The current annual budget of sustainability activities in the coffee sector is roughly $350M. This is a large investment with the potential to generate considerable impact if projects are coordinated and targeted effectively.

Individual stakeholders can of course use their own indicators to track outputs and outcomes of their activities, but the sector as a whole needs to benefit from a common way to track and report progress. This will enable more effective evaluation and action across all activities.

The Sustainability Progress Framework

The Sustainability Progress Framework (SPF) aims to be a globally accepted framework to measure and report on performance and impact against the joint goals and common performance indicators of the coffee sector (Vision 2020).

In addition to clear goals and agreed common core indicators, the SPF will:
- Include reporting tools and a transparent reporting mechanism so stakeholders can measure and report their progress. This allows stakeholders to learn from each other, align their work and avoid duplication.
- Give members recognition for their sustainability efforts.
- Integrate the Equivalence Mechanism and standards reports.
- Be integrated within GCP Connect to provide stakeholders with a seamless channel to easily collect and learn from their own performance and that of others.
- Build on the work done by experts and other sectors such as cocoa, cotton and rice.

The box below shows an example of how this would work for the goal of prosperity of farmers.

PROSPERITY (SDG 1)

Improving the profit received by coffee farmers will be the coffee sector’s greatest contribution to SDG 1: Ending Poverty. However, various reports observe an insufficient amount received by coffee farmers to ensure the coffee industry is sustainable.

A report by the ICO (2016) said more data and research are needed to understand the economic viability of coffee farming. As a transparent, sector-wide framework, the SPF will make data on factors like productivity more easily accessible. Stakeholders could then undertake activities such as GAP training or dissemination of different coffee varieties, to help solve their unique problems.

The Global Progress framework will measure economic viability at 3 levels:

1. Performance indicators on training and adoption, renewal of fields and rejuvenation practices
2. Performance indicators on increased yield, improved quality, optimized costs, prices.
3. Impact level indicators of increased coffee profits.

Stakeholders can move reporting from Level 1 and improve to 2 and 3 over time, using the common performance indicators, reporting resources and visualization tools established in the SPF.
Timeline

The Kick-off Report will be published at the end of 2017 after a participatory process which involves 4 main activities:

- **Quarter 1:** Goal and issue clarification
- **Quarter 2:** Indicator consultation and agreement with stakeholders and expert taskforce
- **Quarter 3:** Development and optimization of reporting tools
- **Quarter 4:** Member reporting support and preparation of Kick-off Report

NO-ONE LEFT BEHIND

Collectively measuring our actions is an opportunity to learn. But how do we keep track of so much information?

The SPF offers:

- Clear articulation of joint goals
- A participatory approach to choosing the priority common performance indicators, facilitated by an expert task force
- Pooled resources for efficient data collection via GCP Connect and self-assessment
- Choice on what to measure (through web vote and GCP MA recommendation)

By making the reporting process as simple as possible, and maximising information gains, reporting becomes a benefit rather than a burden. The SPF will also be integrated with existing pathways to joint goals (like standards and national platforms). This will complete the information loop, so we can measure the changes that happen when stakeholders implement processes and practices to meet the Baseline Common Code (or equivalent).

SPF gives GCP members the chance to showcase their sustainability work, contribute to the choice of priority issues to measure, benchmark against peers, and learn from a practical and scientifically sound measuring methodology.