



Projects Committee  
11<sup>th</sup> Meeting  
9 March 2016  
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

**Report of the  
Virtual Screening Subcommittee (VSS)  
on one coffee project proposal**

## **Background**

1. This report contains the assessment provided by the Virtual Screening Subcommittee (VSS) on the following project proposal which will be considered by the Projects Committee and Council in March 2016:

- Empowering women and youth to participate in the coffee value chain in Uganda

2. The VSS is currently composed of Côte d'Ivoire, Guatemala and Indonesia (exporting Members) and European Union and the USA (importing Members).

## **Action**

The Projects Committee is requested to consider the report of the VSS and to submit recommendations on the above proposals to the Council.

## VSS ASSESSMENT – NEW PROPOSAL

### Empowering women and youth to participate in the coffee value chain in Uganda

Proposal submitted by Uganda

Main criteria <sup>1</sup>		Notations by Member	Comments (if any)	Score Member 1	Score Member 2
1	Is the country an ICO Member?	Yes/No	Yes		
2	Is the country up-to-date with the ICO Budget contributions?	Yes/No	Yes		
3	Has the proponent suggested or identified any sources of funding, including a contact person?	Yes/No	<b>Member 1:</b> Yes. There is a co-financing component by Heritage Coffee Company Ltd., but there is no contact person <b>Member 2:</b> Yes		
4	To what extent is the project contributing to poverty alleviation in rural communities?	0 – 8	<b>Member 1:</b> The beneficiaries of the project are women and young people who normally suffer poverty harder. <b>Member 2:</b> Note that income will be largely seasonal, though community storage & warehousing will help	8	5
5	Will this project develop capacity-building in the local community?	0 – 5	<b>Member 1:</b> Technical capacity building is the main component of the project and the beneficiaries are women and young people from communities	5	4

<sup>1</sup> See 'Development Strategy for coffee' – Document [ICC-105-16 Rev. 1](#) as well as document [PJ-75/14](#) that includes new criteria of the Common Fund for Commodities.

Main criteria <sup>1</sup>		Notations by Member	Comments (if any)	Score Member 1	Score Member 2
6	To what extent is the project likely to have long-term impact for project beneficiaries beyond its duration?	0 – 9	<p><b>Member 1:</b> As capacity building is the main component, it is expected to have a long-term impact for the beneficiaries.</p> <p><b>Member 2:</b> It will depend on uptake of practices, tenure security for women &amp; youth, and effect of practices on bean quality</p>	9	5–6
7.	How well does the project promote equal opportunities for men and women (including youth) to participate in and benefit from the project?	0 – 9	<p><b>Member 1:</b> Women organisations and young people would be the beneficiaries of the project. The project is specifically focused on these groups</p> <p><b>Member 2:</b> The project needs to assess and address women’s control over income to ensure that women have a strong say in directing their coffee earnings and income in general within the household. Approaches to consider could include accounts belonging to women and youth within producer groups, building women’s negotiation skills, promoting joint decision-making in households with women and men.</p> <p>Also, it is not clear what is being proposed for youth involvement in the project. There are several promising suggestions for roles/openings in the coffee value chain. The proposed indicators do not adequately capture youth involvement. Disaggregating by both sex and age to measure youths’ and women’s participation in and benefit from projects activities should be considered.</p>	9	9

Main criteria <sup>1</sup>		Notations by Member	Comments (if any)	Score Member 1	Score Member 2
8. Will the project activities create synergies with other initiatives in the countries?	0 – 4		<p><b>Member 1:</b> It is not clearly presented in the project. It should be clarified. However, the proponent is a company already running a chain of specialty coffee houses in Uganda and there are already arrangements with women coffee farmer group</p> <p><b>Member 2:</b> The project does well to focus on working with existing groups and arrangements and pursuing concrete opportunities for increased incomes such as certification. However, It is not clear from the proposal what the existing arrangements with women coffee farmer groups that they plan to consolidate &amp; expand are</p>	2	3
9. How well does the project promote a sustainable coffee sector?	0 – 8		<p><b>Member 1:</b> It is not clearly presented in the project document. It could be expected a better socially and economically sustainable coffee sector, with the inclusion of women and youth, but there is no mention of environment.</p>	5	7
10. Are the project activities environmentally friendly?	0 – 5		<p><b>Member 1:</b> This aspect is not mentioned in the document</p>		
11. Has the proponent already secured co-financing?	0 – 6		<p><b>Member 1:</b> The proponent would co-finance the project</p>	6	6
12. How well does the project leverage additional resources through private sector, civil society, government or academic participation?	0 – 9		<p><b>Member 1:</b> The proponent would co-finance 80% of the budget</p>	9	4

Main criteria <sup>1</sup>		Notations by Member	Comments (if any)	Score Member 1	Score Member 2
13. Is the project economically and commercially viable?	0 – 4		<b>Member 1:</b> The project will improve their economic and commercial situation, because it would expand the commercial relation between the proponent and the beneficiaries	3	3
14. Will the project generate sustainable financial profits?	0 – 5		<b>Member 1:</b> The proponent would take an advantage on a better quality coffee produced by the beneficiaries	5	3
15. In case of financing through repayable loans, can the project generate enough profit to reimburse these loans?	0 – 6	N/A	<b>Member 1:</b> There are no provisions of future revenues but it would generate profit for the proponent	2	0
16. Does the proponent/beneficiary institution have financial records?	0 – 2		<b>Member 1:</b> I have not seen them, but if it is a private company (Ltd) there might be financial records	1	2
17. Is the project consistent with the country national strategies/priorities?	0 – 4			4	4
18. Are the project aims and purposes consistent with the 2007 Agreement and ICC-105-16 Rev. 1?	0 – 3		<b>Member 1:</b> Uganda is an ICO Member and the project is consistent with the ICO strategy ICC-15-16 Rev. 1	3	3
19. Are the intended beneficiaries of the project consistent with the type of beneficiaries described in paragraph 30 of ICC-105-16 Rev. 1?	0 – 3			3	3

Main criteria <sup>1</sup>		Notations by Member	Comments (if any)	Score Member 1	Score Member 2
20. Is the scale and scope, including budget, of the project appropriate?	0 – 3		<p><b>Member 1:</b> There is not a detailed budget for the project and there is a mistake in the calculation of the total amount. There is a component of investments that seems reasonable. There is a high budget for capacity building that is not detailed, but considering the number of beneficiaries (4,800 farmers) and the duration of the project (2 years), it seems to be appropriate and the scale and scope too.</p> <p><b>Member 2:</b> In the proposed timeframe the project can introduce and increase the application of inputs and good practices among existing groups. I would expect to see more changes in the quality of bean and benefits of certification in a 3-5 year process.</p>	2	2
21. Can the project realistically achieve its goal?	0 – 3		<p><b>Member 2:</b> See comment No. 20.</p>	3	1–2
22. Is the timeframe of the project appropriate?	0 – 1		<p><b>Member 2:</b> See comment No. 20.</p>	1	1
23. Does the project management team have sound experience in implementing such a project?	0 – 3		<p><b>Member 1:</b> There is no information about this aspect in the document</p>	0	3
<b>Total</b>				<b>80</b>	<b>70</b>