



**INTERNATIONAL
COFFEE
ORGANIZATION**

ICC 141-6
9 April 2025
Original: English

E

**Decisions and Resolutions adopted
at the 141st Session of the
International Coffee Council**

25-26 March 2026

Opening of the 141 st Session of the Council.....	2
Item 1: Draft Agenda	2
Item 2: Votes.....	3
Item 3: International Coffee Agreement (ICA) 2022	3
Item 4: Financial and administrative matters.....	6
Item 5: Report on the work of the ICO and market situation.....	10
Item 6: Partnerships.....	14
Item 7: Report of meetings of committees and other bodies	16
Item 8: Premises.....	18
Item 9: Post of Executive Director – Mandate 2027-2032	29
Item 10: Office holders and committees.....	35
Item 11: Credentials	36
Item 12: Future meetings.....	36
Item 13: Other business.....	37
Closing session.....	37

Opening of the 141st Session of the Council

1. Mr Michael Wheeler of Papua New Guinea chaired the 141st Session of the International Coffee Council held online on 25 and 26 March 2026.
2. The Chair of the Council opened the Session by welcoming and thanking all Members for attending. In his speech¹, he expressed gratitude for the privilege of chairing the meeting, emphasized the importance of open and constructive dialogue, and urged delegates to work together collaboratively to address challenges and strengthen the International Coffee Organization (ICO) and the global coffee sector.
3. The delegate of Switzerland echoed the Chair of the Council's remarks and affirmed her delegation's support.
4. Following the Chair's opening speech, the Executive Director of the ICO, Dr Vanúcia Nogueira, delivered her opening remarks.
5. The delegate of Brazil thanked the Chair of the Council and the Executive Director for their remarks, which his government fully endorsed. He echoed the Executive Director's comments on the importance of the ICO, noting that its work remained of major and crucial significance for Brazil. He highlighted that more than 300,000 farms across his country were involved in coffee production, which provided income and generated employment for millions of people.
6. The Head of Operations informed the Council that, in compliance with paragraph 4 of Article 11 of the 2007 Agreement, the quorum for holding the 141st Session of the International Coffee Council had been reached.

Item 1: Draft Agenda

7. The Council adopted the draft Agenda contained in document [ICC-141-0 Rev. 2](#).

¹ Subsequently published as document [ICC-141-2](#).

Item 2: Votes**Item 2.1: Redistribution of votes for the 141st Session of the Council for coffee year 2025/26**

8. The Head of Operations reported on document [ICC-141-1](#) and tables 1-4 contained therein, showing the redistribution of votes in the Council for coffee year 2025/26 as at 2 March 2026, which had been calculated on the basis of the initial distribution of votes as per document [ICC-140-3 Rev. 1](#) and in accordance with Articles 12 and 21 of the International Coffee Agreement (ICA) 2007. She also presented Annex I, containing the situation of outstanding payments from Members in arrears as at 2 March 2026.

9. The Council approved document [ICC-141-1](#) on the redistribution of votes for the 141st Session of the Council for coffee year 2025/26.

Item 3: International Coffee Agreement (ICA) 2022**Item 3.1: Membership of the ICA 2022**

10. The Chair of the Council urged all delegations to work closely with their capitals and relevant offices to ensure that membership processes proceeded as smoothly as possible, particularly given the sensitivity and length of procedures in many countries.

11. The Executive Director reported on the status of membership of the ICA 2022, noting that the last update had been shared with delegates during the Council session held in San Pedro Sula. Since October 2025, two countries had completed the formalities to become Members of the ICA 2022: Côte d'Ivoire, which had deposited its instrument of ratification in February 2026 ([DN-39/26/ICA 2022](#)), and Viet Nam, which had submitted its instrument of approval in March 2026 ([DN-40/26/ICA 2022](#)). She reported that importing Members' participation remained at 15.2%, as no additional instruments had been deposited since October 2025. As for exporting Members, votes had reached 28.3% following the ratifications of Côte d'Ivoire and Viet Nam. In this sense, the Executive Director reminded delegates that two-thirds of the votes from both exporting and importing groups were required for the entry into force of the ICA 2022. She also noted that Angola had completed the ratification process, and only the signature and the deposit of its instruments were pending. The Executive Director further shared that in February 2026, during the 3rd African Coffee Week in Addis Ababa, the Secretariat had organized

bilateral meetings with 11 African Members to understand their priorities, explore partnership opportunities, and receive updates on the ICA 2022 ratification process. She noted that several countries had reported that their ratification processes were near complete, while others were progressing internally, with some delays due to government changes. She concluded by thanking the countries that had met with the Secretariat and reaffirmed the Organization's readiness to provide support to expedite the completion of all formalities.

12. The delegate of the European Union reported that the European Council had granted political approval for the signature of the ICA 2022 and that the process of designating the signatory was underway. He noted that progress was being made and expressed hope that the ratification and deposit of the relevant instrument would be completed by the end of the year.

13. The delegate of Switzerland thanked the Secretariat for the clear update on the ICA 2022 membership process and welcomed the progress made, congratulating the two Members who had completed their formalities. At the same time, she expressed concern that progress was slower than initially expected, particularly in light of the fact the ICA 2007 could not be extended indefinitely. She urged all remaining Members to complete the ratification process as soon as possible.

<p>14. The Council noted the report on the membership of the ICA 2022 presented by the Executive Director.</p>
--

Item 3.2: Working Group for the Entry into Force of the ICA 2022 (WGEF)

15. The Chair of the Council introduced item 3.2, recalling that he had stepped down as Chair of the WGEF during the 140th Session of the Council in San Pedro Sula, Honduras, in order to take over as Chair of the Council for coffee year 2025/26.

16. The Chair of the WGEF, Mr Tom Fabozzi of the EU-Ireland, reported that the group had held its 11th meeting on 19 February 2026. He noted that progress had been made on the Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the Economics Committee, while discussions on the ToRs for the Board of Affiliate Members (BAM) had reached an impasse on membership. He explained that, given this limited progress on the BAM, it had been considered useful for

the Secretariat to present some of the outstanding documents to help advance work in other areas while Members continued ratifying the ICA 2022. The Chair of the WGEF clarified that the WGEF had reviewed the proposed conversion factors document, with Members seeking clarification on scope, methodology, and implications for statistical practices and contributions, and that proposed reviews of the Financial Rules and Financial Regulations (document [ICC-102-8](#)) and the Staff Rules and Regulations (document [ICC-119-17](#)) had also been discussed. He stated that he would work with the Secretariat to clarify which documents were required for the ICA 2022 to enter into force and had been approved for review, and to provide further detail on the WGEF's mandate. He concluded that discussions would resume at the next meeting, which was planned for the second half of April.

17. The delegate of the European Union thanked the previous Chair of the WGEF for the work carried out during his mandate and expressed appreciation to the current Chair of the WGEF for volunteering to take over, emphasizing the importance of maintaining momentum and continuing work on all documentation in preparation for the entry into force of the ICA 2022.

18. The delegate of Brazil congratulated the Chair of the WGEF on his precise and comprehensive report and emphasized the importance of the group, which provided Members with the opportunity to discuss issues crucial for the entry into force of the ICA 2022. He underscored the need for all information and relevant documentation to be made available well in advance in order to enable more substantive and productive discussions. Referring to the 11th meeting of the WGEF, he noted that the explanation provided for agenda item 3 had been generic, without detailing the specific topics to be addressed, and observed that the list of pending documents included highly relevant issues that had not previously been communicated or made available to Members. He added that, although the proposal was primarily informative, prior knowledge of those details would have allowed Members to prepare adequately, including for assessing whether a specific mandate was required for the WGEF to examine certain issues. The delegate of Brazil stressed that the observation applied to all ICO organs and committees, noting that transparency contributed to broader participation and strengthened the efficiency and openness of the Organization's processes. He concluded by stating that the Brazilian delegation's work had aimed to ensure the Organization carried out its work efficiently and transparently, with full participation by all Members, thereby strengthening its role and representation of the global coffee sector's interests.

19. The Chair of the Council noted the report of the Chair of the WGEF, as well as the comments by Member delegations, expressed his appreciation, and echoed many of the sentiments conveyed. He welcomed Brazil's active participation in the group and encouraged other delegations to engage in the work of the WGEF.

20. The Council took note of the report on the WGEF.

Item 4: Financial and administrative matters

Item 4.1: Finance and Administration Committee

21. The Chair of the Finance and Administration Committee (FAC), Mr Zoltan Agai of the European Union, reported on the 66th and 67th meetings of the Committee held on 3 and 20 March 2026, respectively.

22. The Chair of the FAC informed Members that the Head of Finance and Administration had presented the financial situation and an updated chart with the actual cash balances as at the end of January 2026, which took into account all budgeted expenditures for each month until September 2026. While the cash balance had been deemed sufficient to finance the Organization's operations until the end of the coffee year in progress, Members were still encouraged to pay their contributions promptly. When addressing the matter of the Russian Federation's outstanding contributions, the Secretariat noted that it had received a letter in February 2026 indicating that the ICO would not require a licence from the Office of Financial Sanctions Implementation (OFSI) to receive contributions from the Russian Federation. Accordingly, the Secretariat had communicated with Russia to initiate the transfer of assessed contributions for coffee years 2024/25 and 2025/26. The latest update since the FAC meetings was that the payment request was now with the Treasury Department of the Russian government and the ING Bank.

23. The Council took note of the report by the Chair of the FAC.

Item 4.2: Report on collection of contributions from Members in arrears

24. The Chair of the FAC noted that the Head of Finance and Administration had presented a report on the collection of contributions from Members in arrears (document [FA-408/26 Rev. 1](#)), which showed that about 76% of the total contributions for coffee year 2025/26 had been received. He also informed the Council that the Secretariat continued to make regular contact with all Members with outstanding contributions from previous years to encourage them to settle their arrears.

25. The delegate of Indonesia reported that the process for the payment of its contributions for coffee year 2025/26 was underway, reaffirmed the country's commitment to fulfilling its financial obligations, and expressed appreciation for the Secretariat's patience while regretting any impact on the Organization's cash flow.

26. The Council noted the report on collection of contributions from Members in arrears by the Chair of the FAC.

Item 4.3: Administrative Accounts of the Organization for financial year 2024/25 and Auditors' Report

27. The Chair of the FAC introduced document [FA-403/26 Rev. 1](#), containing the Administrative Accounts of the Organization for financial year 2024/25 and the report of the auditors, noting that its approval had been recommended.

28. The delegate of Brazil thanked the Chair of the FAC and congratulated the Secretariat for providing the information and clarifications requested by his delegation during the recent FAC meetings, and supported the approval of the relevant document.

29. The Council approved the Administrative Accounts of the Organization for financial year 2024/25 and Auditors' Report contained in document [FA-403/26 Rev. 1](#).

Item 4.4: Accounts of the Special Fund for the financial year 2024/25 and Auditors' Report

30. The Chair of the FAC informed Members that document [FA-404/26 Rev. 1](#), containing the Accounts of the Special Fund for financial year 2024/25 and the report of the auditors, had been recommended for approval.

31. The Council approved the Accounts of the Special Fund for the financial year 2024/25 and Auditors' Report contained in document [FA-404/26 Rev. 1](#).

Item 4.5: Salary scales and basis for contributions to the Provident Fund

32. The Chair of the FAC informed Members that the Committee had recommended the salary scales and basis for contributions to the Provident Fund, contained in document [FA-406/26 Rev. 2](#), for the approval of the Council.

33. The delegate of Brazil noted that the Head of Finance and Administration had informed Members that she would calculate the adjustments referred to in the relevant document retroactively. He inquired whether that was the standard practice that had also been applied in previous years and whether the calculation was always carried out retroactively from January of the current year. He further requested clarification on the specific formula used, as presented in the documents.

34. The Head of Finance and Administration explained that, following the approval of the new salary scale by the Council, the retroactive adjustment would apply from January 2026, covering the period up to March, as March salaries had just been paid. She noted that the ICO's pension fund contributions would also be adjusted retroactively for February and March. She clarified that the calculation involved comparing salaries and pension fund contributions under the new scale with those under the old scale, and that the resulting differences would be retroactively adjusted. She added that this had been the normal practice in the past.

35. The delegate of Indonesia reported that his delegation had examined the proposed update to the salary scale and pension fund contributions for Secretariat staff. He acknowledged the importance of fair and competitive compensation to maintain a

motivated workforce and stated that Indonesia did not oppose the revisions, provided they did not create additional financial strain. He emphasized the need for continued financial prudence and expressed confidence that the Secretariat would monitor the impact of these adjustments on the Organization's resources.

36. The delegate of Switzerland echoed the comments made by Indonesia, noting that the financial framework in which the Organization was operating remained tight and was unlikely to change in the near future. While not opposing the adoption of the updated salary scale, Switzerland emphasized the need for cost-cutting and efficiency measures wherever possible, including the reconsideration of travel-related privileges and re-evaluation of pay grade classifications, particularly when Secretariat staff left. She acknowledged the Secretariat's efforts, as already reflected in the draft Administrative Budget for coffee year 2026/27 ([FA-411/26](#)), and encouraged that continued attention be paid to balancing costs and benefits. The delegate of Switzerland also referred to the request made by the FAC on 3 March 2026 for updated accounts of the Trust Fund and thanked the Secretariat for the additional information provided bilaterally, while also expressing regret that the updated documents had not yet been shared with the Council. She stressed the importance of transparency, particularly regarding the financing of two Junior Professional Officers by one Member country, and respectfully urged the Secretariat to provide the requested information as soon as possible.

37. The delegate of Brazil endorsed the comments made by the delegates of Indonesia and Switzerland on the ongoing need to reduce expenditures. He recalled that Brazil had highlighted in several meetings that the entire United Nations system had been undergoing expenditure reviews through the UN80 Initiative, which the International Coffee Organization needed to take into account and apply in the coming years when carrying out its work.

38. The Chair of the FAC thanked the Secretariat for its work, including the preparation of additional documents for a second meeting. He also informed the Council that during the 66th FAC meeting, a presentation had been delivered by Mr Stefano Gatti, Director General for Development Cooperation of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, outlining an updated and concrete offer to host the ICO headquarters in Rome. He noted that, given the importance and sensitivity of the matter, it had been agreed to bring the issue to the Council for discussion under the relevant agenda item. He further indicated that Members had also raised the fact that the Executive Director's mandate would end in April of the

following year, and that this matter had thus likewise been referred to the Council for consideration.

39. The Chair of the Council took note of the report presented and indicated that the matters concerning the premises and the post of the Executive Director would be discussed under the relevant agenda items. He then thanked the Chair of the FAC for his report and commended the efficient work of the Committee under his leadership, expressing his appreciation for the efforts undertaken.

40. The Council approved the salary scales and basis for contributions to the Provident Fund contained in document FA-406/26 Rev. 2 .

Item 5: Report on the work of the ICO and market situation

41. The Executive Director began her report by providing insights into the most recent market trends. She reported that global coffee prices had reached a historic nominal peak in February 2025 before declining to lower levels by March 2026, reflecting a downward trend over the past year despite periods of volatility driven by geopolitical developments, including trade measures and regulatory uncertainties. She noted that the earlier price surge had been underpinned by consecutive global supply deficits from 2019/20 to 2023/24, which had incentivized increased investment in inputs, labour, and area expansion, resulting in a significant rise in production and a return to a modest global surplus in 2024/25. The expansion, led by key producing countries such as Colombia, Ethiopia, Indonesia and Viet Nam, alongside a strong export performance in the early months of 2025/26, was expected to result in a further supply surplus, thereby exerting continued downward pressure on prices. At the same time, she observed that demand had remained relatively stable, with consumers adjusting consumption patterns rather than reducing overall intake. She emphasized, however, that relatively low stock levels in major consuming markets had helped limit the extent of the price decline, although stocks appeared to have reached a floor and were beginning to recover gradually.

42. With reference to progress under the ICO's Strategic Goal I, the Executive Director noted continued delivery of key statistical outputs, increased subscriptions and revenue, and positive user engagement, alongside progress in implementing planned activities for 2025/26. She highlighted efforts to improve accessibility through simplified publications,

expanded dissemination of the ICO composite indicator price (I-CIP), and the development of more user-friendly tools, as well as support to Members through Communities of Practice, bilateral consultations, and data automation initiatives. While a recent satisfaction survey had indicated generally positive feedback, the Executive Director noted areas for improvement, particularly in database accessibility, and added that early progress had been observed in data timeliness and coverage.

43. With reference to Strategic Goals II and III, the Executive Director reported on ongoing activities within the Coffee Public-Private Task Force (CPPTF), highlighting efforts to strengthen farmer incomes, promote regenerative agriculture, and enhance mechanization. Progress by the CPPTF's Technical Workstreams (TWs) included sharing the Living Income Process Guide (TW1); piloting the "Proxy for Production Cost and Real Income" tool in El Salvador, Rwanda and Southeast Asia (TW2); and supporting Members with compliance with the European Union Regulation on Deforestation-Free Products (EUDR) and other regulatory matters (TW3) in collaboration with technical and financial partners. Additional initiatives included training programmes in partnership with the International Trade Centre (ITC) and the Specialty Coffee Association (SCA), activities with the Centre for Circular Economy in Coffee (C4CEC), updates to the Coffee Sustainability Support Database, and discussions on specialty coffee definitions, among others.

44. The Executive Director further reported that the UN General Assembly had officially recognized 1 October as International Coffee Day (ICD) through resolution [A/RES/80/248](#), following a proposal by Brazil that was adopted with broad support. She noted that the designation aligned with provisions of the ICA 2007 on promoting coffee consumption, quality, and market development, and recalled that ICD had first been launched by the ICO in 2015 at EXPO Milano. She emphasized that the UN's recognition had strengthened the sector's global visibility and awareness of its social, economic, and cultural importance, and thanked Brazil, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and all ICO Members that had contributed to achieving the milestone. As for the 2025 ICD campaign, she noted that the materials prepared, including an official video in four languages, had been widely shared, reaching 18 million users and raising social media engagement by 90% in October 2025. The dedicated website gained over 9,000 new users, while social media activity grew organically through more frequent posts and faster event coverage. She added that the 2026 campaign, "Coffee is Part of the Solution", had been launched to showcase the sector's contributions to global challenges, with Members and partners invited to contribute with their initiatives.

45. Lastly, the Executive Director reported that six mission reports had already been circulated to Members for coffee year 2025/26 and highlighted the activities carried out in San Pedro Sula during the 140th Session of the Council, while expressing gratitude for the exceptional hospitality and support provided by the Government of Honduras. She added that reports from five more recent missions would be sent to Members in due course.

46. The delegate of Switzerland thanked the Executive Director for her comprehensive report on the coffee market, noting its usefulness, and expressed her appreciation for the detailed account of activities undertaken by the Executive Director and the Secretariat, as well as for her visits to producing and importing Members. She expressed special appreciation for the work on statistics and new income sources, and highlighted the valued support provided to Members in navigating the policy environment. She also congratulated the Executive Director on the UN General Assembly's recognition of ICD, thanked the Brazilian delegation for their initiative, and looked forward to celebrating the first official UN ICD in Switzerland within the framework of the Swiss Coffee Trade Association Forum in October 2026.

47. The delegate of Brazil thanked the Executive Director for her detailed and comprehensive report, noting that Brazil relied on the statistics provided by the Organization for several of its operations. He then suggested including exploratory visits to Southeast Asia and China in next year's Programme of Activities, given the growing demand for coffee in those regions. He also expressed gratitude to those who contributed to the ICD initiative and underscored the importance of its approval, highlighting the global and essential nature of coffee, and commending the countries that had joined Brazil in establishing its observance.

48. The delegate of Côte d'Ivoire thanked the Secretariat for its work and congratulated it on the initiatives undertaken, highlighting the support provided to both producing and consuming countries, and expressing appreciation to the team for their dedicated efforts in advancing the Organization's activities.

49. The Executive Director thanked delegates for their words and expressed her anticipation for the celebrations of ICD in Montreux, noting that preparations were already underway and that the Secretariat was collaborating closely with the Swiss delegation to ensure that ICO meetings and other events would be highly engaging. Regarding visits to Asia, she clarified that a trip to Thailand was planned for May, as well as one to Viet Nam

towards the end of 2026. She then noted that she would be coordinating potential visits to other countries, including the Philippines, and return visits to China, India and Indonesia, in collaboration with Members.

50. The delegate of Mexico thanked the Organization for convening the meeting and expressed appreciation for the message sent to Mexico on the promulgation of the country's coffee development law, enacted in December 2025. She announced that a coffee policy launch within that framework was planned for June 2026 and invited Members and the Secretariat to participate. She also referred to the call for proposals launched by the ICO and noted that Mexico had submitted a project requesting support for provisions on coffee reference prices.

51. The delegate of Papua New Guinea noted that the European Union was considering simplifying the application of the EUDR and seeking inputs from various organizations and countries. He inquired whether the ICO would coordinate among Members to submit suggestions or make submissions on their behalf.

52. The Head of Operations confirmed the information and noted that the deadline for official submissions had been at the end of January 2026. She explained that proposals from stakeholders would feed into the "April Package" and that the Secretariat remained in dialogue with DG Environment. She acknowledged that systematic coordination among Members had not yet occurred but suggested that a coordinated proposal could still be developed to provide guidance and an initial framework.

53. The delegate of Papua New Guinea acknowledged the opportunity to contribute and noted that the EUDR did not adequately address the position of very small growers. He observed that no schemes had yet been established to address this issue and indicated that Papua New Guinea was intending to submit recommendations.

54. The delegate of the European Union noted that the deadline for submissions had passed but expressed confidence that the concerns of Papua New Guinea had been addressed through the broad consultation process, which had included other countries and the private sector. He explained that the Commission was required to submit a report to the co-legislators—the European Council and the European Parliament—by 30 April 2026. He also thanked the Secretariat for its work and noted that the EU continued to provide support within the context of the CPPTF's TW3.

55. The delegate of Papua New Guinea thanked the European Union for the update and noted that, without coordination, it was difficult to be certain that the concerns of small growers had been addressed. He emphasized his continuing concern regarding the introduction of the EUDR, observing that he had seen no proposals ensuring that small growers would be fully protected, and indicated his intention to address this issue further at a later stage.

56. The delegate of Côte d'Ivoire expressed his satisfaction that the ICO was discussing the EU legislation. He noted that the delegate of the European Union, like him, was also involved in cocoa and served as the spokesperson for consuming countries. He added that he would exchange views with him and expressed appreciation that the issue had been raised in the context of coffee.

57. The delegate of Switzerland echoed the delegate of Papua New Guinea and noted that coordination by the ICO on the matter would be appreciated, also by the Swiss private sector.

58. The Council took note of the report on the work of the ICO and market situation.
--

Item 6: Partnerships

Item 6.1: MoU ICO-FAO

59. The Head of Operations introduced document [WP-Council 355/26](#), containing the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the ICO and FAO, and noted the long-standing collaboration between the two organizations. She recalled that the previous MoU, approved in September 2004, had provided a broad framework for cooperation, and explained that the updated MoU, under development since late 2024, reflected a more focused collaboration involving several FAO divisions. She highlighted that the MoU would cover areas such as market transparency and sustainability, trade-related issues, resilience and adaptation, and the sustainability of family farmers. She clarified that all activities under the MoU would be carried out by the Secretariat without the use of consultants.

60. The delegate of Indonesia noted that his country had reviewed the draft MoU between the ICO and FAO and had no objection in principle, seeing it as a strategic step to promote sustainability in the coffee sector. He requested clarification on the work plan in

Annex 1, noting that the outputs that FAO expected to use appeared to be higher than those for the ICO. He asked how equitable benefits and intellectual property for jointly developed data would be ensured and emphasized that Indonesia's intention was to ensure a balanced and mutually beneficial partnership.

61. In response to the query from Indonesia, the Head of Operations noted that the collaboration would enhance the ICO's impact and credibility. She explained that the ICO would be clearly recognized for its contributions in publications and activities, and that the intellectual property would remain with the originator, with ICO data processed and appropriately credited. She concluded that the MoU arrangements ensured both the recognition and protection of ICO inputs.

62. The Council approved the draft MoU between the ICO and FAO, which will be published as document ICC-141-3².

Item 6.2: MoU ICO-IACO

63. The Head of Operations introduced document [WP-Council 356/26](#), noting that the ICO and Inter-African Coffee Organisation (IACO) had been long-standing partners, with a shared goal of supporting and developing the coffee sector in Africa. She explained that the draft MoU established a framework for cooperation to improve data collection and analysis, support compliance with global regulations such as the EUDR, promote research on climate-resilient coffee production, build capacity across the coffee value chain, and strengthen institutional cooperation to integrate African priorities into global discussions. She emphasized that the MoU would ensure the continuation of the partnership while enabling targeted activities, and added that all work would be carried out by ICO Secretariat staff without hiring external consultants.

64. The delegate of Indonesia noted that his country had reviewed the draft MoU between the ICO and IACO and recognized its potential to benefit the African coffee sector. He emphasized that challenges required strong partnerships and that a more robust African coffee sector would contribute to a balanced and sustainable global coffee economy. He

² In accordance with Article 5 of the MoU, the ICO will publish the MoU on its website after it has entered into force.

requested clarification from the Secretariat on the urgency of concluding the arrangement and the expected immediate outcomes for Members.

65. The Head of Operations explained that cooperation between the ICO and IACO had been ongoing for many years but had intensified recently, particularly in the area of statistical data collection and engagement with African Members. She noted that practical collaboration, including workshops such as the one held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, had highlighted the mutual need for closer coordination and improved access to data. She emphasized that the decision to formalize the partnership through an MoU stemmed from a shared recognition of the need to establish a clear institutional framework, particularly given the increasing importance of data sharing and related intellectual property considerations. She added that a formalized arrangement would strengthen and professionalize cooperation, allowing it to be further supported by specific agreements, as needed.

66. The Council approved the draft MoU between the ICO and IACO, which will be published as document ICC-141-4³.

Item 7: Report of meetings of committees and other bodies

Item 7.1: Joint Committee

67. The Chair of the Joint Committee, Ambassador Aly Touré of Côte d'Ivoire, reported on the 6th meeting of the Joint Committee, held on 2 March 2026. He advised that an amended version of the agenda had been adopted, with the original item 4 ("Update of the list of exporting countries and their country codes, ICO Certifying Agents and registered ports of export") deferred to allow additional time for Members to submit the required information. He also explained that the Report of the 5th meeting (document [JC-21/26](#)) had been approved and noted that the three statistical workshop reports mentioned therein had subsequently been circulated as documents [JC-25/26](#), [JC-26/26](#) and [JC-27/26](#).

68. The Chair of the Joint Committee noted that the Secretariat had reported on activities aimed at strengthening the Organization's statistical function and that Members had been reminded that monthly statistical dashboards were being disseminated to

³ The ICO will publish the MoU on its website after it has entered into force.

provide regular progress updates. The three main areas of work highlighted included: (i) capacity-building activities for Members, including workshops, Communities of Practice meetings, and engagements with national statistical focal points; (ii) improvements in the dissemination and accessibility of statistics, including a more user-friendly Coffee Market Report, expanded daily publication of the I-CIP, and the planned launch of a public statistical dashboard and enhanced Global Coffee Statistics Database; and (iii) the results of the recent satisfaction survey. The Chair added that it was still too early to assess the full impact of these activities, but that positive developments had been observed. He also explained that, following the presentation, the delegation of Brazil had emphasized the importance of maintaining full transparency and had referred to the more detailed reporting format set out in document [JC-02/24](#).

69. With respect to the submission and evaluation of ICO initiatives, the Chair explained that the Secretariat had reminded the Joint Committee of the approved procedures set out in document [JC-13/25 Rev. 2](#). He added that, as at 2 March, three Members had submitted proposals and that the Joint Committee had agreed to extend the submission deadline to 16 March 2026, as well as that the use of the original template provided by the Secretariat was optional, and that Members retained full decision-making authority.

70. The Chair highlighted that all approved initiatives would be implemented without external consultants and noted that the Joint Committee had agreed that the next meeting would be held in June 2026, by which time all proposals would have been circulated and reviewed.

71. The Council took note of the report by the Chair of the Joint Committee.
--

Item 7.2: Update on the submission and evaluation of proposals for ICO initiatives and their inclusion in the Programme of Activities

72. The Head of Operations noted that the deadline for submitting proposals and initiatives had been extended and thanked delegations for the additional submissions received for coffee year 2026/27. She explained that all proposals would be translated into the four official languages and circulated to Members, who would have six weeks to provide comments and indicate priorities. She added that these inputs would be compiled and shared with all Members before being reviewed by the Joint Committee at its next

meeting in June or early July, after which recommendations would be made to the Council for consideration in September 2026.

73. The Council took note of the report by the Head of Operations.
--

Item 8: Premises

74. The Chair of the Council introduced the item on premises, noting that it was a strategic topic which had been discussed extensively at almost every Council session since it had first been raised by Members at the 136th Session held in Bengaluru, India.

75. For the benefit of delegates who were not present in 2023, the Chair recalled that the topic had originally been introduced following the receipt of a letter from the ICO headquarters' landlord, informing the Secretariat that the Organization would need to vacate the building on Gray's Inn Road in June 2025 due to planned renovation works. He explained that, at the time, urgent discussions on the matter had also addressed ways to reduce the Organization's costs, noting that rent and personnel expenses had represented and continued to represent the largest share of the Administrative Budget.

76. The Chair further recalled that, at the 136th Session of the Council, [ICC Resolution 483](#) had been approved and the Secretariat had subsequently provided relevant information on the topic of premises to Members through both the FAC and the Council, while continuing to liaise with the Government of the United Kingdom and the landlord.

77. The Chair noted that, in February 2024, a second letter from the landlord had informed the Organization that it could continue renting the current premises, and that at the 137th Session of the Council, held in March 2024, Members had approved the proposal to extend the lease of the current premises at 222 Gray's Inn Road by four years, from 2025 to 2029, with a break clause after two years. He clarified that, should the Organization wish to end the contract in June 2027, as foreseen by the break clause, a notice letter would need to be sent to the landlord by December 2026 at the latest.

78. The Chair then introduced the four reference documents, noting that they contained: an expression of interest submitted by Switzerland to host the headquarters of the ICO in Geneva ([ED-2464/24 Rev. 2](#)); an expression of interest submitted by Italy to host

the ICO headquarters in Rome ([ED-2455/24](#)); a formal candidature submitted by Italy to host the ICO headquarters in Rome ([ED-2498/26](#)); and a proposal from El Salvador to create a working group mandated to discuss the matter of premises ([ED-2503/26](#)).

79. The Chair reported that, following discussions with a representative of the Italian Government, Italy's offer to host the ICO headquarters in Rome was subject to a time schedule, as the building's layout needed to be finalized by the end of the summer. The Chair reported that Italy had indicated the building offered for the ICO headquarters could be given to another international organization if the ICO was not interested in relocating.

80. The Chair recalled that the location of the ICO's headquarters had been specified as London in most agreements since 1964, making the matter a Council decision. He also noted that Switzerland had submitted an expression of interest to host the headquarters, which remained at that stage. The Chair emphasized the need for the Council to establish a clear timeline for discussing the issue and making a decision, while clarifying that no agreement was expected on the proposals during the 141st Session.

81. The delegate of Switzerland confirmed her country's interest in hosting the ICO headquarters in Geneva, highlighting the city's role as a global coffee trade hub and a centre for international dialogue and economic cooperation. She noted that Switzerland was committed to preparing a concrete proposal tailored to the Organization's needs, while expressing regret that certain procedural concerns had not been addressed, despite being raised previously. In this sense, she pointed out that the Council and Secretariat should allow adequate time for Members to consider such a strategic matter and emphasized that procedures could not be expedited for the sake of one competitor. She additionally noted that Switzerland had repeatedly highlighted the need for a shared understanding of a rough timetable and key milestones, and that the absence of such a framework had made planning difficult. The delegate of Switzerland called for a fully transparent process to ensure a level playing field for all Members interested in hosting the headquarters, with the same relevant information being shared simultaneously with everyone. Lastly, she reiterated that any decision had to go through the regular Council decision-making process and warned that failure to uphold transparency could undermine trust in the Organization and create a challenging situation.

82. The delegate of the European Union thanked the Chair for providing a detailed history of the discussions and noted that concerns regarding a lack of transparency did not

reflect the extent of the open dialogue held since the 136th Session of the Council held in Bengaluru, India. He recalled that the possibility of considering locations outside London had been raised by some exporting Members, particularly due to the high costs associated with being based in the United Kingdom. He also noted that Members had repeatedly called for savings and referred to UN system-wide efforts to reduce costs, including the relocation of staff from high-cost duty stations such as New York. He continued to underline that the choice of location should take into account not only rental costs but also post adjustments under the UN system, which could add approximately 80% to base salaries, and observed that alternative locations might offer significantly lower cost structures. Finally, the delegate of the European Union welcomed the proposal from El Salvador and reaffirmed the importance of transparency and openness, noting that the Secretariat had provided Members with relevant information and specifications.

83. The delegate of Brazil stated that the issue of the headquarters was of great strategic importance to the Organization, going beyond administrative and budgetary concerns, and emphasized that it was a political matter on which the Council should exercise caution. He noted that a decision should not be taken in haste and stressed the need for the utmost transparency from the Secretariat, as well as a process to be debated and decided upon by Member States, with specific deadlines, a clear timeline, and schedules so that all countries could feel included. He echoed the statements made by the Chair, noting that the first question to be addressed by the Council was whether the Organization should consider a move, and emphasized that Brazil viewed remaining in London as the most ideal option, given its status as a global transport hub and its unique urban and business infrastructure for international organizations. He stressed that no discussion on relocating outside the UK should be initiated until all possibilities for remaining in London had been exhausted. He also noted that the need to vacate the current premises was not urgent, as the Organization could remain at 222 Gray's Inn Road until at least 2029, which provided sufficient time for Members to consider the issue. Based on available figures, he noted that 15% of the Organization's budget was being spent on premises – which was not considered unreasonable given the size and importance of the Organization – while salaries accounted for around 70%, suggesting that there were ways to reduce costs that did not involve relocating the headquarters. Lastly, the delegate of Brazil welcomed El Salvador's suggestion to create a working group and proposed that, alternatively, discussions could also take place within the FAC. He emphasized that any debate or analysis should adhere to principles of transparency, openness, and equal

opportunity for all Members, and that the Council's decision-making process should respect the independence and autonomy of the Organization.

84. The delegate of Colombia requested clarification from the Secretariat on the timeline for making decisions regarding the Organization's headquarters. She emphasized the need for clear deadlines, first for deciding whether to leave London, and second for possibly selecting an alternative location. She expressed support for El Salvador's proposal to create a working group, noting that it could review existing proposals and open opportunities to other countries interested in hosting the Organization. She stressed that a clearly defined decision-making process that considered political, strategic, and austerity factors was required for the purposes of transparency, and asked the Secretariat to provide a schedule for the process.

85. The Chair of the Council clarified that, in light of the Italian proposal, the ICO would need to decide by December 2026 whether to leave London and vacate the current premises, with the next relevant deadline occurring in 2029 prior to the lease renewal. He emphasized that the timeline had not yet been formally set and that the Council's first decision was whether to consider relocating the headquarters outside of London. If that option were deemed viable, the Council would then review offers and establish timelines for other countries or Members interested in hosting the Organization.

86. The delegate of Indonesia took note of the developments regarding the potential relocation of the ICO headquarters and expressed appreciation to both Italy and Switzerland for their interest and commitment to the ICO. Referring to similar processes undertaken in other international organizations, he emphasized the need for a comprehensive pros and cons analysis, which would serve as the basis for Members to make an informed decision on the relocation. He suggested that the ICO Secretariat prepare a comparative analysis of London, Rome and Geneva as potential host cities, to include, inter alia, a detailed assessment of the financial and operational implications for the ICO, covering areas such as rental costs, staff salaries and benefits under the applicable scales of the United Nations common system, operational expenses, and the strategic advantages of each city in terms of diplomatic representation and coordination with other international organizations. He further noted his understanding that the Secretariat could undertake this analysis once the formal proposal from Switzerland had been officially received. The delegate of Indonesia also stressed the importance of establishing a clear procedure and timeline to ensure transparency and equal participation, particularly if

additional countries wished to present their candidatures. Lastly, he supported El Salvador's proposal to establish a working group with membership open to all interested Members, viewing it as a constructive and inclusive forum to examine the relocation process, ensure transparency and develop clear procedures and timelines, while confirming Indonesia's readiness to engage constructively.

87. The delegate of El Salvador expressed his appreciation to Italy for its interesting proposal, noting the political and economic complexity of the matter at hand. He highlighted the deadline to vacate the current ICO premises by 2029 and emphasized that, although the time available might seem ample, decisions on relocating an international organization were infrequent and challenging. While expressing his understanding for Brazil's preference for the ICO to remain in the United Kingdom for practical reasons, he acknowledged the legitimate interest shown by other countries, including Italy and Switzerland, in hosting the Secretariat. He stressed the need to provide a response to Italy on its proposal and to agree on a path forward, including the possibility of requesting that the Italian government grant an extension beyond June, which would allow additional proposals to be considered. While acknowledging that other locations might be more convenient financially, he highlighted the historical and strategic value of the current location. Echoing other Members, the delegate of El Salvador then disagreed with the suggestion that there had been a lack of transparency, but stressed that the process had been somewhat disorganized. For this reason, his government had proposed the creation of a dedicated working group, open to all interested Member countries, to focus on the relocation process. He explained that the group's first task would be to establish an appropriate timeline, followed by the definition of specifications for proposals and the process for their analysis. He added that the working group would support the Secretariat and the Council, ensuring a practical, transparent, and orderly approach to evaluating proposals while taking into account the political, economic, and social dimensions of any decision. Finally, he confirmed that El Salvador was ready to engage constructively and promptly in the process and emphasized the importance of providing feedback to the Italian government.

88. The delegate of the EU-Italy recalled that discussions on the topic had begun in Bengaluru, India, and noted the need to vacate the current ICO premises by June 2029, while also emphasizing that decisions on relocating were rare and complex. He referred to the UN80 Initiative, highlighting the potential for cost savings from the relocation of UN organizations, and stressed that time was a critical financial factor. He noted that premises

costs and post adjustments represented a significant portion of the ICO's expenditures, and emphasized the substantial difference between London and Rome in this regard. He explained that Rome had submitted a proposal offering free premises and significant post adjustment savings, which could reduce organizational expenses by approximately 30%. He added that Rome also offered additional potential savings, such as access to meeting rooms for annual in-person gatherings, which he considered valuable for both cost efficiency and maintaining direct interaction. The delegate of the EU-Italy took note of the points made by El Salvador regarding the need for a clear timeline and structured process and agreed that a dedicated timeframe would be necessary to allow proper consideration, while reiterating the financial implications of extra time. He noted that he would consult with the Italian government on the possibility of extending the current June deadline to allow sufficient time for constructive discussions. Lastly, he stressed the importance of a timely decision, reiterating that the proposal offered financial benefits that could be reinvested in the Organization.

89. The Chair of the Council acknowledged the comments made by Brazil, Colombia and Indonesia and thanked the delegate of El Salvador for taking the initiative to put forward a proposal for the establishment of a working group, noting that several delegations had already expressed their support. He also thanked the delegate of the EU-Italy for his intervention and expressed appreciation for his willingness to explore the possibility of extending the deadline at hand. He noted that the current deadline posed certain challenges and underlined the importance of allowing sufficient time to follow due process. He recalled that, while the Organization could be agile, it could not always move quickly, emphasizing the need for a measured and structured approach.

90. The delegate of Honduras recalled that the issue at hand had originally arisen in Bengaluru from the urgent need to address uncertainty regarding the Organization's current premises and echoed El Salvador's view that discussions on the relocation of the ICO headquarters had lacked structure. He emphasized that, while various options had been explored since 2023, including proposals from Italy and Switzerland, the Council had not yet taken a formal decision on whether to relocate the headquarters, either within or outside the United Kingdom, nor had Members formally sought guidance from their governments. He cautioned that discussions on timelines, costs, and alternative locations were taking place without a clear legal or procedural basis, suggesting that the process had been initiated in the wrong way and advanced prematurely. In this regard, he supported El Salvador's proposal to establish a dedicated working group to bring order and

clarity to the process, define the problem to be addressed, and outline the appropriate legal and procedural framework, including timelines, but without presuming that the Organization would necessarily relocate. While thanking his colleagues for all the discussions certainly held in good faith, he stressed the importance of ensuring the full consultation and informed participation of all Member countries before proceeding further.

91. The Chair of the Council thanked the delegate of Honduras and agreed with his analysis, recalling that the headquarters would remain in London unless the Council decided otherwise, as foreseen in the ICA, and noting that no decision in that sense had yet been taken. He added that a proposal had been received which called for a re-examination of the entire issue. He expressed agreement that the working group solution had considerable merit and emphasized the importance of hearing from other delegations before moving forward.

92. In response to the question raised by the delegates of Honduras and the EU–Italy on whether the United Kingdom had been consulted on the matter of premises, the Executive Director informed Members that a formal inquiry had been submitted at the beginning of the process in 2024. While the Government of the United Kingdom at the time had expressed satisfaction with the Organization’s presence in the country, it was noted that no further proposals had been forthcoming. She further noted that during the last FAC meeting in March 2026, the delegate of the United Kingdom had conveyed the country’s interest in maintaining the ICO headquarters in the country, but had not presented a specific offer. Finally, the Executive Director observed that no United Kingdom representative was present during the discussion of the premises item and added that the Secretariat had not yet engaged with the current government.

93. The delegate of Switzerland noted that transparency seemed to be a shared concern among other Members and emphasized the importance of defining milestones and achieving a common understanding to avoid risks related to potential governance issues. She also noted that, despite Switzerland’s repeated requests, no deadlines had been defined, including for the submission of letters of intention, and emphasized that, for the sake of fairness, all potential candidates, including but not limited to Italy and Switzerland, should be given sufficient time to submit concrete proposals. She expressed appreciation for the proposal put forward by El Salvador and noted that, while a temporary working group could be a useful tool, Switzerland would prefer to refrain from creating one until fundamental principles were clarified at the Council level. She emphasized that the FAC

was already mandated to deal with questions of that nature, and that a working group could not replace the functions or recommendations of the FAC or the Council. She also highlighted the burden that the creation of a new body could represent for delegations with limited resources and stated that Switzerland would not oppose a working group if a clear consensus emerged, provided it did not replace any decision or function of the Council. On financial matters, she noted that it was premature to discuss costs in detail, as no concrete offer had yet been made by Switzerland. While noting that there was room for financial optimization, she invited Members to look at the broader picture and all potential financial synergies, not only regarding Secretariat staff salaries but also in terms of costs borne by Member countries in representing themselves within the Organization.

94. The delegate of Côte d'Ivoire expressed alignment with the position of Honduras, noting that if there were Members who believed the Organization should remain in London, the Secretariat needed to take all necessary measures to gather relevant information and report back to the Council with a fully informed report. He emphasized that the Executive Director was to provide the necessary information, but that the decision on whether to stay or move would be taken by the Council. He highlighted two important points: (i) that the headquarters would remain in London unless the Council decided otherwise; and (ii) that while acknowledging Italy's proposal and congratulating both Italy and Switzerland for their interest, Côte d'Ivoire could not analyse any proposal from other Members without a legal basis for a move. He concluded that the discussion was premature and that, for it to be productive, a Council decision was necessary.

95. The delegate of Brazil echoed the statements made by Côte d'Ivoire and Honduras regarding the need to bring greater structure to the discussion. He further noted that Brazil supported the creation of a working group to examine the issue and suggested the consideration of its chairmanship, while emphasizing that the establishment of such a group would not imply a decision to relocate the Organization outside of London, but rather provide a dedicated forum to discuss the matter in a structured manner, separate from the FAC. He also requested that the Secretariat re-engage with the Government of the United Kingdom, taking into account the discussions held and the relevant [ICC Resolution 483](#), and report back to Members in writing. Finally, he suggested that alternative premises within London should also be considered as an option and included in the Secretariat's report to Members.

96. The delegate of El Salvador emphasized that the creation of a working group would not affect or overlap with the existing structure of the Organization, while underlining that

the proposal was intended as a temporary mechanism to advance the process and that such practices existed in other organizations. He further noted that it would be an open-ended working group, reporting regularly to the Council and helping to provide the information needed for informed decision-making. He also stressed the importance of inviting the United Kingdom to take a position on the matter and agreed with the European Union that the issue should not be addressed within the FAC, given its workload.

97. The delegate of Honduras clarified that the proposed working group would not replace any existing committee or the Council and emphasized that it would not prejudice any decision regarding a potential relocation of the Organization. He stressed the importance of clearly defining the scope and name of the working group to avoid any implication that a relocation decision had already been made, while noting that such a group could help bring greater organization to the process and that any final decision would remain with the Council. He further suggested that, if the working group were established, Ambassador Francisco Mena Lima of El Salvador should serve as its Chair and Ambassador Aly Touré of Côte d'Ivoire as Vice-Chair.

98. The delegate of Switzerland agreed to join the consensus on the creation of the working group but requested reassurance that it would not override the Council's authority and that financial and administrative matters, including the premises, would continue to pass through the FAC before reaching the Council. She emphasized that, while the matter also included political elements, financial and administrative aspects remained part of the FAC's remit and should be addressed accordingly. The delegate of Switzerland also stressed the importance of defining a clear mandate for the working group, including setting procedures and deadlines, and highlighted the need to consider the time and resource constraints of certain delegations.

99. In response to Switzerland's comment, the Chair clarified that the working group would not be established under the auspices of the FAC but under the Council. He noted that the group could provide interim reports to the FAC, including on financial aspects, but that the final report and decision had to return to the Council, as that was ultimately a political decision.

100. The delegate of Honduras noted that the Council was the highest governing body of the Organization and had the authority to create any working group independently of existing committees. While recognizing that the matter involved both economic and

political considerations, he expressed the view that, if established, the working group would have the authority to present its recommendations directly to the Council, independently of any work undertaken by the FAC. He stressed the importance of ensuring that the name of the working group clearly reflected its mandate to avoid misunderstandings. He concluded by suggesting that the Executive Director reestablish contact with the authorities of the UK Government and offered his availability to facilitate the process.

101. The delegate of the European Union emphasized that the working group should report directly to the Council rather than the FAC, given the political and sensitive nature of the matter. He noted that involving the FAC would add an unnecessary layer, as the same Members were represented at all levels, and could compromise the EU's neutral role as FAC Chair.

102. The delegate of Côte d'Ivoire highlighted the importance of addressing the concerns raised, particularly those of Switzerland regarding transparency and good governance. He welcomed the establishment of the working group, proposing that it focused on providing information on financial and administrative matters to the FAC, which would then present its recommendations to the Council. While expressing a preference for the group to report to the FAC rather than directly to the Council, he emphasized that his delegation would fully support any consensus reached.

103. The delegate of Colombia agreed with Honduras on the importance of: (i) collecting all available information; and (ii) delegations consulting their capitals to determine their national positions. She urged the Secretariat and Members to avoid repetition and called for a decision on the working group,

104. The delegate of El Salvador stressed that the matter was political and should be addressed by the Council, while the FAC's role remained limited to financial and administrative aspects. He highlighted that the proposed working group would serve to organize the issue for the Council, without superseding its authority, and emphasized that any decision regarding the Organization's location ultimately rested with the Council. He also noted the broader importance of the discussion, including the Organization's economic and financial health and the wellbeing of coffee growers and the coffee sector, and, echoing Colombia, underscored the need to use Council time efficiently to advance the matter constructively.

105. The Chair of the Council thanked all Members for their contributions. Noting that a consensus had been reached to establish the working group, and acknowledging concerns about resources and availability, he stressed that the group should meet as soon as possible. He clarified that the next Council session was scheduled for September 2026 and noted that Members would need to consider whether it was necessary to address the issue before then.

106. The delegate of El Salvador thanked Members for their trust and confirmed his availability to chair the working group, as well as to convene its first meeting before the end of April 2026. He explained that this timing would allow for consultations with the Secretariat to gain a clearer understanding of the matter, including relevant precedents and background information, thereby enabling the group to agree on a timeline and roadmap as soon as possible. He proposed holding meetings once per month, as necessary, until the next Council session in September, and providing written reports to Members to ensure full transparency of the process. He also stressed the importance of receiving Italy's feedback regarding the June deadline and requested that the Secretariat contact representatives of the UK Government again.

107. The delegates of the European Union and Honduras congratulated the delegate of El Salvador on his appointment as Chair of the working group.

108. The delegate of Côte d'Ivoire echoed the European Union and Honduras and confirmed his availability to serve as Vice-Chair of the group.

109. The delegate of Brazil supported the appointment of Ambassador Lima of El Salvador and Ambassador Touré of Côte d'Ivoire as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, and confirmed his country's availability to participate in the activities of the working group.

110. The Secretariat and External Relations Officer shared document [WP-Council 357/26](#) on screen and read out the Terms of Reference (ToRs) of the Working Group for Discussions related to the ICO Premises (WGDP).

111. The Council approved the establishment of the Working Group for Discussions related to the ICO Premises (WGDP) and its Terms of Reference, subsequently published as document [ICC-141-5](#) and attached hereto.

112. The Council appointed Ambassador Francisco Lima of El Salvador and Ambassador Aly Touré of Côte d'Ivoire as Chair and Vice-Chair of the WGDP, respectively.

Item 9: Post of Executive Director – Mandate 2027-2032

113. The Chair of the Council requested that the Executive Director leave the room while this matter was being discussed. He recalled that the current Executive Director had been elected by consensus at the 131st Special Session of the Council in February 2022 (document [ICC-131-4](#)), following her nomination by the Government of Brazil, and had assumed her functions in May 2022. He noted that, at the 66th meeting of the FAC, Members had been informed that her mandate would expire in April 2027, and that it was therefore appropriate for the Council to begin considering the way forward at the present session. He further explained that, in consultation with the Secretariat, he had reviewed relevant documentation on the appointment of previous Executive Directors. Referring in particular to Annex I of document [ICC-129-6](#), published in April 2021, he highlighted that the current Executive Director's contract provided for the possibility of renewal for one additional five-year term.

114. The Chair of the Council emphasized that the Organization placed significant demands on the Executive Director, requiring full commitment, professionalism, and effective management, which she had consistently demonstrated with dedication. He stressed that, given these demands, the Council had not only a responsibility but also a duty of care towards her as a key asset of the Organization. As her mandate was approaching its expiry, he underlined the importance of reaching a decision as soon as possible, preferably at the present session. He suggested that the Council could consider renewing her mandate for an additional five-year term in line with her contract and, while acknowledging possible political considerations, emphasized the need to send a clear and positive message of appreciation and confidence in her leadership. He warned that too long a delay could send a negative signal and urged Members to take into account both the institutional and personal dimensions of the matter.

115. While welcoming the fact that the Council was addressing the end of the mandate in an open and transparent manner, the delegate of the European Union indicated that he was not in a position, at that stage, to support the renewal of the current Executive Director's mandate. He underlined that there was no urgency, given that the mandate would expire at the end of April 2027, leaving sufficient time for careful consideration. He acknowledged the Executive Director's performance, emphasizing that his remarks were not directed against her personally. He further highlighted the need to carefully examine the financial implications of the position, in particular its grading, noting that it constituted a significant budgetary item. He observed that the current Under-Secretary-General level was comparable to that of heads of United Nations agencies with large staff, such as UNIDO and UNDP, and considered this to represent a substantial commitment for the Organization, particularly in the context of ongoing discussions on cost-efficiency. He clarified that this matter was not attributable to the current Executive Director but should be considered in the context of the next mandate.

116. The delegate of Brazil clarified that he was speaking based on instructions received from his capital. He emphasized that Brazil considered it important to begin discussions on the parameters that would guide the process for either reappointing the current ICO Executive Director or selecting a new one. He recalled that, at the 66th FAC meeting, the Brazilian delegation had highlighted that the current Executive Director's mandate would expire in just over a year, making it appropriate to establish clear guidelines for the process. He stressed that the Council should agree on a schedule of actions that would allow sufficient time for delegations to consider the process, ensure transparency, and avoid last-minute or hasty decisions. He further explained that the matter would be subject to internal consultation within Brazil's Deliberative Council on Coffee Policy, which included both government and private sector representatives, and that these consultations would take place once the parameters and schedule for discussion and decision-making within the Organization had been defined.

117. The delegate of Côte d'Ivoire expressed appreciation for the Executive Director's excellent work, noting that her visit to Abidjan had provided a valuable opportunity to observe her skills and contributions to the coffee sector. Referring to the comments of the European Union and Brazil, and acknowledging their role as major contributors to the Organization, he noted that he had not seen a mandate for automatically renewing the Executive Director's term and that such automatic renewal could be procedurally difficult. He emphasized that Côte d'Ivoire was satisfied with the Executive Director's performance

but could not take a position on her mandate until Brazil had clarified its stance. He suggested that the issue could be entrusted to the recently established Working Group for Discussions related to the ICO Premises (WGDP). While confirming Côte d'Ivoire's willingness to join a consensus, he stressed that the discussion should respect the sovereign decision-making powers of all Member States and focus on proper procedures rather than personal support for the Executive Director.

118. The Chair of the Council explained that his initial proposal was based on a historical precedent, noting that for several previous Executive Directors, the Council had routinely approved automatic renewals until a specified retirement age, while other Executive Directors had generally stepped down after one term, with the exception of Néstor Osorio, whose mandate had also been renewed for five years by Council decision. He emphasized that the current Executive Director's contract provided for a five-year renewal if the Council so decided. Speaking in a personal capacity as the delegate of Papua New Guinea, he expressed his view that an automatic renewal could provide continuity and reduce disruption. However, he acknowledged the interventions made by other delegations and recognized the need for a more robust process involving internal consultations with capitals. He concluded by affirming his willingness to follow the Council's agreed process.

119. The delegate of Mexico emphasized the need for procedural clarity regarding the Executive Director's mandate, suggesting that the Chair provide a written document outlining the matter and the Council's options to allow delegations to consult their capitals. He noted that it would be appropriate to also receive a formal letter from the Executive Director regarding her willingness to serve a second term, after which Member States could decide whether to renew her mandate or initiate a new selection process. Lastly, he stressed that this approach would ensure transparency and provide delegations with clear guidance for deliberation.

120. The delegate of Switzerland echoed the positions expressed by Brazil, the European Union, Côte d'Ivoire and Mexico, noting that, without a clear written proposal, she was not in a position to take a decision at that time. She emphasized that the matter was important and time-sensitive, highlighted the need to move the process forward, and suggested that, as it concerned leadership and human resources, it should be prioritized by the FAC. She stressed the importance of establishing a clear process with defined milestones and agreed with fellow delegates that both the Executive Director's intentions regarding a possible second term and Brazil's position needed clarification.

121. The delegate of Brazil reiterated that the process should follow the proper sequence and not be rushed. He explained that Brazil would first need a clear timetable and defined parameters to initiate the procedure within the Organization, after which the country would consult its political coffee authorities for guidance.

122. The delegate of Honduras expressed his support for the Executive Director, praising her dedication, responsibility, and the Organization's successes under her leadership. He recalled his participation as Chair of the Council at the time of her election and noted her consistent engagement, which had contributed to the ICO's increased international visibility. He emphasized that any decision regarding her re-election should not be taken hastily and stressed the importance of following established procedures, as done for past appointments, including the current Executive Director's, so that all Members could exercise their sovereign decision-making.

123. In response to the question from the delegates of Mexico and Switzerland, the Chair of the Council informed Members that the Executive Director had verbally confirmed her availability for a second term. Regarding the process, he clarified that he did not intend to deviate from established procedures. He noted that the Executive Director's contract allowed for renewal but recognized the sensitivities of the current situation. He emphasized the need for a clear process and highlighted possible ways forward, including referring the matter to the FAC, assigning it to a working group, or conducting individual consultations with delegations. He expressed his willingness to facilitate and collaborate, and asked Members to indicate which approach they considered best.

124. The delegate of Brazil proposed that the matter be discussed within the FAC, noting that it was an established body with the appropriate mandate to address such issues and could provide a suitable framework for the process. He added that this would not preclude the Council from allowing parallel consultations between the Chair and Member delegations, emphasizing that both approaches could be complementary and contribute to an inclusive and effective process.

125. The delegate of Switzerland supported Brazil's proposal to address the matter within the FAC, acknowledging that it clearly fell under its mandate. She reiterated that the creation of new subgroups could be challenging for some delegations, as it generated additional workload on all sides, and therefore expressed a preference for making use of

the existing structure. She also noted that another meeting of the FAC was expected in the near future, which could provide a suitable opportunity to take the matter forward.

126. The delegate of Mexico seconded Brazil's proposal and noted that written confirmation of the Executive Director's intentions would allow the FAC to consider the matter and present two options to the Council: either renewing her contract or initiating a new selection process.

127. The delegate of Honduras echoed the interventions by Mexico and Switzerland and endorsed Brazil's proposal. He noted that the Chair of the Council could conduct consultations and share their outcomes while the FAC focused on the matter. He added that Members would need a basis from which to start and suggested that either the Executive Director or the Chair indicate her availability to continue in the post.

128. The delegate of the European Union, in his capacity as Chair of the FAC, noted that he was not certain the FAC was the appropriate forum to discuss the matter, as the Executive Director did not report to the FAC; the only reporting instance was to the Council. He emphasized that, as an Under-Secretary-General, the Executive Director held a highly political mandate appointed by Member States and did not depend on committees. He added that he was willing to abide by the Council's decision and noted that, in the past, similar matters had not been addressed by the FAC. He observed that there was sufficient time to wait for Brazil's input before taking further steps and echoed the views of others that there was no need, at that stage, to create a new special committee or working group.

129. The delegate of Côte d'Ivoire noted that the proposal made by the European Union was very pertinent and emphasized the need for the status of the Executive Director to be formally recognized. Referring to the Chair's earlier remark that the matter would be discussed in September, he suggested that, with effective negotiations between March and September, a final decision could be reached at that time. He added that, in the interim, all Members would need to be prepared and aware that they would be expected to make a decision in September 2026. Lastly, he noted that a special meeting of the FAC or even a Council Session could be called to discuss the matter before then.

130. The delegate of El Salvador sought clarification on whether a process for addressing the matter was already established or if a new procedure needed to be created. He also inquired about the timeline and steps to be followed, referencing Brazil's earlier remarks.

131. In response to El Salvador, the Chair of the Council noted that procedures for extending an Executive Director's term had existed in the past but had been used only on a few occasions, with discussions held in the former Executive Board and the Council approving the final decisions. The Chair added that, if Members were seeking a precedent, the FAC was the closest approximation to the former Executive Board and had also been the forum in which the extension of another Executive Director had been discussed.

132. In response to a query from the European Union, the Chair of the Council confirmed that a special session of the Council had been held in February 2022 for the appointment of the current Executive Director.

133. The delegate of the European Union suggested that it was premature to decide on a special Council session. He noted that, although the current Executive Director was available for a renewed mandate, the Brazilian government was still consulting on whether to formally propose the renewal. He added that, as Chair of the FAC, he would review the matter at the next meeting and determine the best way forward regarding a potential special session of the Council.

134. The delegate of Brazil agreed with the proposal of the European Union, describing it as a sensible approach. He noted that the delegation of Brazil was not opposed to the idea of a special Council session, but reminded Members that the ICA 2007 required at least ten Members to formally call for such a session and that procedures would need to be followed. He added that there was sufficient time to consult with capitals and potentially hold a special session later in the year or most likely some time after January 2027.

135. The delegate of Côte d'Ivoire noted that, contrary to assumptions, the selection of a new Executive Director was a complex and lengthy process, with negotiations that could be long and arduous. He emphasized the need to consider the Chair of the FAC's availability and suggested that said Committee meet as soon as possible, as the earlier the meeting, the better it would be for the Council, the Executive Director, and the staff. Drawing on his experience with similar elections and decisions, he added that delays could create stress for the Secretariat and Members. He concluded that, following the FAC meeting, it could be decided whether a special Council session would be needed before September.

136. The Chair of the Council agreed that the issue should be delegated to the FAC and noted that he would continue consultations with delegations, assuring Members that they would all be contacted. He observed that the discussion had clarified the Council's approach and that the FAC would report back on whether a special Council session was necessary, following the established procedure if so decided. He concluded by emphasizing the Council's duty to inform the Executive Director as soon as possible.

137. The Council mandated the FAC to consider the matter of the Executive Director's post, requesting it to convene at the earliest convenience and report to the Council in September 2026, unless otherwise decided.

Item 10: Office holders and committees

Item 10.1: Chair and Vice-Chair and composition of committees

138. The delegate of Brazil, in his capacity as spokesperson for the exporting Members, indicated that Indonesia had expressed an interest in becoming a member of the Joint Committee and the FAC for the rest of coffee year 2025/26. He also noted that Honduras, as reported by the Chair of the Council, had expressed a desire to remain a member of both committees. Lastly, he endorsed the nomination of Ambassador Aly Touré of Côte d'Ivoire for the position of Vice-Chair of the FAC.

139. The delegate of the European Union, in his capacity as spokesperson for importing Members, noted that there were no further nominations from the importing side and that the positions of Chair and Vice-Chair of the committees had already been filled.

140. The Council approved the composition of the Joint Committee and the Finance and Administration Committee for coffee year 2025/26 submitted by exporting Members.

141. The Council approved the appointment of Ambassador Aly Touré of Côte d'Ivoire as Vice-Chair of the FAC for coffee year 2025/26.

Item 11: Credentials

142. The Head of Operations stated that the credentials received were found to be in good and due form.

143. The Council approved the report on credentials.
--

Item 12: Future meetings

144. The Chair of the Council submitted for consideration the following dates for future meetings, which were also shared on the screen:

- 142nd Session of the Council: 27–30 September 2026, Geneva;
- 143rd Session of the Council: week 22–26 March 2027, virtual; and
- 144th Session of the Council: 27 September–1 October 2027, Bogotá.

145. The delegate of Switzerland informed Members that preparations for the 142nd Session of the Council in Geneva were underway and noted that the Geneva International Conference Centre had been selected as the venue for the Council and ICC-related meetings. She indicated that, subject to confirmation, an opening ceremony was planned for 28 September, with meetings scheduled until 30 September, and that a provisional reservation had been made for committee meetings to be held on 27 September, if required. She expressed appreciation for the Secretariat's cooperation and noted that preparations were ongoing, including an official reception and panel discussions, while highlighting Geneva's convening power and expressing hope for broad participation from government, private sector, and non-governmental stakeholders. She further recalled the intention to celebrate the first official UN ICD during the session and informed Members that the ICC would be held back-to-back with the Swiss Coffee Trade Association (SCTA) Forum and Dinner, to be held in Montreux, providing opportunities for synergies between delegates and private sector representatives. She added that the SCTA was in close contact with the Secretariat to facilitate participation by ICO Members.

146. The Chair of the Council thanked the delegate of Switzerland and noted that preparations appeared to be well advanced, with an engaging programme outlined. He

expressed confidence that delegates would look forward to participating in the session in Geneva.

147. The delegate of Côte d'Ivoire thanked Switzerland for hosting the forthcoming session of the Council and confirmed his delegation's readiness to support its successful organization. He also commended the Chair of the Council for his leadership and conveyed his appreciation to the Executive Director, noting that many Members considered that she had performed her duties effectively.

148. The delegates of Brazil and Honduras echoed the intervention of Côte d'Ivoire, thanking the Governments of Switzerland and Colombia for their kind invitations to host the next sessions of the Council. They also congratulated the Chair of the Council on his leadership and expressed their appreciation for his work.

149. The Council took note of the dates and locations for future meetings.
--

Item 13: Other business

150. No other business was discussed.

Closing session

151. The Chair of the Council thanked Members for their presence, as well as the Executive Director and the Secretariat, for organizing the Session. He then closed the 141st Session of the International Coffee Council.

International Coffee Council
141st Session
Virtual session
25-26 March 2026
London, United Kingdom

**Terms of Reference (ToRs) of the
Working Group for Discussions
related to the ICO Premises
(WGDP)**

1. The International Coffee Council (the Council), taking into account the proposal submitted by the Government of El Salvador ([ED-2503/26](#)), decides to establish a working group mandated to hold discussions on the matter of ICO premises.
2. The working group shall establish a planning process that ensures transparency, enhances efficiency, and facilitates Members' decision-making on the political and financial implications of the location of the ICO's headquarters.
3. The name of the group shall be the "Working Group for Discussions related to the ICO Premises (WGDP)".
4. The Council has appointed a Chair and a Vice-Chair of the WGDP, to remain in office until the Council decides otherwise.
5. The WGDP shall report to the Council and shall present interim reports to the Finance and Administration Committee (FAC) between Council sessions.
6. The WGDP shall be open to all Members.
7. The WGDP shall submit its recommendations to the Council for approval.
8. The WGDP shall meet either online or in person, at locations most convenient for its members.
9. The working language of the WGDP shall be English.