the new formulation. He explained that it seemed to imply that there had been a consensus or an agreement on the reasons for the removal of the document when in fact some Members, starting with Brazil and possibly others, had considered those points and, because the ICO operates by consensus, all Members had then agreed that the text should be removed. However, he stressed that this did not mean that those points had been the actual reason for the removal, noting that this was slightly different.

84. The delegate of Brazil thanked the Chair and stated that, if the first part of the sentence was not acceptable, his delegation would be willing to amend the formulation to highlight that Brazil and many other producing countries had indicated the reasons for their opposition, which was factual.

85. The Chair checked whether the delegate of Brazil had understood his point and stressed that he was not defending the study but rather highlighting a matter of nuance.

86. The delegate of Brazil confirmed that he had understood and stated that, in his delegation's view, the study reflected the "sorry position" of the Organization as one of the few

commodity bodies that “criticizes its own producers”, something not seen in other commodity organizations. The delegate of Brazil added that the study was an “infamous” example of how a commodity-based organization should not proceed.

87. The Chair confirmed that the JC had taken note of the delegate of Brazil’s comments and added that the forthcoming session of the ICC would also provide an opportunity to make his points.

88. The delegate of El Salvador thanked the Secretariat for presenting the report and recognized the significant progress made in implementing the Plan’s 16 KPIs. In particular, she highlighted her delegation’s gratitude for the support provided to Central American countries through the ICO’s Special Fund and the joint collaboration with PROMECAFE, which had enabled the development of actions to strengthen domestic coffee consumption. The delegate of El Salvador also emphasized the importance of strengthening Member States’ commitment to improving the provision of data. On the subject of cooperation and in the context of the new planning exercise, she urged the Organization to consider identifying a source of funding for regions such as Central America in order to strengthen statistical systems, promote research and development of new technologies, and implement actions to enhance the resilience of the coffee sector.

89. The Chair thanked the delegate of El Salvador for her contribution and, seeing no further requests for the floor, thanked the Secretariat and stated that the JC had taken note of the report and that it would be presented to the Council.

Item 7: Other updates and other business

90. The Chair invited delegates to put forward other points for discussion. Since no delegations requested the floor, he indicated that the Committee could move on to the final agenda item.

Item 8: Next steps and next meeting

91. The Chair informed delegates that the next meeting of the JC could be held later in the year, after the upcoming session of the ICC in Honduras.

92. The Head of Operations confirmed that there was no need to hold a JC meeting in Honduras and invited countries to participate in the statistical workshop. She added that the Secretariat would prepare and circulate to Members a monthly report on statistical activities and outcomes.

93. The delegate of Côte d’Ivoire thanked the Chair and congratulated him on how he had handled the meeting.

94. The Chair thanked the delegate of Côte d'Ivoire and then announced that, unfortunately, he would not be able to attend the Council session in Honduras. He stated that the Vice-Chair or the Secretariat would therefore present the report of the JC to the Council on his behalf. The Chair expressed his appreciation to the Secretariat and all Members for their work, adding that it had been an honour and a pleasure to preside over the JC and that he looked forward to working in the other committees as well.

95. The Executive Director thanked the Chair for his leadership of the JC and said that every effort would be made to report on his behalf in Honduras. She expressed regret that the Chair would not be able to attend, while noting that she fully understood the reasons why.

96. The delegate of Honduras expressed regret that the Chair would not travel to Honduras. He highlighted that a fantastic trip had been planned, including visits to coffee farms, beaches, and Mayan cultural sites, but noted that he understood that it was not always possible to attend. The delegate of Honduras thanked the Chair for his cooperation, particularly highlighting his prudence and openness in moderating discussions, and congratulating him on the high-level and dedicated work he had done at the ICO.

97. The Secretariat and External Relations Officer took the opportunity to remind all delegations to submit their credentials for the 140th Session of the Council in San Pedro Sula by 22 September 2025. She added that any delegations that required assistance or support, including those needing visas or visa exemptions, should contact the Secretariat.

98. With no further business, the Chair declared the 5th Meeting of the Joint Committee of the International Coffee Organization formally closed.