



C.A.F.E. Practices Verifier and Inspector Indicator Guidance Reference of Scorecard V3.4

Starbucks Coffee Company

V1.2

Table of Contents

- 1.0 Introduction..... 3
- 2.0 General Guidance 3
- 3.0 Economic Accountability 5
- 4.0 Social Responsibility 6
- 5.0 Coffee Growing..... 25
- 6.0 Coffee Processing..... 36
- 7.0 Producer Support Organization..... 42
- 8.0 Appendix 48

1.0 Introduction

This document supplements the C.A.F.E. Practices Generic and Smallholder Scorecards, V3.4 and the C.A.F.E. Practices Verifier and Inspector Operations Manual. The purpose of this document is to serve as a reference for verifiers and inspectors that are conducting a verification as well as suppliers preparing for a C.A.F.E. Practices verification. The Indicator Guidance Reference lists guidance that has been developed to clarify interpretation for certain indicators in the C.A.F.E. Practices program. The Indicator Guidance Reference is not exhaustive, and does not include guidance for all indicators in the Scorecards.

If suppliers have questions about any content of this document, they should direct their inquiries to Starbucks at CAFEprac@starbucks.com. Verification organizations should direct any questions regarding this document to SCS Global Services at cafepractices@scsglobalservices.com.

2.0 General Guidance

- The requirements for minimum evidence listed in Zero Tolerance indicators refer to the qualitative evidence for these indicators. In addition to the requirements specified in the respective indicator, any other important information must also always be completed in the evidence fields in the Field Notes and VRS.

For some indicators a legal reference must be provided as part of the qualitative evidence. The reference should include the title of the document, publication year, and relevant section or article.

- If no specific timeframe for evaluation is provided within the indicator language, and there is doubt on how far back data should be reviewed in order to evaluate an indicator, inspectors should evaluate the indicators as follows:
 - a. For new verifications, based on information going back to the date of the First Response letter.
 - b. For reverifications, inspectors should evaluate indicators going back to the time of the last verification.
- Extra Point indicators note best practices and therefore call for rigorous evidence showing that the producer is going above and beyond baseline expectations. These indicators should be evaluated strictly and should not be used as compensation for other Non-Comply evaluations.

Management plans for Coffee Growing (CG) and PSO indicators

- For Coffee Growing indicators included only in the generic scorecard that require a management plan (CG-WR1.5, CG-SR1.2, CG-CB1.2, CG-CB1.3, CG-CB2.4, CG-CB3.5, CG-EM1.9, CG-EM1.10, CG-EM2.1, CG-CC1.2), the management plan needs to be personalized for each farm, and a general plan given out by a support organization cannot be accepted if it has not been adjusted to the specific context of the farm. Inspectors should evaluate that the information provided in the documents is realistic and appropriate for the farm's context.
- For plans needed on the PSO level, a general plan can be developed, however it needs to be relevant to the farms that are part of the program, considering the local topography, etc. (PS-SR1.1, PS-EM2.1)

Indicators that require calculations

- For indicators that require calculations (CG-WR2.1, CG-EM1.16, CP-WC1.1, CP-WC1.4, CP-WC1.5, CP-EC1.1, CP-EC1.3, CP-EC1.5, CP-RM1.1, CP-RM1.2):
 - a. In inspections that are part of verifications that are classified as “New”, calculations can be done during the inspection by entity representatives.

- b. For inspections that are part of verifications that are classified as re-verifications, calculations for previous years (up to last verification) should be available for review and calculations cannot not be done during the inspection itself.
- c. All calculations must be performed and presented by the entity representatives. Inspectors should never do the calculation on behalf of the client to arrive at the total amount per kg of green coffee, reduction in use of resources, or other information requested by the indicator.

Proof of resource reduction

- For indicators that request proof of resource reduction over time (CG-EM1.16, CP-WC1.4, CP-EC1.5, CP-RM1.2):
 - a. In cases where entities do not have previous years' data (more likely in the case of new verifications), this indicator should be evaluated as Not Applicable.
 - b. The reduction should be evaluated yearly per harvest cycle (e.g. June – May). For countries where there are multiple harvests in a 12-month timeframe, all harvests in a 12-month period should be included.
- If entities are using any units other than kilograms for weight measurements (for example, “fanega” in Costa Rica), inspectors need to confirm that the equivalence of the unit in kg is consistently used across all entities in the supply chain to ensure accurate verification of production and processing volumes, as well as traceability. Once this is confirmed, all indicators referring to calculations “per kg” of green coffee (CG-WR2.1, CP-WC1.1, CP-WC1.4, CP-EC1.1, CP-EC1.3, CP-EC1.5, CP-RM1.1, CP-RM1.2) can be evaluated considering the unit other than kg.

3.0 Economic Accountability

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
EA-IS1.3	Entity keeps receipts or invoices for the coffee (cherry, parchment, green) it buys or sells.	<p>In vertically integrated supply chains where the coffee is transferred between entities (e.g., between a farm and mill) without an associated purchase or sale, inspectors should still evaluate EA-IS1.3 as Comply or Not Comply based on whether there are receipts/invoices kept for the final sale of coffee for the entities.</p> <p>Even if no purchase of coffee is being made at the mill, it will be necessary for inspectors to evaluate CP-MT1.1 to determine whether C.A.F.E. Practices coffee is tracked from the point of entry to the point of output. For new supply chains that have not yet sold any coffee as C.A.F.E. Practices verified, inspectors should evaluate any receipt exchanges between entities to ensure that there is a system for managing traceability.</p>
EA-IS1.4	Presented documents indicate: date, names of buyer and seller, unit of measure (volume or weight), price per unit, quantity, type of coffee (cherry, parchment or green).	All items mentioned in EA-IS1.4 must be included in documents reviewed by inspectors for an evaluation of Comply. The indicator may still be evaluated as Comply if some information is included in a separate document that accompanies the receipt/invoice.

4.0 Social Responsibility

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
SR-HP1.1	<p>ZERO TOLERANCE: All permanent workers are paid the nationally or regionally established minimum wage. If minimum wages for permanent workers have not been established, all permanent workers are paid the local industry standard wage. If workers are paid by production, wages meet the nationally or regionally established minimum wage, or, where minimum wage has not been established, the local industry standard wage.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National/regional minimum wage, including the legal reference, or wage as established by the C.A.F.E. Practices program For workers that are paid by productivity (i.e., piece-rate), evidence must include productivity range (e.g., kg per hr, highest and lowest), price per unit (e.g., \$ per kg), , AND corresponding payment rate; and Rates paid for different tasks performed at the entity, e.g. harvesting, weeding, security (watchmen); <p>Additional evidence required for Non- Comply evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number or percentage of workers not meeting the minimum wage; Tasks conducted by workers not meeting minimum wage; and, Payment rate of workers not meeting minimum wage.
SR-HP1.2	<p>ZERO TOLERANCE: All temporary and seasonal workers are paid the nationally or regionally established minimum wage. If minimum wages for temporary/seasonal workers have not been established, all temporary/seasonal workers are paid the local industry standard wage. If workers are paid by production, wages meet the nationally or regionally established minimum wage, or, where minimum wage has not been established, the local industry standard wage.</p>	<p>For medium/large farms, documentation of wages must include hours worked in order to confirm that the minimum wage is met.</p> <p>If workers are paid by productivity and are not meeting the daily minimum wage, the inspector should review if the conditions are the same for all workers, and if the conditions are normal in the industry to meet the minimum wage. The hours of work should also be considered.</p> <p>When national or regional minimum wages are not established, organizations should always first confirm with SCS in determining which local industry standard wage should be used.</p> <p><i>For guidance for the approach to evaluate pay by productivity payments, please see the Verifier and Inspector Operations Manual.</i></p>
SR-HP1.3	<p>ZERO TOLERANCE: Wages are paid regularly to all workers in cash, cash equivalent (check, direct deposit), or through in-kind payments (e.g., food), if legally permissible.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Type of payment to workers; Frequency of payment to workers; Description of system of in-kind payments (if applicable); and, Legal reference related to requirements for in-kind payments (if applicable). <p>Acceptable arrangements for “regular” payment include daily, weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly payments. Payment “at the end of harvest” does not constitute a regular payment and would result in a Not Comply evaluation if observed.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
SR-HP1.4	<p>Management maintains complete written earning records for at least the past year, which itemize all: wages, overtime worked, and deductions.</p> <p><i>For warehouses and mills, hours AND days worked must also be included in the records</i></p>	<p>This indicator is applicable when workers are hired, directly or indirectly through a labor intermediary/contractor, etc. This indicator cannot be evaluated as Not Applicable if workers are contracted. "Complete" means for all workers in all activities, 12 months back from the month of inspection.</p>
SR-HP1.6	<p>EXTRA POINT: Workers are given copies of earnings records, which itemize all wages, overtime and deductions.</p>	<p>This indicator can only be evaluated Comply in cases where earning records are given proactively. If workers need to ask for a copy of the records, the correct evaluation is Not Comply.</p>
SR-HP1.9	<p>Overtime pay meets national requirements. If workers are paid by production, overtime wages meet the local/regional/national requirements. If overtime pay has not been established by law, overtime is calculated at 150% of regular pay. If workers are paid by production, wages meet the above requirements.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required if overtime observed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of overtime system; and, • Overtime payment rate. <p>The indicator must be evaluated for workers paid by productivity and working more than legally established regular working hours (e.g., harvesting worker harvesting 9 hours per day, assuming 8 hours is the established regular working time).</p>
SR-HP1.10	<p>EXTRA POINT: All permanent workers are paid MORE than the nationally or regionally established minimum wage. If minimum wages for permanent workers have not been established, all permanent workers are paid MORE than the local industry standard wage.</p> <p>If workers are paid by production, wages are higher than the nationally or regionally established minimum wage, or, where minimum wage has not been established, the local industry standard wage.</p>	<p>When national or regional minimum wages are not established, organizations should always first confirm with SCS in determining which local industry standard wage should be used.</p> <p>This indicator can only be evaluated as Comply if all permanent workers receive more than minimum wage throughout the time they work. If there are times, e.g., during low season, in which they are paid only minimum wage, the indicator cannot be evaluated as Comply.</p> <p>In the case of in-kind payments, determining the value of the in-kind payments will be necessary to evaluate whether the sum of in-kind and monetary payment is above minimum wage.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
SR-HP1.12	Where in-kind payments (e.g., food) are legally permissible, in-kind payments are agreed to by the employee and the employer, and itemized in writing by product, quantity, average price, and frequency of distribution.	<p>For an evaluation of Comply, in-kind payments must be legally allowed and in accordance with the requirements of the law (e.g., types and amount of in-kind payments). During worker interviews, inspectors must confirm that in-kind payment terms were agreed to by the employer and employee.</p> <p>If in-kind payments are not itemized per the conditions in the indicator, inspectors should evaluate SR-HP1.12 as Not Comply.</p> <p>If there is no in-kind payment, the correct evaluation is Not Applicable.</p>
SR-HP1.13	Time spent by workers in any required trainings and meetings is considered working time and workers are compensated at their normal rate.	A training deemed required is one that is pertinent to the job at hand.
SR-HP1.15	The use of continuous short-term employment contracts or the practice of terminating and then rehiring workers is not permitted as a means to avoid legal obligations related to wages and benefits.	<p>“Short-term” contracts are defined as contracts which terminate prior to the time at which the worker would become a permanent employee, as legally defined by national labor laws. In absence of legal definition, “short term” is 90 days. Inspectors should review employee contracts in order to confirm if there are short-term or time limited contracts observed for the same workers continuously.</p> <p>Where there are no contracts, or contracts are not required by law, inspectors should ensure that workers are classified correctly based on C.A.F.E. Practices worker classifications. The situation where workers are rehired for several years for seasonal tasks (e.g., harvesting) does not constitute continuous short-term employment contracts.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
<p>SR-HP1.16</p>	<p>Workers are not required to pay a recruitment fee as a condition for employment.</p>	<p>Inspectors should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the economic cost of recruiting does not fall on the worker; • Determine if labor intermediaries are involved in recruiting workers; and • Assess whether workers are required to pay fees. <p>Recruitment fees may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placement fees; • Payment for required medical testing; and • Excessive transportation fees charged to migrant workers. <p>If transportation fees are charged, they should be equal to or less than the market value of the transportation service. Inspectors should pay special attention to this practice in countries where it is common practice for labor intermediaries to obtain a fee from workers. Inspectors should also pay close attention for cases where the fee is charged to the entity itself rather than the workers, but the entity then deducts the fee paid to the intermediary from worker payments.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
<p style="text-align: center;">SR-HP1.17</p>	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE</u>: Labor intermediaries are only used where legally permissible. Legal status of the intermediary can be demonstrated at the time of inspection. All necessary documentation from the labor intermediary is made available at the time of the inspection to support evaluation of relevant Social Responsibility indicators.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of type of labor intermediary, including legal status; • Activities carried out by workers for labor intermediary; • Legal reference related to requirements for labor intermediaries; and, • Confirmation of whether all documentation related to the legal status of the intermediary was provided, and if not, which documentation was missing. <p>SR-HP1.17 refers to the a) use of legal intermediaries where they are legally allowed; b) demonstration of legal status at the time of inspection. SR-HP1.17 should be evaluated as Not Applicable if no labor intermediaries are used. In addition to the requirements of this indicator, ALL Social Responsibility indicators still apply for workers employed through labor intermediaries that either handle the coffee (like cargo personnel) or work in/on the entity like security guards and cleaning personnel. SR-HP1.17 applies only to the specific legal status of the labor intermediary. Other aspects of the employment relationship, such as benefits, will need to be evaluated with the relevant SR indicator (e.g., benefits – SR-HP1.8/ SR-HP1.9). Suppliers are responsible for ensuring that all documentation necessary to confirm legal compliance is made available at the time of inspection. Inspectors should issue a Not Comply for SR-HP1.17 if the supplier has not arranged for all documentation proving their legal status as a labor intermediary to be ready at the time of inspection. Verifiers should continue to emphasize to suppliers during the planning process that subcontracted workers (e.g., security guards, bag loaders, subcontracted agrochemical application) and other workers through labor intermediaries are within the scope of the verification.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">SR-HP2.1</p>	<p>Workers have either direct communication or a designated representative to communicate with management or employer.</p>	<p>The inspector must ensure the designated representative is a worker who is not part of the management.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">SR-HP2.2</p>	<p>Workers are able to talk about workplace grievances with management or employer with no fear of reprisal.</p>	<p>Grievances include issues with other workers, issues related to work environment or conditions, among others.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
SR-HP2.4	A workers' association or committee has been formed and governed by the employees, independent of management influence except where prohibited by law.	<p>The objective of SR-HP2.4, is to recognize farms and mills that allow workers the right to organize an independent workers' association. A workers' association may function to provide low-interest loans to workers, finance worker access to a doctor or dentist if these services are not available on-site, provide a forum for workers to meet and discuss working conditions and wages, work to improve worker living conditions, and/or support educational opportunities for workers and their families.</p> <p>The inspector is only asked to verify if there is any type of workers' association or organization formed, which is governed by employees and independent of management influence. Scoring decisions should be justified by citing some form of documentation related to the workers' association meetings, such as a meeting agenda or minutes. If no such documentation is available, inspectors should confirm the existence of a workers' association through the process of interviewing workers.</p> <p>If a workers' association doesn't exist in the entity being evaluated, the evaluation should be Not Comply. The only case when an evaluation of Not Applicable can be justified is when the country law doesn't allow the right to form a workers' association.</p> <p>Membership in a labor union, in some cases, can count for an evaluation of Comply for this indicator, but only if there is representation for all entity workers.</p>
SR-HP2.5	There are regular meetings between management and employees or worker's representative to improve working conditions.	<p>SR-HP2.5 states, "There are regular meetings between management and <i>employees or employees' association</i>". Therefore, although there may not be an employees' association formed, if there are regular meetings (e.g., meetings at set intervals during the growing and processing season) between management and employees, which lead to better working conditions, this indicator may be scored as Comply.</p> <p>Inspectors should evaluate whether the meetings are regular enough to give workers sufficient opportunity to communicate their needs based on the context of the specific farm.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
SR-HP2.6	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> If a workers' association or committee exists, a workers' association fund has been established to which management and workers contribute matching funds.</p>	<p>SR-HP2.6 and SR-HP2.7 are always to be treated as Not Applicable if a workers' association or committee does not exist. In the case where there is no association/committee this indicator should be evaluated as Not Applicable. In the case where an association/committee exists but there is no fund this indicator should be evaluated as Non Comply. In the case where an association/committee and a fund exist but management does not contribute this indicator should be evaluated as Non Comply.</p> <p>In the case where an association/committee and fund exist, but management contributes less than matching funds as workers (i.e., management contributes fewer funds than what the workers contribute), then this indicator should be evaluated as Non Comply. When an association/committee and fund exist, management contributes at least matching or more then this indicator should be evaluated as Comply.</p>
SR-HP2.8	<p>If allowed by law, and agricultural worker organizations are established in the coffee sector, a collective bargaining agreement exists between employees and employer.</p>	<p>The objective of SR-HP2.8 is to allow the opportunity for collective bargaining with legally established worker organizations (e.g., unions, legal associations), if they exist in the coffee sector.</p> <p>Legal agricultural worker organizations can also be considered if they include in their scope the coffee sector workers.</p>
SR-HP3.1	<p>All workers do not work more regular hours (before overtime) per day or week than allowed by local law. If regular hours are not established, regular hours are considered as 8 hours per day, 48 hours per week.</p>	<p>Workers paid by productivity should be included in the evaluation of SR-HP3.1 and evidence of working hours for workers paid by productivity needs to be recorded. Different worker positions may have different hours established by law (e.g., some countries establish 60 hrs/week as regular working hours for security guards)</p>
SR-HP3.5	<p>Hours worked on potentially hazardous activities (pesticide application, very heavy labor, etc.) are limited according to the law. If hours have not been established by law, the activities are limited to six hours per day.</p>	<p>Workers might be present for 8 hours but only work on potentially hazardous activities for a few hours. The evidence for this indicator should clearly provide information on how much time is spent on the potentially hazardous activity. For pesticide exposure, time required for preparation, transport, application and cleaning of equipment is to be considered. If questions arise about the hazardousness of an activity, the inspector should investigate the local law to see if there is a list of hazardous activities. If there is no list of hazardous activities, the inspector should get more information at the entity to establish which activities are potentially hazardous and support the evaluation of this indicator with evidence. This indicator applies to the farmer, the farmer's family and workers.</p> <p>If no hazardous activity is done, this indicator should be evaluated as Comply.</p> <p>Examples for potentially hazardous activities include: Pesticide exposure (based on MSDS), carrying heavy loads (carrying 60 kg for no more than 15 minutes), exposure to loud noises (6 hrs), using machinery (6hrs), high pruning, etc.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
<p style="text-align: center;">SR-HP4.1</p>	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE</u>: Employer does not directly or indirectly employ any persons who are under the age of 14 or the legal working age (ILO Conventions 10 and 138).</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required for Non-Comply evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age(s) of worker(s), or children assisting family members, under 14 or the legal working age; • Reference to the legal working age; • Activities conducted by workers under 14 or legal working age; • Schedule of when children under 14 or the legal working age work and/or are present at the entity; • If applicable, pPayment system for work done by children under 14 or legal working age, including whether payment is direct to the child or indirect (e.g., through parents or other person or organization); • Information about whether children are accompanied by a parent or legal guardian; • When applicable, the school calendar including holidays in the country of inspection; • Any additional circumstances as to why the children are working and what the circumstances are (e.g., whether work is voluntary, how many hours children work, how long has this been occurring); and, • Any additional references to relevant national legislation. <p>For additional guidance, please review the C.A.F.E. Practices Manual and Guidance on the Evaluation of Child Labor (SR-HP 4.1).</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
<p style="text-align: center;">SR-HP4.2</p>	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Employment of authorized minors of age 14 or older follows all legal requirements, including, but not limited to, work hours, wages, education, working conditions, and does not conflict with or limit their access to education (ILO Convention 10).</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ages of authorized minors**; • Legal reference for requirements for authorized minors; • Activities conducted by authorized minors; • Schedule of when authorized minors work and/or are present at the entity; • Payment system (if applicable) for work done by authorized minors; and, • Information about whether authorized minors are accompanied by a parent or legal guardian. <p><i>**For the purpose of the indicator, “authorized minors” refers to minors within the legal working age, up to their 18th birthday.</i></p> <p>The inspector must evaluate two separate conditions: 1) whether direct or indirect employment of minors older than 14 is authorized, and 2) whether all of the legal requirements for employment of authorized minors are met. If either condition is not met, the evaluation is Not Comply. To evaluate whether minors found working are authorized or not, inspectors should refer to relevant national or local labor laws and use their discretion. Evidence for authorization may include written or verbal approval from the minor’s parents and / or an interview with the minor. If the minor and minor’s parent(s) are not present, the inspector should rely on interviewing the farm manager to confirm authorization as well as assess the working conditions, work schedule, etc., during the authorized minor’s employment to ensure that all legal requirements were met under SR-HP4.2 and SR-WC4.9. Since SR-HP4.1 covers the general aspect of minors working, if there is no employment of authorized minors, the correct evaluation for SR-HP4.2 is Not Applicable.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">SR-HP4.3</p>	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Employer enforces a policy of prohibiting discrimination on the basis of gender, race, ethnicity, age or religion (ILO Convention 111).</p> <p><i>Written policy required for large/medium farms, mills, and warehouses with more than 5 employees.</i></p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of whether a written policy exists (if applicable); • Confirmation that work environment is absent of any type of discrimination; • If discrimination is observed, evidence should specify (i) the number and type of workers affected, and (ii) the type of discrimination observed. <p><i>*For large and medium farms or mills with 5 or fewer employees (including permanent and temporary workers), inspectors are still required to confirm whether there is an enforced policy in place according to the requirements of SR-HP4.3 and SR-HP4.4. However, for large and medium farms or mills with 5 or fewer employees, a <u>written</u> policy is not required for an evaluation of Comply, however workers also need to confirm during interviews that the policy is practiced and respected.</i></p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
SR-HP4.4	<p>ZERO TOLERANCE: Employer enforces a policy that prohibits the use of forced, bonded, indentured, convict or trafficked labor (ILO Conventions 29, 97, 105 and 143).</p> <p><i>Written policy required for large/medium farms, mills, and warehouses with more than 5 employees.</i></p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of whether a written policy exists (if applicable); • Confirmation of absence of forced, bonded, indentured, convict or trafficked labor and, • If forced, bonded, indentured, convict or trafficked labor is observed, evidence should specify (i) the number and type of workers affected, and (ii) the type of labor observed. <p>*For large and medium farms or mills with 5 or fewer employees (including permanent and temporary workers), inspectors are still required to confirm whether there is an enforced policy in place according to the requirements of SR-HP4.3 and SR-HP4.4. However, for large and medium farms or mills with 5 or fewer employees, a <u>written</u> policy is not required for an evaluation of Comply, however workers also need to confirm during interviews that the policy is practiced and respected.</p> <p>Indications for forced labor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abuse of vulnerability • Restriction of movement • Physical and sexual violence • Retention of identity papers • Debt bondage • Excessive overtime • Deception • Isolation • Intimidation and threats • Withholding wages • Abusive living and working conditions
SR-HP4.5	<p>ZERO TOLERANCE: The workplace is free from physical, sexual, and verbal harassment and abuse.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of workers affected by harassment and/or abuse; • Type of workers affected by harassment and/or abuse (provided that information does not put workers at risk); and, • Type of harassment and/or abuse, including person(s) responsible. <p>This indicator applies to workers as well as family labor, including any individuals involved in coffee farming or processing at the household level. Because of the potentially sensitive nature of including this finding during the closing meeting with the producer, inspectors are encouraged to use their best judgement when presenting this information to avoid potential reprisals against the person(s) being harassed.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
SR-HP4.6	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE</u> : Workers do not surrender their identity papers or other original personal documents or pay deposits as a condition of employment.	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If original identity papers are required for employment, then details should be provided about the (i) types of identity papers surrendered and, (ii) length of time that identity papers are kept; and • If a deposit is required for employment, then the evidence should specify the type and amount of deposit, and the evaluation should be Not Comply.
SR-HP4.7	All workers are employed, promoted, and compensated equally based upon their ability to perform their job, and not on the basis of gender, ethnicity, religious or cultural beliefs.	The inspector should evaluate how decisions are made about worker hiring, promotion and compensation based on interviews and composition of workforce. Performance vs. gender, ethnicity, etc. should be considered. Cultural norms of the country should also be considered when evaluating the indicator.
SR-WC1.1	Permanent and temporary/seasonal workers living onsite have habitable housing.	<p>The evaluation of SR-WC1.1 should be based on the local conditions and general minimum requirements for habitable housing. These minimum requirements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free of any risk of exposure to harmful and irritating substances (e.g. smell, fumes, noise); • Sufficiently ventilated; • Sufficient space/rooms considering the total number of workers; • Safe, without risk of injury, theft, fire; • Access to sanitary facilities and potable water, and, • Waterproof roofs. <p>Inspectors should also be prepared to evaluate whether there are enough types of mattresses or appropriate sleeping furniture for workers living in the onsite housing. This information can be acquired during worker interviews and through observation.</p> <p>Inspectors should also evaluate access to appropriate number and quality of sanitary facilities (bathrooms, showers, sinks).</p> <p>Access to electricity, internet, TV, hot water and similar should be evaluated based on the local context and might not be required for habitable housing.</p> <p>The producer's house, if they are the owner of the farm, does not fall under the scope of this indicator.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
SR-WC1.2	Employer provides workers with convenient access to safe drinking water.	<p>The best practice for determining whether the water source is suitable for drinking is to review the water quality analysis test results for the water source. Both piped and open (e.g., stream, spring, capped well) water sources should be considered.</p> <p>Testing results should be compared to the regional or national guidelines published by the government ministry (usually the ministry of health or environment) tasked with establishing safe thresholds for water contaminants. In the absence of applicable regulation, the test results should be compared to the World Health Organization Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality.</p> <p>Water quality analysis results may not always be available. In this case, inspectors should evaluate the indicator by interviewing the individuals reliant on the water source, as well as make observations of the basic characteristics of the source.</p> <p>If the employer does not provide employees with safe water onsite and workers must bring their own water to the farm or mill, then this indicator should be evaluated as Not Comply.</p> <p>Points to consider include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the water look clean, is it running clear? • Is it stagnant, or is it flowing? • Is there any strange smell or odor coming from the water source? • Is there evidence of wild or domestic animal activity in or near the water source? • Is there evidence of chemical application in or near the water source? • Is there garbage, sewage, or empty chemical containers in or near the water source? • Is there any entity upstream from the water source (e.g., a non-organic farm or cattle ranch, a factory, a milling operation) that could be a potential source of pollution? • Do the people using the water source generally boil the water first before drinking it? • Do they recall ever becoming sick from drinking the water? • Do they take any additional protective measures to protect themselves from contaminants in the water? • In cases where workers bring their own water to the entity, is it simply because of personal preference?
SR-WC1.3	Worker housing has buffer zones, of 10 meters minimum width, from productive area and agrochemical storage facilities to prevent injury or agrochemical exposure to workers and their families.	For worker housing at mills "productive area" does not apply, and only the distance to agrochemical storage areas should be considered. Worker housing at farms would include reference to both aspects, productive area and agrochemical storage, in evaluation of the indicator. On farms that do not use agrochemicals and have no agrochemical storage, the correct evaluation is Not Applicable.

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
SR-WC1.4	Workers have convenient access to sanitary facilities that do not contaminate the local environment.	<p>In evaluating SR-WC1.4, inspectors should refer to both components of the indicator: a) that workers have convenient access to sanitary facilities and b) that the sanitary facilities do not contaminate the local environment. Convenient access refers both to a reasonable distance to the farm and to the quantity of facilities compared to the size of the workforce. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines a reasonable distance to sanitary facilities to be either a 30-minute walk, or 1 km. Inspectors should evaluate SR-WC1.4 as Not Comply when the distance to sanitary facilities is either over 1 km or requires more than a 30-minute walk due to the terrain (e.g., steep slopes). Convenient access is confirmed to be available to workers, and workers choose not to use the facilities, the inspectors should then determine whether the actions of the workers risk contaminating the local environment. In their review, inspectors should also check the areas around the sanitary facilities in order to understand risks of contamination to places such as worker housing, natural water sources, and dining and break areas. The indicator should be assessed for the conditions during working hours and at worker housing provided by the employer.</p> <p>Access means cleanliness and working properly. Sanitary facilities include bathrooms and hand-washing stations.</p>
SR-WC1.5	Garbage from housing and facilities provided by employer is removed either to a municipal waste dump or to a waste site located at least 25 meters from any worker housing.	Examples for facilities include: warehouses, mills, offices, stores, etc.

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
SR-WC2.1	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Children of legal school age who live onsite or accompany family members who are working onsite attend school</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National legislation regarding mandatory school attendance, including the age or level to which children must attend school; • The number and ages of children living or working onsite; • The school and work status of each child (attends school: Y/N; works or helps on the farm: Y/N); • Types of activities that the child is doing on the farm; and, • The school and working hours of any children working or helping on the farm. <p>Minimum evidence required for Non-Comply evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location and distance to school; • The reason why minors are not enrolled in school; • Information about whether the farm or mill has supported the family in the process of school registration/enrollment; • Whether the families tried to enroll the children in school; • Whether the minors are part of seasonal/migrant worker families; • The length of time the families intend to stay in this region (if migrants); and, • Information on the school calendar where the minors come from and whether school is out of session in their region (if migrants). <p>SR-WC2.1 has two requirements for children of legal school age: i) that they attend school, and, ii) that they do not work during school hours. Thus, in order to evaluate this indicator as Comply, both of these conditions must be met for all children living onsite , or accompanying workers at the farm. Inspectors are expected to know the legal school age for each country in which they conduct inspections and evaluate SR-WC2.1. This indicator applies to all children, including family and non-family (hired) labor.</p> <p>In the case of farms, “onsite” refers to the entity affiliated with the producer (the farm itself AND any housing provided for workers).</p>

<p>SR-WC2.2</p>	<p>If reasonable access to public education does not exist, primary school aged children of workers who live on-site have access to primary education, facilities and materials equal to national or regional requirements.</p>	<p>The indicator should be evaluated as Not Applicable when it is determined that children that live onsite have reasonable access to public education.</p>
<p>SR-WC2.3</p>	<p>If reasonable access to public education does not exist, secondary school aged children of workers who live on-site have access to secondary education, facilities and materials equal to national or regional requirements.</p>	<p>In the case of farms, “onsite” refers to the entity affiliated with the producer (the farm itself AND any housing provided for workers)</p>
<p>SR-WC2.4</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Employer supports local schools with either in-kind donations or financial support</p>	<p>In the case of one time donations, this needs to have occurred after the previous inspection of the entity, where applicable.</p>
<p>SR-WC2.5</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Employer supports training or workshops for permanent/full-time workers on additional skills or trades (i.e., financial literacy, second language).</p>	<p>SR-WC2.5 refers to trainings related to improvement of skills of permanent workers to improve their professional development.</p> <p>Examples: literacy training, computer training, or specific trade skills (e.g., special farm or mill techniques, construction skills, etc.).</p> <p>This indicator does not apply to trainings that are required as part of the normal course of employment (e.g., health and safety trainings) and/or trainings that ensure that employees carry out their assigned duties in a safe manner.</p> <p>This indicator is always applicable when there are permanent/full-time workers and can only be evaluated as Not Applicable in cases where the entity doesn't employ permanent/full-time workers.</p>
<p>SR-WC3.1</p>	<p>Employer has a medical care plan which includes transportation or a trained medical person (technical expert) is available in case of medical emergency.</p>	<p>Inspectors should evaluate the source and reliability of transportation. If it is a manager's vehicle, inspectors should assess how often the manager is on-site. In the case of a trained medical person (technical expert), the inspector should evaluate the location and responsiveness of said person in addition to reviewing their credentials.</p>

<p>SR-WC3.3</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT: If there is convenient and accessible medical care</u>, employer supports these facilities with either in-kind donations or financial support.</p>	<p>The intent of SR-WC3.3 is to encourage suppliers to contribute to the ability of local medical care facilities to provide services to the community where the farm or mill is located. The contributions can come in the form of either in-kind donations (e.g., donations of materials and/or professional services) or direct financial support. While the indicator states that the recipient of the donations or financial support be a public medical care facility, there are cases in which public medical care facilities are owned and operated by the national government and do not accept donations or support from private entities, or in which such public medical care facilities are not available in the region. In these cases, the inspector should evaluate the indicator based on whether the employer donates to an internationally or nationally recognized non-governmental organization (NGO) that provides convenient and accessible medical care in the local community (e.g., the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, Doctors Without Borders, etc.). However, prior to determining eligibility for compliance based on a non-governmental medical clinic, the verifier should confirm with SCS that the NGO is eligible for this consideration. In the case that public medical care facilities are present, but do not accept donations, AND an internationally or national recognized non-profit organization is not present, then indicator SR-WC3.3 should be evaluated as Not Applicable.</p> <p>In the case of one time donations, this needs to have occurred after the previous inspection of the entity, where applicable.</p>
<p>SR-WC3.4</p>	<p>Employer contributes to the cost of general health services for all permanent workers.</p>	<p>General health services may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical insurance; • On-site clinic; and/or, • On-site trained medical person. <p>If medical coverage is provided by general health services (e.g., by the state) and if the employer decides voluntarily to not contribute to the program, the correct evaluation for these indicators is Not Comply. If medical coverage is entirely provided by general health services (e.g., by the state) or if the law does not allow the employer to contribute, the correct evaluation is Not Applicable. In cases where an employer pays for a Workers Compensation plan that covers injury costs the correct evaluation is Comply.</p>
<p>SR-WC3.5</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Employer contributes to the cost of general health services for all temporary/seasonal workers.</p>	<p>If medical coverage is provided by general health services (e.g., by the state) and if the employer decides voluntarily to not contribute to the program, the correct evaluation for these indicators is Not Comply. If medical coverage is entirely provided by general health services (e.g., by the state) or if the law does not allow the employer to contribute, the correct evaluation is Not Applicable. In cases where an employer pays for a Workers Compensation plan that covers injury costs the correct evaluation is Comply.</p>
<p>SR-WC3.6</p>	<p>Employer pays for all medical costs associated with documented work-related injuries and illnesses if not covered by other programs or services.</p>	<p>The intent of indicator SR-WC3.6 is to protect workers from costs of workplace injuries not covered by general health services (SR-HP3.4 and 3.5). Work-related injuries should be documented at the entity or clinic level. Both review of records and interviews with workers should occur.</p>

<p>SR-WC4.1</p>	<p>Employer provides appropriate Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) to all applicable workers at no cost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For farms: respirators with filters, goggles, rubber boots, water-proof gloves, impermeable clothing • For dry mills: goggles, ear plugs, masks 	<p>When evaluating SR-WC4.1, inspectors should assess which PPE would be appropriate based on the particular situation on the entity and should avoid using a checklist approach. In addition to checking for PPE provided by employers, special attention should be given to the type of chemicals used and who handles them. The determination of “appropriate” depends on a number of factors, including: method of application, form of chemical (e.g., pellets, liquid, etc.), toxicity of substance being applied, and type of operation (e.g., organic). Where available, Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) should also be reviewed. When verifying dry mills and warehouses, verifiers and inspectors are encouraged to also review indicators SR-WC4.1 and SR-WC4.2 in the context of agrochemical use for fumigation of export containers that are used to transport coffee. If the PPE is provided by the cooperative, for the farm the indicator should be evaluated as Comply.</p> <p>Minimum evidence required for Not Comply evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly indicate if no PPE is given to applicable workers, and source of evidence; • PPE missing or is in poor condition; • Task for which PPE is missing; and/or, • Information on how frequently the task is performed and how frequently it is performed without the use of appropriate PPE; • Clearly explain if the workers are bringing their own PPE or buying it themselves.
<p>SR-WC4.2</p>	<p>Anyone handling or applying agrochemicals and operating machinery uses the appropriate protective equipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When applying pesticides, workers use respirators with filters, goggles, rubber boots, water-proof gloves, and impermeable clothing (SR-WC4.1). • When applying chemical fertilizers, workers use rubber boots, and if appropriate, gloves and protective goggles. 	<p>Where available, Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) should also be reviewed.</p> <p>For machinery, it will depend on the machine specifications and normal safety requirements for that machine. The inspector can determine this by consulting information related to that machine and should support the evaluation with evidence.</p> <p>This indicator is applicable to any person handling or applying agrochemicals and operating machinery, including the farm owner, family members and all workers.</p>
<p>SR-WC4.4</p>	<p>Training covers, at a minimum: use of protective equipment, safe handling of hazardous materials, operation of equipment and personal safety and hygiene.</p>	<p>Trainings at the entity can include other topics than those specified in the indicator, but at minimum need to include those listed in the indicator. If one of the topics from the indicator is not included in the entity trainings, the indicator should be evaluated as Not Comply.</p>
<p>SR-WC4.5</p>	<p>For all enclosed work areas, there is a documented fire and emergency evacuation plan. <i>Applicable to farms, mills, and warehouses.</i></p>	<p>Examples of enclosed areas on farms include agrochemical and machinery storage. An outdoor space with gates is not considered an enclosed work area.</p>

<p>SR-WC4.6</p>	<p>Management maintains written injury reports. The written injury reports include the type of injury, name of worker, time and date, and location of the accident.</p>	<p>If no injuries have occurred, inspectors should evaluate this indicator as Not Applicable, but only after confirming with workers that no injuries have occurred.</p> <p>To receive a Comply evaluation, all fields requested by the indicator should be included in the injury report.</p>
<p>SR-WC4.7</p>	<p>Management reviews accident and injury records at least annually and updates safety procedures and training materials to prevent accident and injury re-occurrence.</p>	<p>The intent of this indicator is to ensure that management is continuously reviewing and improving safety procedures and training materials based on workplace injuries.</p> <p>Inspectors need to evaluate whether management implemented changes to procedures and training materials in an appropriate amount of time.</p> <p>In case no accidents have occurred, the correct evaluation is Not Applicable.</p>
<p>SR-WC4.8</p>	<p>Anyone who handles, mixes, or applies agrochemicals has convenient access to eye baths, soap, sinks for hand washing, showers, and clothes washing facilities.</p>	<p>“Convenient access” can differ depending on farm conditions. Inspectors should observe and determine where product is mixed, how it is applied, if there have been any spills, and what workers would do if exposed to chemicals. For a large farm, ideally, washing stations (e.g., shower, eye wash, hand wash) are installed at sites where there is agrochemical storage, handling and mixing.</p>
<p>SR-WC4.9</p>	<p>Authorized minors (minors older than 14) and pregnant women are prohibited from handling or applying agrochemicals, operating heavy machinery and/or heavy lifting.</p>	<p>Minors refers to anybody below the age of 18.</p>
<p>SR-WC4.10</p>	<p>Entrance is prohibited to areas where pesticides were applied 48 hours prior without protective equipment.</p>	<p>Evidence should include information on how this is enforced (e.g., signposts that clearly indicate prohibition of entry, watchmen or similar), even to persons who do not work on the farm (e.g., school children on their way to and from school). Chemicals include both pesticides and herbicides as well as rodent management in warehouses, dry mills, storage areas and housing. if the product label re-entry interval (REI) indicates less than 48 hours required, entrance can be granted before the 48hrs without PPE.</p>
<p>SR-WC4.11</p>	<p>For all enclosed work areas, there is a sufficient number of emergency exits that are clearly marked, unobstructed at all times, unlocked when workers are present or have latches that do not require special operation.</p>	<p>The goal of this indicator is to ensure that workers in enclosed areas have access to escape routes in the case of emergencies. In order to evaluate “clearly marked”, inspectors should confirm that the sign is not only clearly visible by the exit, but that workers may identify the exit from wherever they are. Inspectors should confirm that all conditions in the indicator are met through observation and interview in order for the entity to receive an evaluation of Comply.</p>
<p>SR-WC4.12</p>	<p>Employees are provided with a safe working environment.</p>	<p>Examples for unsafe work environments include: unprotected electric wires, uncovered trenches, water tanks and lagoons, unstable ladders and bridges, overstacked coffee, very narrow alleys, slippery floors. Safe work environments have well ventilated and lighted enclosed areas, machinery and equipment of the site, are kept in good condition and have adequate protection and safety devices. There are stairs, emergency exits and fire extinguishers with signage and they remain accessible.</p>

<p>SR-WC4.13</p>	<p>All equipment used by workers is properly maintained and safe to use.</p>	<p>Examples of equipment include (but are not limited to): wet/dry milling machinery, tractors, anything for transportation, spraying equipment, weeding machinery. Inspectors should confirm with the entity representative that maintenance schedules are well known and clearly defined and documented. “Properly maintained” should show records of servicing, recalibration, certificates, etc.</p>
<p>SR-MS1.1</p>	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Entity provides transparency into their operations, policies, processes, and relevant records to Starbucks or its designated third party. Payroll records and time cards provided by management are true and accurate.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required for Not Comply evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aspects of the operation that were not available during the verification; and/or, Items provided to the inspector that were not true or accurate. <p>SR-MS1.1 should be evaluated based on whether inspectors were provided with access to all areas and information requested during the verification, and whether the information provided was true and accurate. If an inspector does not believe that the information provided was true or accurate (e.g., fraudulent payroll documents), a full description of the issue needs to be included in the evidence for a Not Comply evaluation.</p> <p>When payroll records and time cards are not available, there is a possibility that SR-MS1.1 could still be evaluated as Comply. There may be cases that the entity either legitimately does not have payroll records or time cards, and/or they do not maintain those records. If the operation does not maintain these records, then a non-compliance may be evaluated under SR-HP1.4. However, this type of scenario could still allow for a Comply evaluation for SR-MS1.1, unless there was evidence that the operation was intentionally withholding those records as a way of avoiding transparency into their operations.</p>
<p>SR-MS1.2</p>	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Money and/or gifts of any type are not offered to Starbucks or its designated third party.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required for Not Comply evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Type of money or other gift that was offered, and the reason for offering. <p>SR-MS1.2 refers to attempted bribery. Inspectors should evaluate this indicator based on whether the supplier provided any bribe or expensive gifts in order to influence the outcome of the verification. Evidence for the indicator should include the type of the bribe. Further information regarding bribery and corruption is also included in the C.A.F.E. Practices Verification Organization Approval Procedure. Inspectors should be aware of the local culture and recognize the difference between a bribe and a symbolic gesture of hospitality and follow guidance given by their organizations regarding anti-corruption practices and bribery.</p>
<p>SR-MS1.3</p>	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Entity demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement and engages in the improvement process.</p>	<p>SR-MS1.3 is included in the Scorecards as a program principle, and is evaluated by Starbucks. This indicator is not evaluated by inspectors.</p>

5.0 Coffee Growing

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
CG-WR1.1	Buffer zones exist next to more than 50% of permanent water bodies ; buffers are at least 5 meters in width (measured horizontally from the high water mark to the base of any coffee tree), exclude all cultivation and are composed of vegetation.	<p>If there are no permanent water bodies, then CG-WR1.1, CG-WR1.2, CG-WR1.6, CG-WR1.7 would be Not Applicable. If there are permanent water bodies, but NO buffer zones next to them, then CG-WR1.1, CG-WR1.2, CG-WR1.6, CG-WR1.7 would be evaluated as Not Comply.</p> <p>When evaluating these indicators, inspectors are reminded that the percentage to evaluate refers to the total <i>area</i> around all permanent water bodies and not the total number of water bodies. Inspectors should use visual estimation/observation to arrive at the total percentage.</p>
CG-WR1.2	Buffer zones exist next to all permanent water bodies ; buffers are at least 5 meters in width (measured horizontally from the high water mark to the base of any coffee tree), exclude all cultivation and are composed of vegetation.	<p>Ideally, inspectors should visit all water bodies on the farm in order to determine if the buffer zones are sufficient to meet the 50% threshold for this indicator. If a water body is adjacent, only the area bordering the farm should be considered.</p>
CG-WR1.3	Buffer zones exist next to more than 50% of seasonal and intermittent (temporary) water bodies ; buffers are at least 2 meters in width (measured horizontally from the high water mark to the base of any coffee tree), exclude all cultivation and are composed of vegetation.	<p>If there are no temporary water bodies, then CG-WR1.3 and CG-WR1.4 would be Not Applicable. If there are temporary water bodies, but NO buffer zones next to them, then CG-WR1.3 and CG-WR1.4 would be evaluated as Not Comply. When evaluating these indicators, inspectors are reminded that the percentage to evaluate refers to the total <i>area</i> around all seasonal water bodies and not the total number of water bodies.</p>
CG-WR1.4	Buffer zones exist next to all seasonal and intermittent (temporary) water bodies ; buffers are at least 2 meters in width (measured horizontally from the high water mark to the base of any coffee tree), exclude all cultivation and are composed of vegetation.	<p>If a water body is adjacent, only the area bordering the farm should be considered.</p>
CG-WR1.5	Farm has a plan to restore native vegetation within the buffer zones.	<p>If there are no water bodies on the farm or the entire buffer zone is composed of native vegetation, the correct evaluation is Not Applicable.</p> <p>The plan should include a clear time-frame for implementation, which the farm has been following. In the case of re-verifications, inspectors should confirm that the farm follows the established time-frame to give a Comply evaluation.</p>

CG-WR1.6	More than 50% of permanent water body buffer zones are composed of native woody vegetation.	If there are no permanent water bodies, then CG-WR1.1, CG-WR1.2, CG-WR1.6, and CG-WR1.7 would be Not Applicable. If there are permanent water bodies, but NO buffer zones next to them, then CG-WR1.1, CG-WR1.2, CG-WR1.6, and CG-WR1.7 would be evaluated as Not Comply. The evaluation of CG-WR1.6 and CG-WR1.7 should be done independently of the total amount of buffer zones. For example, CG-WR1.6 and 1.7 are evaluated according to the % of buffer zones that exist that are composed of native woody vegetation. For example, if 60% of the total area around permanent water bodies on the farm have buffer zones, and there is native woody vegetation in all of those buffer zones, then CG-WR1.1 would be evaluated as Comply, CG-WR1.2 would be evaluated as Not Comply (since only 60% of the total area around permanent water bodies have buffer zones), but both CG-WR1.6 and 1.7 would be evaluated as Comply since the total amount of the existing buffer zone has native woody vegetation. Bamboo can be considered as woody vegetation.
CG-WR1.7	All permanent water body buffer zones are composed of native woody vegetation.	
CG-WR1.8	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> All water crossings are protected by the use of bridges, culverts or sufficient means to prevent degradation.	Any means that prevent degradation, erosion, and contamination are acceptable for a Comply evaluation.
CG-WR1.9	No agrochemicals are applied within 5 meters of any permanent water body	This indicator is applicable even if there are no water bodies <i>on the farm</i> to account for possibilities of water bodies <i>outside of the farm</i> that may be in the distance as specified in the indicator. Inspectors should ensure that the quantitative evidence (e.g., # of meters) is entered in the VRS.
CG-WR1.10	Nematicides are NOT applied within 20 meters of any permanent water body.	
CG-WR1.11	Farm waste or garbage sites are located at least 100 meters from any water body.	
CG-WR2.1	If mechanical (pumps, etc.) irrigation is used, quantity of water used is tracked and recorded in writing: liters per Kg of green coffee AND liters per hectare	For this indicator to be evaluated as Comply, the amount of water must be verified using a device that measures water use or the entity must provide the method used for the calculation. This indicator needs to be evaluated as Not Applicable, when the farm uses solely rain water for mechanical irrigation which they catch and store
CG-WR2.2	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> If mechanical irrigation is used, the farm management demonstrates an understanding of local water conditions or stress factors.	Water stress refers to the condition where total water use exceeds the locally available water supply in the watershed (e.g., streams, rivers, groundwater), and could lead to a long term deficit problem. The producer should demonstrate knowledge of potential water stress causes and long term effects in the region.

<p>CG-WR2.3</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Farms that use mechanical irrigation monitor and try to minimize total water usage.</p>	<p>For CG-WR2.3, the inspector will need to evaluate whether the farm has demonstrated efforts to both monitor and minimize water use. Examples of efforts to minimize water use include, but are not limited to, the use of mulch or organic material to minimize soil water loss, the use of efficient irrigation systems (e.g., drip), evidence of soil moisture or plant condition monitoring to determine irrigation schedule, and ongoing monitoring of irrigation systems for leaks and other problems. If situations like regular irrigation at midday or the day after rainfall are observed, the indicator needs to be evaluated as Not Comply.</p> <p>Minimizing water usage by using sustainable methods and techniques of irrigation (e.g. recycling of water or use of technology, etc) can be considered for a Comply evaluation as well.</p>
<p>CG-SR1.2</p>	<p>Farm has a written soil management plan that includes measures to minimize surface erosion.</p>	<p>The plan should include a clear time-frame for implementation, which the farm has been following. In cases of re-verifications, inspector should check for implementation based on previously defined plan (if such existed).</p>
<p>CG-SR1.3</p>	<p>At least 50% of productive area with slopes of less than 20% is covered by shade trees and/or cover crops/vegetation.</p>	<p>A layer of mulch of thickness greater than or equal to 5 cm (2 in) can be considered as an acceptable method for erosion control on coffee farms. Therefore, the use of a layer of mulch with a consistent layer of 5 cm (2 in) thickness or greater can be considered for a Comply evaluation for CG-SR1.3 and CG-SR1.4, rather than only cover crops and vegetation. Soil coverage needs to be maintained throughout the year.</p> <p>To evaluate the contribution of shade trees to soil erosion protection effects, the density of shade trees should be considered.</p>
<p>CG-SR1.4</p>	<p>All productive area with slopes of less than 20% is covered by shade trees and/or cover crops/vegetation.</p>	
<p>CG-SR1.5</p>	<p>In addition to the soil erosion prevention measures included in CG-SR1.3-1.4, contour lines and/or bench terraces are established on at least 50% of productive area with slopes between 20% and 30%.</p>	<p>Evidence for area with slopes between 20% and 30% should include information for compliance with CG-SR1.3-1.4. Inspectors should include the specific measures taken by the farm.</p>
<p>CG-SR1.6</p>	<p>In addition to the soil erosion prevention measures included in CG-SR1.3-1.4, contour lines and/or bench terraces are established on all productive area with slopes between 20% and 30%.</p>	<p>To evaluate these indicators as Comply, areas with slopes between 20% and 30% need to both be covered by shade trees and/or cover crops/vegetation, as well as contour lines and/or bench terraces.</p>

<p>CG-SR1.7</p>	<p>In addition to the soil erosion prevention measures included in CG-SR1.3-1.6, physical barriers (e.g., pruned branches, rocks) and/or living barriers (e.g., grasses, shrubs) are established on at least 50% of productive area with slopes over 30%.</p>	<p>Areas with slopes over 30% (including those with slopes over 60%) should have shade tree cover and/or cover crops/vegetation, contour lines and/or bench terraces, and physical barriers (e.g., pruned branches, rocks) and/or living barriers (e.g., grasses, shrubs) in order to evaluate these indicators as Comply. Inspectors should include the specific measures taken by the farm.</p>
<p>CG-SR1.8</p>	<p>In addition to the soil erosion prevention measures included in CG-SR1.3-1.6, physical barriers (e.g., pruned branches, rocks) and/or living barriers (e.g., grasses, shrubs) are established on all productive area with slopes over 30%.</p>	
<p>CG-SR1.9</p>	<p>Herbicides are not used to control ground vegetation or cover crops. If herbicides are used, they are only used in spot applications for aggressive weeds.</p>	<p>If herbicides are not used by this entity, the indicator needs to be evaluated Comply.</p>
<p>CG-SR1.10</p>	<p>At least 50% of roads or frequently used trails or footpaths are protected from erosion through proper drainage ditches and/or other control measures (including cover vegetation, etc.).</p>	<p>In cases where roads are adjacent to the farm, the entity is responsible to protect against erosion on their property.</p>
<p>CG-SR2.1</p>	<p>At least 25% of the productive area is covered by a layer of organic matter (dead and decaying biomass - mulch, grass, leaves, branches, etc.) and/or nitrogen-fixing cover crops.</p>	<p>A layer of mulch of thickness greater than or equal to 5 cm (2 in) can be considered as an acceptable method for maintaining soil productivity on coffee farms. Therefore, the use of a layer of mulch with a consistent layer of 5 cm (2 in) thickness or greater can be considered for a Comply evaluation for CG-SR2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, rather than only cover crops and vegetation. Soil coverage needs to be maintained throughout the year.</p>
<p>CG-SR2.2</p>	<p>At least 50% of the productive area is covered by a layer of organic matter (dead and decaying biomass - mulch, grass, leaves, branches, etc.) and/or nitrogen-fixing cover crops.</p>	
<p>CG-SR2.3</p>	<p>All of the productive area is covered by a layer of organic matter (dead and decaying biomass - mulch, grass, leaves, branches, etc.) and/or nitrogen-fixing cover crops.</p>	

CG-SR2.5	At least 25% of the productive area is planted with nitrogen-fixing, leguminous shade trees.	Indicators CG-SR2.5-2.7 refer to nitrogen-fixing and leguminous shade trees. While in general, many trees that are nitrogen-fixing are leguminous, there are examples of trees that are nitrogen-fixing but not leguminous. In order to justify a Comply evaluation for these indicators, the tree must be <u>BOTH</u> nitrogen-fixing AND leguminous (i.e., a species that is part of the bean family, Fabaceae). For example, while species of the genus <i>Casuarina</i> L. may be nitrogen-fixing, the trees are not leguminous, and therefore cannot be considered as evidence of compliance for these indicators. Similarly, there is evidence that some shade-tree species in the genus <i>Grevillea</i> may also be nitrogen fixing, but note that <i>Grevillea</i> is not leguminous and should not be used to justify a Comply evaluation for these indicators.
CG-SR2.6	At least 50% of the productive area is planted with nitrogen-fixing, leguminous shade trees.	
CG-SR2.7	All of the productive area is planted with nitrogen-fixing, leguminous shade trees.	
CG-SR2.10	The formula of applied nutrients and non-synthetic soil amendments is customized in response to results of soil and foliar analyses.	In cases where only one type of analysis is conducted, if the formula is based on either the soil OR the foliar analysis the indicator should be evaluated Comply.
CG-CB1.1	Native trees are removed only when they constitute a human hazard or when they significantly compete with coffee plants.	Established native trees may only be removed with an appropriate justifications relating to already existing coffee plants. If there haven't been any native trees on the farm to remove, the indicator should be evaluated as Comply.
CG-CB1.3	The farm is implementing the shade management plan according to the plan's timeline.	In cases where CG-CB1.2 is evaluated as Not Comply because a topic is missing, CG-CB1.3 can still be evaluated as Comply if the farm has a plan and its implementation according to the timeline can be confirmed. In the absence of a written plan, this indicator needs to be evaluated Not Comply since no timeline can be confirmed. Inspectors should conduct a visual assesment of the farm in order to confirm that the producer is following the shade management plan.
CG-CB1.4	At least 10% of the farm (including productive AND non-productive area) has canopy cover.	According to the C.A.F.E. Practices program, canopy cover is defined as the multiple stories of foliage in a stand of trees or shrubs, in particular the uppermost continuous layer of branches and foliage. Inspectors must evaluate not only the number of trees planted in the productive and non-productive areas, but the cover provided by their branches and leaves. Banana trees, as well as other productive trees such as macademia, avocado, citrus etc., can count towards the evaluation of percent canopy cover as well as diversity of species, only if they are managed for shade regulation. When the farm does not have any canopy cover , CG-CB1.4 and CG-CB1.9 would be evaluated as Not Comply. Assuming there are no trees in the canopy , then CG-CB 1.5, CB-CB1.8, CG-CB 1.10 and CG-CB1.11 would also be evaluated as Not Comply. CG-CB1.6 would be evaluated as
CG-CB1.5	Canopy cover in the productive area has a diversity of tree species.	
CG-CB1.6	Invasive species are not used for canopy cover in the productive area.	
CG-CB1.7	Where conditions permit, locally native epiphytes, lianas and woody vines are retained in the canopy cover in the productive area.	

<p>CG-CB1.8</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Canopy cover in the productive area is kept at biologically significant levels (i.e., the level of canopy cover changes the farm's micro-climate, produces a noticeable leaf layer on the ground and creates an obvious habitat for a range of plant and animal species, etc.).</p>	<p>Comply, and CG-CB1.7 would be evaluated as Not Applicable.</p> <p>For indicators that refer specifically to “productive area,” inspectors should evaluate these indicators based on the canopy cover of the productive area only, and therefore not include conservation areas, buffer zones, or productive areas for other crops (if cultivated separately from coffee) in their evaluation of these indicators. For those that refer to “productive AND non-productive” (e.g., CG-CB1.4), inspectors should include conservation area, buffer zones, and productive areas for other crops, as well as the productive area for coffee.</p>
<p>CG-CB1.9</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> At least 40% of the productive area of the farm has canopy cover.</p>	<p>A diversity of trees is considered three or more different species.</p> <p>For a list of invasive species, inspector should refer to the Global Invasive Species Database (GISD) or other official local/regional list.</p> <p>For CG-CB1.8 when evaluating this indicator as Comply, specific evidence of the effects of the canopy cover on the habitat conditions needs to be provided.</p>
<p>CG-CB1.10</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> At least 75% of the canopy cover in the productive area is comprised of locally native species and/or the canopy consists of at least 10 species that are locally native or can be shown to contribute to the conservation of native biodiversity.</p>	<p>CG-CB1.9 needs to be evaluated as Comply, for this indicator to be considered for Comply evaluation.</p>
<p>CG-CB1.11</p>	<p>Hunting threatened or rare wildlife species and unauthorized collection of flora and fauna are not allowed on the property.</p>	<p>Inspector should confirm that no workers of the entity hunt threatened or rare wildlife, nor collect unauthorized flora and fauna.</p>
<p>CG-CB2.1</p>	<p>Farm management has created a list of wildlife species native to the region and identified which of those species are classified as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered according to the IUCN red list (http://www.redlist.org) or local government source.</p>	<p>Local government guidance is an acceptable source as an alternative to the IUCN red list website. The list needs to be relevant to the farm's region.</p>
<p>CG-CB2.3</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> A written wildlife management plan is developed and implemented on the farm (e.g., management and workers are trained, action steps are outlined, timeline to completion, etc.).</p>	<p>In order to evaluate this indicator as Comply, the evidence needs to be robust and the management plan need to include actions beyond the ones required for compliance with CG-CB2.2 and 2.3.</p>
<p>CG-CB2.4</p>	<p></p>	<p></p>

<p>CG-CB3.1</p>	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> No conversion of natural forest to agricultural production since 2004.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date that land was converted; • Type of forest or land that was converted; • Purpose for land conversion; and, • Approximate area converted (in hectares). <p>Inspectors should evaluate CG-CB3.1 as Not Comply in the case that land has been converted for the purposes of agricultural production, not only for coffee production. The indicator refers to “natural” forest, which includes both primary and secondary forest. Abandoned, slightly overgrown land, formerly used for agricultural practices is not considered secondary forest. However, if it is still visible that the land was formerly used for agricultural purposes but a forest has regenerated and has been reestablished and the effects of the agricultural production are no longer evident, this can be considered a secondary forest.</p> <p>Conversion to agriculture of all types of ecosystem should be considered in evaluation of the indicator (e.g., cerrado/savanna in Brazil). Evidence for Not Comply evaluations should include the year in which the deforestation or land conversion occurred, the number of hectares converted, and the reason for the conversion.</p>
<p>CG-CB3.2</p>	<p>Farm has made an assessment of areas of high conservation value (areas with significant intact forest, primary forest canopy cover, rare flora and fauna communities, important habitat elements, critical watershed values, importance to local communities’ traditional cultural identity).</p>	<p>The purpose of this indicator is for producers to conduct a farm assessment in order to evaluate whether areas of high conservation value exist on the farm. Therefore, producers must show a documented assessment in order to comply with this indicator, even if it is concluded that there are no areas of high conservation on the farm. The assessment of the areas of high conservation value can be done internally by the farm, agronomist, management or person with basic environmental knowledge.</p> <p>Areas of high conservation value are areas that possess one or more of the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity; • Are in or contain rare, threatened, or endangered ecosystems; • Provide basic ecosystem services (e.g. watershed protection or erosion control) in critical situations; • Are fundamental in meeting the basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence or health); and/or, • Are critical to local communities’ traditional cultural identity (areas of significance identified in cooperation with such local communities). <p>The assessment should include all topics included in the indicator, as well as the date the assessment was made and who conducted it.</p>

<p>CG- CB3.5</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> If areas of high conservation value do not exist on the farm, managers have implemented a plan to restore natural habitat or conditions on a portion of the farm (ecological restoration).</p>	<p>This indicator is only applicable if there are no areas of high conservation on the farm. If the farm has areas of high conservation then the correct evaluation of this indicator will be Not Applicable.</p>
<p>CG- CB3.10</p>	<p>Multiple plant species that contribute to biodiversity have been planted where space allows within the farm (e.g., borders, roads, trails, paths, etc.).</p>	<p>The importance of this indicator is to address the contributions to the biodiversity at the farm. For a Comply evaluation, inspectors should ensure that invasive species are not planted and assess if the species are contributing to biodiversity on the farm.</p> <p>Multiple means three or more.</p>
<p>CG- CB3.11</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> A nursery has been established or identified as a source of native tree and plant species for ecological restoration activities.</p>	<p>The nursery can be part of the farm or another entity. If the farm is part of an association and the association has established a nursery for the farm to use, this indicator can be evaluated as Comply.</p> <p>“Identified” should not be sufficient, if the farm does not source trees from that nursery.</p>
<p>CG- EM1.1</p>	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Farm does not use pesticides that are listed by the World Health Organization as Type 1A or 1B, or that are banned according to national, regional, or local laws.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required for a Non-Comply evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active ingredient of illegal or prohibited pesticides used; • Purpose for use of illegal or prohibited pesticides; • Duration of time that illegal or WHO-listed pesticide has been in use; and, • Legal reference (if applicable) or specification of whether pesticide is listed as Type 1A or 1B. <p>In order to determine the types of agrochemicals used by the entity and/or distributed by PSOs where applicable, the inspector should consult all information available and make necessary observations, including reviewing agrochemical purchase records and agrochemical management plans, chemical use records/maps; visiting agrochemical storage facilities, and conducting interviews with management and workers. Inspectors must check the active ingredient of the product and not simply rely on the label color.</p>
<p>CG- EM1.2</p>	<p>Farm keeps purchase records of pesticides, specifying date, product, product formulation, quantity, supplier, and price of purchase for each pesticide.</p>	<p>If one of the aspects of the indicator is not on the record presented by the farm, the correct evaluation is Not Comply. Product formulation refers to its form: liquid, powder, gas.</p>
<p>CG- EM1.6</p>	<p>Agrochemical storage site has safeguards to control spills (e.g., physical barriers to prevent external contamination).</p>	<p>In order for this indicator to be evaluated as Comply, agrochemical storage must include as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - impermeable floor (not made of wood) - Physical barriers to prevent larger spills without manual intervention; i.e. presence of sand, etc. is not sufficient.
<p>CG- EM1.7</p>	<p>There are contingency plans for handling pesticide spills and overexposure.</p>	<p>This indicator needs a document to support the evidence and to be evaluated as Comply. However, the plan to handle pesticides spills and overexposure needs to be implemented and not only written in a document.</p>

<p>CG-EM1.8</p>	<p>Agrochemicals are mixed and spraying equipment loaded in ventilated areas. If products are mixed in the field, because of distance from storage, precautions are taken and plans are in place to handle accidents, spills or contamination.</p>	<p>Farms must have a document outlining the procedures and precautions for mixing and loading spraying equipment. Inspectors must verify, either visually or by interview, that the farm is following safety measures for mixing and loading agrochemicals.</p> <p>If chemicals are mixed in the field, precautions must include as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixing is done at least 20 meters from any water body. • The mixing area must have an impermeable base, bordered to contain a spill of the mixing vessel that has the capacity to contain a spill of the mixing vessel. • There must be access to sufficient water for mixers to wash themselves in case of contamination.
<p>CG-EM1.9</p>	<p>Farm has an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan for monitoring for pests and diseases and symptoms of nematode infestation.</p>	<p>If CG-EM1.9 is evaluated as Not Comply, then CG-EM1.10 will automatically be scored as Not Comply due to the fact that CG-EM1.10 specifies that the written plan is properly implemented.</p> <p>Documentation of the implementation of the IPM should include, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting documentation with monitoring data. • Supporting documentation that the farm implemented the activities outlined in the plan.
<p>CG-EM1.10</p>	<p>There is a written Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan that is properly implemented in the field and includes regular monitoring for pests and diseases and symptoms of nematode infestation.</p>	
<p>CG-EM1.11</p>	<p>Farm takes physical action to control sources of infestation.</p>	<p>Pruning or other agricultural practices may be considered physical action to control sources of infestation only if controlling an infestation is one of the intents of that process. This should be confirmed by the inspector during the farm visit and during interviews with management and workers. It should not be considered if it is only used for productivity or other purposes instead controlling infestation.</p> <p>The most important element for this indicator is that the farm takes action before resorting to chemicals.</p>
<p>CG-EM1.12</p>	<p>Pesticides (not including herbicides) are applied only on a spot-application basis, depending on the type and severity of infestation.</p>	<p>If no pesticides are applied, the correct evaluation is Comply.</p>
<p>CG-EM1.13</p>	<p>Pesticides (not including herbicides) are only applied as a last resort (after cultural and physical controls have failed).</p>	<p>The producer should be able to explain the pest monitoring procedure they follow to determine the point at which they will need to apply pesticides (e.g, % of farm infested, etc). If no pesticides are applied, the correct evaluation is Comply.</p>
<p>CG-EM1.15</p>	<p>Farm maintains written records of total toxic load calculation for productive area on the farm.</p>	<p>Producer may use the template provided by Starbucks to do this calculation, however it is not required in order to evaluate this indicator as Comply. If the producer provides their own document, it should outline, for each product used: the area of the product application, amount of product applied, the name of the product and its active ingredient and concentration.</p> <p>This calculation should be done yearly.</p>

<p>CG-EM1.16</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Total toxic load is decreased over time by reducing pesticide use or selecting less toxic alternatives.</p>	<p>If evidence is observed that the farm is taking steps to reduce the total toxic load as per the requirements of the indicator (e.g., reducing pesticides; selecting less toxic alternatives), then it may still be possible to evaluate CG-EM1.16 as Comply or Not Comply, even if there are no written records of total toxic load. In the absence of written records of total toxic load calculation, CG-EM1.16 can be evaluated according to whether the farm is taking steps to minimize the total amount of pesticides used on the farm, or is using less toxic alternatives.</p>
<p>CG-EM1.17</p>	<p>Spraying equipment is maintained in good working order and cleaned in the agrochemical storage or mixing areas after use.</p>	<p>Inspectors should examine equipment that is used to apply agrochemicals to ensure that the components (e.g., nozzles, connections between hoses and tanks, etc.) do not present risks of leakage, contamination between different chemicals, etc.</p> <p>The inspector can consider the amount of equipment to review based on a review of maintenance records and general observation of the conditions of equipment. If in general more equipment is observed in bad condition, further investigation should be conducted to check for issues that present risk of contamination to the users of the equipment.</p>
<p>CG-EM1.18</p>	<p>Empty chemical containers are rinsed and punctured, or as required by local regulations, and appropriately disposed of to prevent further use or injury.</p>	<p>If local regulations exist, inspectors should confirm through interviews and documentation that farm follows them. If no local regulations exist, containers must be triple rinsed, punctured and disposed of safely. Puncturing ensures containers are properly drained and prevents reuse.</p>
<p>CG-EM2.1</p>	<p>Farm managers have developed and implemented a written C.A.F.E. Practices work plan AND improvement activities are tracked and documented.</p>	<p>The work plan may not specifically be for C.A.F.E. Practices. However, in this case the inspector should receive from farm management a clear reference to the planned improvement activities as they relate to specific indicators of the C.A.F.E. Practices standard in order to give a Comply evaluation. Entities in new supply chains can have a plan that includes projections for the future and templates for monitoring activities. Entities that are part of re-verifications need to base their plans on results of previous verifications, where applicable, or self assessments to show progression. Proof of follow up and documentation of improvement activities must be presented.</p>
<p>CG-EM2.2</p>	<p>Farm managers hold at least one annual meeting with all permanent employees to discuss C.A.F.E. Practices improvement plans and activities.</p>	<p>If there are no permanent workers, anyone who works on the farm (family, sharecroppers, etc.) should be considered. For new verifications this indicator is evaluated based on whether the farm conducted any meetings in preparation for the verification.</p>
<p>CG-EM3.1</p>	<p>The farm implements a coffee pruning program to promote new tissue generation (intended to contribute to increased productivity and coffee quality).</p>	<p>All types of pruning and timeframes can be considered for this indicator. Evidence should detail the objective, frequency and timing, and the extent of pruning throughout productive area, as explained by producer and observed by inspector.</p>

<p>CG-EM3.2</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> On farms older than 25 years, the farm annually renovates or replants at least 5% of the total coffee planted area with coffee varieties that maintain or improve the coffee quality profile.</p>	<p>This indicator refers to the age of the farm at which it started as a coffee farm, and not the age of specific lots. Rennovated lots are considered towards the 5% of the total coffee area of the farm. If 100% of the farm has already renovated/replanted, this indicator should be evaluated as Not Applicable.</p>
<p>CG-EM3.3</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Farm is developing or working with a research institute to establish alternatives (e.g., new varieties, graft seedlings, etc.) to reduce nematode infestations and the incidence of soil fungus as well as reduce the use of pesticides.</p>	<p>The alternative practices that are observed should be included in the evidence (e.g., grafting, new varieties, etc.), as well as the name of the research institute with which the farm collaborates.</p>
<p>CG-CC1.1</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> The farm keeps written records of climate change risks and impacts on coffee production (e.g., change in temperature, rainfall).</p>	<p>This indicator evaluates whether the farm keeps written records of (i) climatic data over time related to climate change risks AND (ii) its current or long-term impacts on their coffee production, like yield and infestations. Therefore, simply recording temperature and rainfall is not sufficient for this indicator to be evaluated as Comply.</p>
<p>CG-CC1.2</p>	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> The farm has developed and is implementing a written plan to minimize impact of climate change on coffee production.</p>	<p>The plan may be included within a general farm management plan, however the producer must be able to show that the measures included in the management plan or any other document provided, are specifically related to minimizing climate change impacts.</p>

6.0 Coffee Processing

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
CP-WC1.1	<p>The total volume of water used for pulping, washing, and sorting for coffee processing operations is tracked and recorded, documenting the annual total water used and volume per Kg of coffee cherry processed.</p> <p><i>Indicator should be evaluated "Not Applicable" for mills that process 3500 Kgs or less in green coffee.</i></p>	<p>CP-WC1.1 is applicable even when waterless depulpers are used (such as penagos or belcosub processors), as water is still being used during other parts of the process (although limited quantities).</p> <p>The source of information for this record must be a reliable source such as water measuring device or mathematical calculation if the water comes from a tank. If the calculation of the water used is made through consideration of capacity, the procedure must be clearly explained, the information must be registered and must be supported through documentation.</p> <p>Water bills are not accepted if they include water used for other purposes. For new verifications, calculations can be done during the inspection. Monthly totals can be accepted for a Comply evaluation.</p>
CP-WC1.2	<p>If water is used for separating coffee cherry before pulping, then a siphon of less than 3 cubic meters is used.</p>	<p>The intent of this indicator is to reduce the water used in separating the coffee and classifying it for quality. If there is no separation of coffee cherry before pulping and all of the coffee cherries go to the depulper, this indicator should be evaluated as Not Applicable.</p>
CP-WC1.3	<p>Processing facility recycles water used for both transporting coffee cherry and the pulping process.</p>	<p>When an inspector observes that in only one of the processes the water is being recycled, then the requirements of the indicator are not met. According to the indicator, both transporting and depulping of coffee cherry should include water recycling.</p> <p>If waterless pulpers are used, this indicator still must be evaluated for water use in the transporting of coffee cherry.</p>
CP-WC1.4	<p>The amount of water used (liters of water per Kg green coffee) shows a decrease over time (until the ratio in CP-WC1.5 is achieved).</p> <p><i>Indicator should be evaluated "Not Applicable" for mills that process 3500 Kgs or less in green coffee.</i></p>	<p>If CP-WC1.1 is evaluated as Not Comply, then the liters of water used per kg coffee is not recorded. Therefore, amount of water use over time cannot be determined accurately. In the case that CP-WC1.1 is evaluated as Not Comply, then CP-WC1.4 should be scored as Not Comply. Only data from completed harvests (in a 12-month period) should be used to proof decrease over time.</p>
CP-WC1.5	<p>The ratio between water (used for pulping and washing) and coffee cherry is no more than 1:1 ratio (volume of water to volume of cherry).</p>	<p>If CP-WC1.1 is evaluated as Not Comply, then CP-WC1.5 should be scored as Not Comply, since the amount of water cannot be determined. If CP-WC1.1 is evaluated NA because the mill processes less than 3500 kgs, CP-WC1.5 should be evaluated NA as well.</p> <p>CP-WC1.5 would be evaluated as Not Comply in cases where a water efficient depulping machine is used (e.g., Belcosub, Penagos) and no water use records are available.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
CP-WC1.6	The mill demonstrates awareness of whether or not water stress exists in the watershed in which they are operating and takes steps to maximize efficiency.	To receive a Comply evaluation, the mill must demonstrate awareness, i.e., understanding of their impact on the water source AND take steps to maximize efficiency, regardless of whether or not water stress exists in the watershed. If the mill demonstrates awareness that no water stress exists in the watershed, but does not take steps to maximize efficiency, the inspector should evaluate the indicator as Not Comply.
CP-WC2.1	Wastewater from pulping and washing is managed in a way that does not contaminate the environment, including water bodies.	In case the mill uses a sedimentation pond/tanks/holes, inspectors should evaluate whether the size is large enough to contain the greatest amount of water that can be discharged during the milling process.
CP-WM1.1	Processing wastes are managed in such a way as to not contaminate the local environment.	Evidence should include the way how waste is processed and the observation on the effect of waste management. This indicator does not apply to wastewater.
CP-WM1.2	Skin, pulp, mucilage, and unacceptable cherries are composted or processed by worms.	Mills are required to manage the composting process to ensure sufficient time and conditions for it to be completed.
CP-WM1.3	Organic processing byproducts are used as soil amendments by the farm or, in the case of an independent processor, distributed to local farmers.	If skin, pulp, mucilage and unacceptable cherries are applied or are left on the farm without being fully processed (i.e. composted), and the inspector confirms that this results in harm to the soil, then this indicator should be evaluated as Non-Comply. If part of the byproducts are affected by a disease and therefore the entire batch is not used as an amendment, this indicator should be evaluated as Non-Comply.
CP-WM1.4	Processing waste solids are recovered from sedimentation ponds, composted and used by coffee farms.	Recovered solids must be fully composted before applied in the field. This indicator can only be evaluated as NA if the entity does not practice sedimentation at all.
CP-EC1.2	At least 25% of parchment coffee is patio (sun) dried or dried in other energy efficient ways (e.g., greenhouses, raised beds, radiant solar drying systems).	Inspectors should consider the portion of the total coffee volume processed by the entity that is patio dried when calculating the percentage to evaluate CP-EC1.2. It is important to note that CP-EC1.2 may still be evaluated as Comply if the coffee is not dried from start to finish in the sun. For example, if the coffee is patio dried initially and then the drying process is finished mechanically, inspectors could still evaluate CP-EC1.2 as Comply, provided that at least 25% of the drying process is done this way. If coffee is not dried at the entity being evaluated, the indicator should be evaluated as Comply, since for now there is no option of evaluating it as Not Applicable.

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
CP-EC1.3	The quantity of wood or other fuel (except parchment skin) used for drying coffee is recorded, documenting both the annual AND per Kg of green coffee processed totals.	If 100% of coffee is sun dried, this indicator should be evaluated as Not Applicable.
CP-EC1.4	Wood used for drying coffee comes from pruning of coffee, shade trees, responsibly managed forests or other minimal impact harvests (e.g., salvage).	<p>In order to evaluate the use of wood from "responsibly managed forests," the mill should show documentation that the forest is managed sustainably (e.g., a sustainability certification, confirmation of participation in a sustainable forestry program).</p> <p>Documentation also needs to show the source of the purchased wood and show receipts that match the quantity of wood used at the entity.</p>
CP-EC1.5	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> The amount of total energy used per Kg of green coffee shows a decrease over time.	<p>It is important for inspectors to confirm that there are auditable records of energy use by the client. The inspector should ask what sources of energy the client uses to process coffee on-site (e.g., electricity, diesel and gasoline). Once the energy sources are determined, the client must be able to show invoices for all energy consumption, including fuel purchase records in cases where generators are utilized, monthly and annual records of green coffee processed, and a calculation of the annual energy consumption per kg of green coffee processed.</p> <p>The inspector should always confirm that the information in the processing/energy consumption records is supported by actual receipts for electricity or fuel procured by the operation.</p> <p>This indicator can only be evaluated as Comply if CG-EC1.1 and 1.3 are Comply.</p>
CP-EC1.6	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Milling operation demonstrates innovation in energy sourcing through either the on-site production of renewable energy or purchase of offsets, or both (e.g., solar, wind, water, geothermal, biomass) beyond any locally available conventional source.	<p>If the entity produces renewable energy on site, inspectors should see the installation. If the entity buys renewable energy or offsets, it should present documented proof. Offset purchases compensate any activity of the farm with a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Offsets: Carbon credits purchased by an entity to offset greenhouse gas emissions generated on-site. One offset represents the reduction, elimination or sequestration of one metric ton of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂-e). Examples of offsets include: renewable energy, energy efficiency, carbon sequestration, etc.</p> <p>Drying coffee beans in the sun is not an innovation in energy sourcing.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
<p style="text-align: center;">CP-MT1.2</p>	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE</u>: Mill has a system and is tracking C.A.F.E. Practices coffee from initial purchase or intake through final sale or output.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of intake procedure; • Comparison of information recorded at the intake with the information given at the sampled farms and if it aligns; • Description of methods for keeping C.A.F.E. Practices coffee physically separate from non-C.A.F.E. Practices coffee (e.g., bag labels; storage areas; separate processing runs, etc.); • System of documentation used for ensuring C.A.F.E. Practices coffee is separate from non-C.A.F.E. Practices coffee (e.g., receipts; invoices; weigh-bridge tickets, etc.); and, • Deficiencies in the system of documents or physical segregation that would lead to mixing of C.A.F.E. Practices and non-C.A.F.E. Practices coffee; • For supply chains in which a collector or other intermediary is used to aggregate coffee from producers prior to delivering to the mill, information about their traceability practices should be included in the evidence. For smallholder networks, this step in the supply chain should be evaluated within the scope of PS-MT1.1. <p>In the case of a vertically integrated farm and mill, CP-MT1.1 and 1.2 should be treated as applicable and therefore must be evaluated as Comply or Not Comply. In the cases of a mill that forms part of a vertically integrated estate and that only receives and processes C.A.F.E. Practices coffee from the associated farm, the inspector should evaluate the relevant CP-MT indicator as Comply.</p> <p>There should be documented evidence of the required type of tracking system, and the entity representative should be able to verbally explain the tracking process system. A mass balance system for tracking the coffee that equates total C.A.F.E. Practices received to total C.A.F.E. Practices coffee delivered, while allowing for mixing of coffee from C.A.F.E. Practices verified sources with other sources is NOT acceptable.</p> <p>If the inspector notices in document review that a mill receives coffee from farms or mills not included in the application, and that the mill does not track the C.A.F.E. Practices and non-C.A.F.E. Practices coffee separately (e.g., through lot numbers or physical segregation), then either: a supply chain discrepancy procedure should be followed to report the farm or mill that is potentially missing from the application, OR the entity should be given an evaluation of Not Comply.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
CP-RM1.1	The quantity of energy (e.g., electricity and diesel) used on-site for coffee processing operations is recorded, documenting both the annual total energy used, AND quantity of energy used per Kg of green coffee processed.	If the mill is unable to provide energy recordsIf the mill is unable to provide energy records showing annual total energy used and quantity of energy according to Kg of green coffee processed, then CP-RM1.1 would be evaluated as Not Comply, and CP-RM1.2 would be evaluated as Not Comply.
CP-RM1.2	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Records indicate the total amount of energy used per Kg of green coffee shows a decrease over time.	If CP-RM1.1 is evaluated as Not Comply, then CP-RM1.2 should be evaluated as Not Comply.
CP-RM1.4	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Milling operation demonstrates innovation in energy sourcing through either the on-site production of renewable energy or purchase of offsets, or both (e.g., solar, wind, water, geothermal, biomass) beyond any locally available conventional source.	The focus of CP-RM1.4 is to encourage the production of renewable energy and/or or purchase of carbon offsets. While the act of drying coffee in the sun may be considered “energy efficient,” it would not be considered relevant to indicator CP-RM1.4 since there is no energy produced or purchased. Wet mills are evaluated for energy efficient drying through indicator CP-EC1.2. If the entity produces renewable energy on site, inspectors should see the installation. Offsets: Carbon credits purchased by an entity to offset greenhouse gas emissions generated on-site. One offset represents the reduction, elimination or sequestration of one metric ton of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO ₂ -e). Examples of offsets include: renewable energy, energy efficiency, carbon sequestration, etc. Offset purchase must be supported through documentation, but documentation is not required for onsite production

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
CP-MT1.1	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE</u>: Entity has a system and is tracking C.A.F.E. Practices coffee from initial purchase through point of export.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of intake procedure • Description of methods for keeping C.A.F.E. Practices coffee physically separate from non-C.A.F.E. Practices coffee (e.g., bag labels; storage areas; separate processing runs, etc.); • System of documentation used for ensuring C.A.F.E. Practices coffee is separate from non-C.A.F.E. Practices coffee (e.g., receipts; invoices; weigh-bridge tickets, etc.); • For supply chains in which a collector or other intermediary is used to aggregate coffee from producers prior to delivering to the mill, information about their traceability practices should be included in the evidence. For smallholder networks, this step in the supply chain should be evaluated within the scope of PS-MT1.1. • Deficiencies in the system of documents or physical segregation that would lead to mixing of C.A.F.E. Practices and non-C.A.F.E. Practices coffee. <p>The tracking system requires that C.A.F.E. Practices coffee is kept distinct from non-C.A.F.E. Practices coffee. Coffee sold as C.A.F.E. Practices should be traceable as coffee that was produced and processed by entities that are included in the verified supply chain. A mass balance system for tracking the coffee, that equates total C.A.F.E. Practices received to total C.A.F.E. Practices coffee delivered, while allowing for mixing of coffee from C.A.F.E. Practices verified sources with other sources is not acceptable.</p> <p>To assess the tracking indicators, there should be documented evidence of this type of the tracking system, and the entity representative should be able to verbally explain the tracking process system. If an inspector sees receiving documents that show coffee coming from different wet mills or farms into the mill being inspected, but does not see that the mill tracks the lots from C.A.F.E. Practices verified and unverified sources uniquely (e.g., through lot numbers or physical segregation), then either a supply chain discrepancy procedure should be followed to report that either a farm or wet mill is potentially missing from the application OR the entity should be given a Not Comply evaluation.</p>

7.0 Producer Support Organization

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
PS-MT1.1	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> All supply chain entities have and implement a system to track the movement of C.A.F.E. Practices coffee from initial purchase through point of export.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of methods for keeping C.A.F.E. Practices coffee physically separate from non-C.A.F.E. Practices coffee (e.g., bag labels; storage areas; separate processing runs, etc.); • System of documentation used for ensuring C.A.F.E. Practices coffee is separate from non-C.A.F.E. Practices coffee (e.g., receipts; invoices; weigh-bridge tickets, etc.); • Information about ALL entities in the C.A.F.E. Practices supply chain, including farms and mills, as well as any other entity that handles coffee (e.g., collectors or farmer delegates that may collect coffee from farms and deliver it to wet mills); and, • Deficiencies in the system of documents or physical segregation that would lead to mixing of C.A.F.E. Practices and non-C.A.F.E. Practices coffee.
PS-MT1.2	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Organization has an annually updated list of producers participating in the C.A.F.E. Practices program.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date when the producer list was most recently updated; and, • Specific discrepancies between the list of producers in the approved C.A.F.E. Practices application and the list encountered at the PSO. In most cases, a supply chain discrepancy notification is also necessary. <p>The C.A.F.E. Practices application list may not always match the cooperative membership list. Differences between the full cooperative list and list of C.A.F.E. Practices members does not mean automatic Not Comply – but the application must contain all C.A.F.E. Practices members of the cooperative. The cooperative should have a specific C.A.F.E. Practices producer list and understand who is participating. If it is different than the general cooperative list, the cooperative should be tracking this coffee separately through collection and milling.</p> <p>The list of producers participating in the program should be updated before the start of the verification and, at a minimum, annually afterwards. If the list of producers is not accurate at the time of the verification and it was confirmed that it was not updated before the application was submitted to Starbucks (referencing the date of the First Response Letter if needed), then this indicator should be evaluated as Not Comply. In addition, a supply chain discrepancy notification should be sent by the verifier according to the protocol in the Verifier and Inspector Operations Manual.</p>
PS-MT1.3	<p><u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Each farm in the supply chain receives a receipt for coffee purchased.</p>	<p>Minimum evidence required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the receipt system that is used; • Information from farms that were visited during the verification and whether receipts were observed; and, • Explanation of system for coffee purchases, if no receipts are issued.

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
PS-MT1.4	Participating farmers are given a written agreement or identification card when they commit to implementing C.A.F.E. Practices guidelines.	In order to evaluate PS-MT1.4, inspectors must conduct document review at both the PSO office and with farmers during field inspections. This indicator requires evidence in the form of documentation from both the PSO and farms (e.g., written agreements with farmers, ID cards). Ideally, a contract and/or agreement will be made between the PSO and farmers on an individual basis (e.g., one contract per farmer). In this case, the inspector should assign an evaluation of Comply. A single contract between the PSO and a group of farmers is only acceptable if each farmer has signed the agreement. Group contracts between a PSO and one person that represents several farmers, however, are not sufficient for a Comply evaluation for this indicator.
PS-MT1.5	Producer Support Organization keeps C.A.F.E. Practices farm verification reports from previous verifications documenting status of compliance of each farm accompanied by a farm map and description.	Compliance with PS-MT1.5 should be evaluated during the PSO inspection. This indicator refers to “C.A.F.E. Practices inspection reports” thus it should be evaluated as Not Applicable in the first year of participation in the program. This indicator is always to be treated as applicable for any re-verification. Verification reports should be maintained by the PSO for the last 2 verifications.
PS-MT1.6	Producer Support Organization actively shares and explains C.A.F.E. Practices verification results with at least 30% of participating farmers, including necessary improvements.	Meeting records or any other form of documentation that confirms that the results of the C.A.F.E. Practices verifications were shared are necessary for a Comply evaluation. Inspectors should confirm whether results were shared with producers during producer interviews.
PS-HP1.1	Producer Support Organization has documented materials for training members in its network on legal hiring practices, including but not limited to: legal minimum wage, age verification, access to education, and related laws.	Trainings should be confirmed through producer interviews and review of training materials and associated documentation.
PS-HP1.2	Producer Support Organization has documented materials for training members in its network on: forced, bonded, indentured or involuntary convict labor or trafficked labor.	
PS-SR2.3	Producer Support Organization has developed and is implementing its soil and/or foliar analysis plan every two years.	This indicator can only be evaluated as Comply if PS-SR2.1 and/or PS-SR2.2 are evaluated as Comply, and the PSO’s soil management plan is updated every other year based on new analysis results.

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
PS-CB1.3	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Producer Support Organization has developed a shade tree nursery and makes seedlings available to farmers.	The goal of this indicator is to encourage the PSO to develop its own source of shade tree seedlings for its producers.
PS-CB2.1	Producer Support Organization has a written list of wildlife species native to the region and identified which of those species are classified as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered according to the IUCN red list (http://www.redlist.org) or local government resource and shares it with the producers in the network.	Local government guidance is an acceptable source as an alternative to the IUCN red list website. The intent of this indicator when referring to the sharing of information with producers in the network, is to increase producer awareness of value of wildlife diversity. The indicator should be evaluated through review of training documentation at PSO and confirmed through producer interviews.
PS-CB2.2	Producer Support Organization provides training to at least 30% of the farmers in the network on the value of wildlife diversity (animals and birds) and discourages hunting or trapping.	The intent of this indicator is to increase producer awareness of value of wildlife diversity and provide better understanding of PS-CB2.1 and CG-CB2.1. The indicator should be evaluated through review of training documentation at PSO and confirmed through producer interviews.
PS-CB3.1	Producer Support Organization has facilitated an assessment of and discussion with the farmer groups about areas of high conservation and ecological value (e.g., areas with significant intact forest, primary forest canopy cover, rare flora and fauna communities, important habitat elements, critical watershed values, importance to local communities' traditional cultural identity).	The intent of this indicator is to assign the PSO the role of assessing areas of high conservation and ecological value in the region of supported farmers and increase producer awareness of areas of high conservation surrounding their farms. Examples of documentation include: assessment report with findings and meeting minutes from farmer group discussions. Findings should be confirmed through producer interviews.
PS-EM1.1	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Producer Support Organization does not buy, distribute or apply pesticides prohibited under the World Health Organization Type 1A or 1B lists, or that are banned according to national, regional, or local laws.	Minimum evidence required for Non-Comply evaluation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active ingredient of illegal or prohibited pesticides used or distributed; • Purpose for use of illegal or prohibited pesticides; • Duration of time that illegal or WHO-listed pesticide has been in use or distributed; and, • Legal reference (if applicable) or specification of whether pesticide is listed as Type 1A or 1B.

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
PS-EM1.2	Producer Support Organization keeps records of all purchases, distribution or sales of pesticides, including: dates, product name, product formulation, active ingredients, quantity, purchase and sales prices.	Product formulation refers to its form: liquid, powder, gas. Records should include the producers who receive these products and inspectors should confirm this during their interviews with them.
PS-EM1.4	Producer Support Organization trains and educates at least 30% of the farmers in the network on correct procedures, storage conditions, and appropriate application of agrochemicals.	Inspectors should evaluate the indicator through review of training documentation at the PSO and confirm trainings through producer interviews. The indicator should be evaluated as Not Applicable if no agrochemicals are used or applied in the producer network.
PS-EM1.5	Producer Support Organization trains at least 30% of the farmers in the network on correct use of Personal Protective Equipment, and facilitates access to, or purchase of, PPE.	Inspectors should evaluate the indicator through review of training documentation at the PSO and confirm trainings through producer interviews. "Facilitates access" can include providing resources on where to purchase and/or provision of PPE to farmers either at a cost or subsidized.
PS-EM1.6	If coffee pest (e.g., coffee berry borer) infestation exists, Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of biological control agents or traps for more than 10% of affected producers in network.	These indicators may be evaluated as Not Applicable if the PSO and producers deem the infestation below the economic threshold where it must be targeted. This evaluation must be confirmed during producer interviews, and it is enough for a few producers to have a significant level of infestation to make these indicators applicable. There needs to be documented proof that the PSO actually provided the biological control to the farmers, or that the farmers actually use the discount provided. If the PSO provides the discount but no one uses it, these indicators cannot be evaluated as Comply.
PS-EM1.7	If coffee pest (e.g., coffee berry borer) infestation exists, Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of biological control agents or traps for more than 25% of affected producers in network.	
PS-EM1.8	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> If coffee pest (e.g., coffee berry borer) infestation exists, the Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of biological control agents or traps for more than 50% of affected producers in network.	The documentation should support the calculation of percentage of producers receiving biological control agents or traps.

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
PS-EM2.2	Producer Support Organization implements a farm monitoring program to track farm activities and improvements in C.A.F.E. Practices for more than 5% of the producers in its network.	This monitoring program needs to track all subject areas related to the program: Social Responsibility, Environmental Leadership, and Economic Accountability.
PS-EM2.3	Producer Support Organization implements a farm monitoring program to track farm activities and improvements in C.A.F.E. Practices for more than 15% of the producers in its network.	
PS-EM2.4	EXTRA POINT: Producer Support Organization implements a farm monitoring program to track farm activities and improvements in C.A.F.E. Practices for more than 25% of the producers in its network.	
PS-EM2.5	Producer Support Organization holds at least one annual planning meeting(s) to develop a written annual work plan which details which C.A.F.E. Practices activities are to be done in the coming year.	For new supply chains: the PSO should have had a meeting and developed a plan related to C.A.F.E. Practices to prepare for the verification, in order for this indicator to be evaluated as Comply.
PS-EM2.6	Producer Support Organization has created a complete set of materials used for training network members on: health and safety including use of personal protective equipment (PPE); shade management; integrated pest control and disease management including correct pesticide container disposal; pruning, weeding and general agricultural practices; coffee processing and drying.	If the PSO did not create these materials themselves but has compiled a complete set of materials from an external source, the indicator can be evaluated as Comply.

Indicator Code	Indicator	Guidance
PS-CC1.1	<p>Producer Support Organization keeps written records of climate change risks and impacts on coffee production (e.g., change in temperature, rainfall).</p>	<p>List of potential risks and impacts of climate change on farm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local or farm-level temperature and rainfall data records to monitor change over time; • General Climate Change Impacts in coffee growing regions; • Temperature increase and higher evaporation; • Less rainfall; • Increased flowering; • New pest behavior; • Higher risk of plant diseases; and, • Overall decline in suitable coffee-growing area at lower elevations. <p>The PSO should be able to demonstrate that they are tracking changes in climatic conditions (e.g., temperature, rainfall, length of rainy season, etc.) and recording how such changes have been or may affect their production in the future.</p>
PS-CC1.2	<p>Producer Support Organization has developed and is implementing a training program to reduce impact of climate change.</p>	<p>Inspectors should review the training program for concrete, feasible, and measurable strategies. Examples of methods to reduce impacts of climate change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shade enhancement; • Expand shade tree canopy; • Increased shade or wind breaks; • Water resource management; • Installation of ditch or drip irrigation; • Increased mulching; • Adaptation; • Drought-tolerant coffee varieties; • Pest and disease management; and • Increased monitoring and pest management strategies.
PS-CC1.3	<p><u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Producer Support Organization is participating in a formal project to calculate and reduce farm greenhouse gas emissions over time.</p>	<p>The project must be “formal” – for example, organized through a university, government, or non-governmental organization (NGO).</p> <p>Participation in the project should be confirmed through document review and interviews with farm owner or manager.</p>

8.0 Appendix

Abbreviations used:

ML = Medium/Large farm

S = Small Farms

P = Processors

W = Warehouse

PSO = Producer Support Organization

ZTNC = Zero Tolerance Non-Conformity

Extra Point = Extra Point

N/A = Not Applicable Option

Doc Req = Documentation Required

Add. Notes = Additional Notes

✓ * = See Additional Notes section for more information

Indicators that do not have an N/A option are always applicable. See also Appendix C of the Operations Manual, V5.5

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
Economic Accountability													
EA-IS1: Demonstration of Financial Transparency	EA-IS1.3	Generic and Smallholder	Entity keeps receipts or invoices for the coffee (cherry, parchment, green) it buys or sells.	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓	
	EA-IS1.4	Generic and Smallholder	Presented documents indicate: date, names of buyer and seller, unit of measure (volume or weight), price per unit, quantity, type of coffee (cherry, parchment or green).	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓	
Social Responsibility													
SR-HP1: Wages and Benefits	SR-HP1.1	Generic and Smallholder	All permanent workers are paid the nationally or regionally established minimum wage. If minimum wages for permanent workers have not been established, all permanent workers are paid the local industry standard wage. If workers are paid by production, wages meet the nationally or regionally established minimum wage, or, where minimum wage has not been established, the local industry standard wage.	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	SR-HP1.2	Generic and Smallholder	All temporary and seasonal workers are paid the nationally or regionally established minimum wage. If minimum wages for temporary/seasonal workers have not been established, all temporary/seasonal workers are paid the local industry standard wage. If workers are paid by production, wages meet the nationally or regionally established minimum wage, or, where minimum wage has not been established, the local industry standard wage.	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	SR-HP1.3	Generic and Smallholder	Wages are paid regularly to all workers in cash, cash equivalent (check, direct deposit), or through in-kind payments (e.g., food), if legally permissible.	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	SR-HP1.4	Generic	Management maintains complete written earning records for at least the past year, which itemize all: wages, overtime worked, and deductions.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓*	For warehouses and mills, hours AND days worked must also be included in the records.
	SR-HP1.5	Generic	Workers have access to their earnings records, which itemize all wages, overtime and deductions	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-HP1.6	Generic	Workers are given copies of earnings records, which itemize all wages, overtime and deductions.	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓		
	SR-HP1.7	Generic and Smallholder	Employer pays for any national, legally required benefits (social security, vacation, disability) for permanent workers.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	SR-HP1.8	Generic and Smallholder	Employer pays for any national, legally required benefits (social security, vacation, disability) for temporary and seasonal workers.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	SR-HP1.9	Generic and Smallholder	Overtime pay meets national requirements. If workers are paid by production, overtime wages meet the local/regional/national requirements. If overtime pay has not been established by law, overtime is calculated at 150% of regular pay. If workers are paid by production, wages meet the above requirements.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
	SR-HP1.10	Generic and Smallholder	All permanent workers are paid MORE than the nationally or regionally established minimum wage. If minimum wages for permanent workers have not been established, all permanent workers are paid MORE than the local industry standard wage. If workers are paid by production, wages are higher than the nationally or regionally established minimum wage, or, where minimum wage has not been established, the local industry standard wage.	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	SR-HP1.11	Generic and Smallholder	All temporary and seasonal workers are paid MORE than the nationally or regionally established minimum wage. If minimum wages for temporary/seasonal workers have not been established, all temporary/seasonal workers are paid MORE than the local industry standard wage. If workers are paid by production, wages are higher than the nationally or regionally established minimum wage, or, where minimum wage has not been established, the local industry standard wage.	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	SR-HP1.12	Generic	Where in-kind payments (e.g., food) are legally permissible, in-kind payments are agreed to by the employee and the employer, and itemized in writing by product, quantity, average price, and frequency of distribution.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-HP1.13	Generic	Time spent by workers in any required trainings and meetings is considered working time and workers are compensated at their normal rate	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-HP1.14	Generic	Financial disciplinary penalties are not assessed against workers.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-HP1.15	Generic	The use of continuous short-term employment contracts or the practice of terminating and then rehiring workers is not permitted as a means to avoid legal obligations related to wages and benefits.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-HP1.16	Generic	Workers are not required to pay a recruitment fee as a condition for employment.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-HP1.17	Generic and Smallholder	Labor intermediaries are only used where legally permissible. Legal status of the intermediary can be demonstrated at the time of inspection. All necessary documentation from the labor intermediary is made available at the time of the inspection to support evaluation of relevant Social Responsibility indicators	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
SR-HP2: Freedom of Association/ Collective Bargaining	SR-HP2.1	Generic	Workers have either direct communication or a designated representative to communicate with management or employer.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-HP2.2	Generic	Workers are able to talk about workplace grievances with management or employer with no fear of reprisal	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-HP2.3	Generic	Management policies recognize the workers' rights to organize and/or collectively bargain as allowed by national laws and international obligations	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-HP2.4	Generic	A workers' association or committee has been formed and governed by the employees, independent of management influence except where prohibited by law.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-HP2.5	Generic	There are regular meetings between management and employees or worker's representative to improve working conditions.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-HP2.6	Generic	If a workers' association or committee exists, a workers' association fund has been established to which management and workers contribute matching funds.	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
	SR-HP2.7	Generic	If a workers' association fund has been established, workers have access to association fund to finance projects that improve living conditions for workers and their families.	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
	SR-HP2.8	Generic	If allowed by law, and agricultural worker organizations are established in the coffee sector, a collective bargaining agreement exists between employees and employer.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
SR-HP3: Hours of Work	SR-HP3.1	Generic and Smallholder	All workers do not work more regular hours (before overtime) per day or week than allowed by local law. If regular hours are not established, regular hours are considered as 8 hours per day, 48 hours per week.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	SR-HP3.2	Generic and Smallholder	All permanent workers must have, as a minimum, the equivalent of one continuous 24 hour period off in each 7 day period, or longer if required by law, whichever is greater.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	SR-HP3.3	Generic and Smallholder	All workers must not work more total hours (including overtime) in one day or week than allowed by local laws. If total hours have not been established by law, workers do not work more than 60 hours per week, except where a written agreement exists between workers and management.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	SR-HP3.4	Generic	If overtime work is required as part of the job, such requirements are clear at the time of hiring and recorded in writing and signed by the employee.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-HP3.5	Generic and Smallholder	Hours worked on potentially hazardous activities (pesticide application, very heavy labor, etc.) are limited according to the law. If hours have not been established by law, the activities are limited to six hours per day.	✓	✓	✓	✓						
	SR-HP3.6	Generic	Employer has a paid sick leave program for all permanent workers.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-HP3.7	Generic	Employer has an annual leave (vacation) program as required by law. If laws have not been established, annual leave for permanent workers is a minimum of ten working days per year (prorated in cases of less than one year of employment).	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-HP3.8	Generic	If workers do not take annual leave (vacation), employer can either allow vacation time to accrue or can pay wages for the equivalent amount of time accrued under the regular pay scale, where permissible by law.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
SR-HP4: Child Labor/Non-Discrimination/ Forced Labor	SR-HP4.1	Generic and Smallholder	Employer does not directly or indirectly employ any persons who are under the age of 14 or the legal working age (ILO Conventions 10 and 138).	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				
	SR-HP4.2	Generic and Smallholder	Employment of authorized minors of age 14 or older follows all legal requirements, including, but not limited to, work hours, wages, education, working conditions, and does not conflict with or limit their access to education (ILO Convention 10).	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	SR-HP4.3	Generic	Employer enforces a policy of prohibiting discrimination on the basis of gender, race, ethnicity, age or religion (ILO Convention 111).	✓		✓	✓		✓			✓*	Written policy required for large/medium farms, mills, and warehouses with more than 5 employees
	SR-HP4.4	Generic and Smallholder	Employer enforces a policy that prohibits the use of forced, bonded, indentured, convict or trafficked labor (ILO Conventions 29, 97, 105 and 143).	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓*	Written policy required for large/medium farms, mills, and warehouses with more than 5 employees

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
	SR-HP4.5	Generic	The workplace is free from physical, sexual, and verbal harassment and abuse.	✓		✓	✓		✓				
	SR-HP4.6	Generic and Smallholder	Workers do not surrender their identity papers or other original personal documents or pay deposits as a condition of employment.	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		
	SR-HP4.7	Generic	All workers are employed, promoted, and compensated equally based upon their ability to perform their job, and not on the basis of gender, ethnicity, religious or cultural beliefs.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
SR-WC1: Access to Housing, Potable Water and Sanitary Facilities	SR-WC1.1	Generic and Smallholder	Permanent and temporary/seasonal workers living onsite have habitable housing.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC1.2	Generic and Smallholder	Employer provides workers with convenient access to safe drinking water	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC1.3	Generic	Worker housing has buffer zones, of 10 meters minimum width, from productive area and agrochemical storage facilities to prevent injury or agrochemical exposure to workers and their families.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC1.4	Generic and Smallholder	Workers have convenient access to sanitary facilities that do not contaminate the local environment.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC1.5	Generic	Garbage from housing and facilities provided by employer is removed either to a municipal waste dump or to a waste site located at least 25 meters from any worker housing.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
SR-WC2: Access to Education	SR-WC2.1	Generic and Smallholder	Children of legal school age who live onsite or accompany family members who are working onsite attend school.	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		
	SR-WC2.2	Generic	If reasonable access to public education does not exist, primary school aged children of workers who live on-site have access to primary education, facilities and materials equal to national or regional requirements.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC2.3	Generic	If reasonable access to public education does not exist, secondary school aged children of workers who live on-site have access to secondary education, facilities and materials equal to national or regional requirements.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC2.4	Generic	Employer supports local schools with either in-kind donations or financial support	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
	SR-WC2.5	Generic	Employer supports training or workshops for permanent/full-time workers on additional skills or trades (i.e. financial literacy, second language).	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
SR-WC3: Access to Medical Care	SR-WC3.1	Generic	Employer has a medical care plan which includes transportation or a trained medical person (technical expert) is available in case of medical emergency	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-WC3.2	Generic	Employer provides sufficient, readily accessible, well equipped and not expired onsite first aid kits	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC3.3	Generic	If there is convenient and accessible medical care, employer supports these facilities with either in-kind donations or financial support.	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
	SR-WC3.4	Generic	Employer contributes to the cost of general health services for all permanent workers.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-WC3.5	Generic	Employer contributes to the cost of general health services for all temporary/seasonal workers	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
	SR-WC3.6	Generic	Employer pays for all medical costs associated with documented work-related injuries and illnesses if not covered by other programs or services.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
SR-WC4: Worker Safety and Training	SR-WC4.1	Generic and Smallholder	Employer provides appropriate Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) to all applicable workers at no cost. • For farms: respirators with filters, goggles, rubber boots, water-proof gloves, impermeable clothing • For dry mills: goggles, ear plugs, masks	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC4.2	Generic and Smallholder	Anyone handling or applying agrochemicals and operating machinery uses the appropriate protective equipment. • When applying pesticides, workers use respirators with filters, goggles, rubber boots, water-proof gloves, and impermeable clothing (SR-WC4.1). • When applying chemical fertilizers, workers use rubber boots, and if appropriate, gloves and protective goggles.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC4.3	Generic	Health and safety training occurs for all workers at least once a year, free of charge, and during regular working hours. Training is documented including instructors, agendas and attendance.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-WC4.4	Generic	Training covers, at a minimum: use of protective equipment, safe handling of hazardous materials, operation of equipment and personal safety and hygiene.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-WC4.5	Generic	For all enclosed work areas, there is a documented fire and emergency evacuation plan.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-WC4.6	Generic	Management maintains written injury reports. The written injury reports include the type of injury, name of worker, time and date, and location of the accident.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-WC4.7	Generic	Management reviews accident and injury records at least annually and updates safety procedures and training materials to prevent accident and injury re-occurrence.	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
	SR-WC4.8	Generic	Anyone who handles, mixes, or applies agrochemicals has convenient access to eye baths, soap, sinks for hand washing, showers, and clothes washing facilities.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC4.9	Generic and Smallholder	Authorized minors (minors older than 14) and pregnant women are prohibited from handling or applying agrochemicals, operating heavy machinery and/or heavy lifting.	✓	✓	✓	✓						
	SR-WC4.10	Generic and Smallholder	Entrance is prohibited to areas where pesticides were applied 48 hours prior without protective equipment.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC4.11	Generic	For all enclosed work areas, there is a sufficient number of emergency exits that are clearly marked, unobstructed at all times, unlocked when workers are present or have latches that do not require special operation.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC4.12	Generic	Employees are provided with a safe working environment.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
	SR-WC4.13	Generic	All equipment used by workers is properly maintained and safe to use.	✓		✓	✓				✓		
SR-MS1: Management Systems	SR-MS1.1	Generic and Smallholder	Entity provides transparency into their operations, policies, processes, and relevant records to Starbucks or its designated third party. Payroll records and time cards provided by management are true and accurate.	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				
	SR-MS1.2	Generic and Smallholder	Money and/or gifts of any type are not offered to Starbucks or its designated third party	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				
	SR-MS1.3	Generic and Smallholder	Entity demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement and engages in the improvement process.						✓		✓		

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
Environmental Leadership: Coffee Growing													
CG-WR1: Water Body Protection	CG-WR1.1	Generic and Smallholder	Buffer zones exist next to more than 50% of permanent water bodies; buffers are at least 5 meters in width (measured horizontally from the high water mark to the base of any coffee tree), exclude all cultivation and are composed of vegetation.	✓	✓						✓		
	CG-WR1.2	Generic and Smallholder	Buffer zones exist next to all permanent water bodies; buffers are at least 5 meters in width (measured horizontally from the high water mark to the base of any coffee tree), exclude all cultivation and are composed of vegetation.	✓	✓						✓		
	CG-WR1.3	Generic and Smallholder	Buffer zones exist next to more than 50% of seasonal and intermittent (temporary) water bodies; buffers are at least 2 meters in width (measured horizontally from the high water mark to the base of any coffee tree), exclude all cultivation and are composed of vegetation.	✓	✓						✓		
	CG-WR1.4	Generic and Smallholder	Buffer zones exist next to all seasonal and intermittent (temporary) water bodies; buffers are at least 2 meters in width (measured horizontally from the high water mark to the base of any coffee tree), exclude all cultivation and are composed of vegetation.	✓	✓						✓		
	CG-WR1.5	Generic and Smallholder	Farm has a plan to restore native vegetation within the buffer zones	✓	✓						✓	✓*	Documentation not required for small farms
	CG-WR1.6	Generic and Smallholder	More than 50% of permanent water body buffer zones are composed of native woody vegetation.	✓	✓						✓		
	CG-WR1.7	Generic and Smallholder	All permanent water body buffer zones are composed of native woody vegetation	✓	✓						✓		
	CG-WR1.8	Generic	All water crossings are protected by the use of bridges, culverts or sufficient means to prevent degradation	✓						✓	✓		
	CG-WR1.9	Generic and Smallholder	No agrochemicals are applied within 5 meters of any permanent water body.	✓	✓								
	CG-WR1.10	Generic	Nematicides are NOT applied within 20 meters of any permanent water body.	✓									
	CG-WR1.11	Generic and Smallholder	Farm waste or garbage sites are located at least 100 meters from any water body	✓	✓								
CG-WR2: Water Resources and Irrigation	CG-WR2.1	Generic	If mechanical (pumps, etc.) irrigation is used, quantity of water used is tracked and recorded in writing: liters per Kg of green coffee AND liters per hectare	✓							✓	✓	
	CG-WR2.2	Generic	If mechanical irrigation is used, the farm management demonstrates an understanding of local water conditions or stress factors.	✓						✓	✓		
	CG-WR2.3	Generic	Farms that use mechanical irrigation monitor and try to minimize total water usage	✓						✓	✓		
CG-SR1: Controlling Surface Erosion	CG-SR1.1	Generic and Smallholder	Farm managers demonstrate knowledge of farm areas at risk to erosion and are able to communicate and/or identify on a map areas at high risk of erosion (considering such factors as slope, soil type, and concavity).	✓	✓								
	CG-SR1.2	Generic	Farm has a written soil management plan that includes measures to minimize surface erosion	✓								✓	
	CG-SR1.3	Generic and Smallholder	At least 50% of productive area with slopes of less than 20% is covered by shade trees and/or cover crops/vegetation.	✓	✓						✓		

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes					
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes	
	CG-SR1.4	Generic and Smallholder	All productive area with slopes of less than 20% is covered by shade trees and/or cover crops/vegetation	✓	✓						✓			
	CG-SR1.5	Generic and Smallholder	In addition to the soil erosion prevention measures included in CG-SR1.3-1.4, contour lines and/or bench terraces are established on at least 50% of productive area with slopes between 20% and 30%.	✓	✓						✓			
	CG-SR1.6	Generic and Smallholder	In addition to the soil erosion prevention measures included in CG-SR1.3-1.4, contour lines and/or bench terraces are established on all productive area with slopes between 20% and 30%.	✓	✓						✓			
	CG-SR1.7	Generic and Smallholder	In addition to the soil erosion prevention measures included in CG-SR1.3-1.6, physical barriers (e.g., pruned branches, rocks) and/or living barriers (e.g., grasses, shrubs) are established on at least 50% of productive area with slopes over 30%.	✓	✓						✓			
	CG-SR1.8	Generic and Smallholder	In addition to the soil erosion prevention measures included in CG-SR1.3-1.6, physical barriers (e.g., pruned branches, rocks) and/or living barriers (e.g., grasses, shrubs) are established on all productive area with slopes over 30%.	✓	✓						✓			
	CG-SR1.9	Generic and Smallholder	Herbicides are not used to control ground vegetation or cover crops and are only used in spot applications for aggressive weeds	✓	✓							✓		
	CG-SR1.10	Generic	At least 50% of roads or frequently used trails or footpaths are protected from erosion through proper drainage ditches and/or other control measures (including cover vegetation, etc.).	✓								✓		
	CG-SR1.11	Generic and Smallholder	All roads or frequently used trails or footpaths are protected from erosion by proper drainage ditches and/or other control measures (including cover vegetation, etc.).	✓	✓							✓		
	CG-SR1.12	Generic and Smallholder	Areas in which the risk of landslides is very high (consider factors such as slope, soil, and including slopes greater than 60%) are not cultivated and are restored with native vegetation where possible.	✓	✓					✓	✓			
	CG-SR2: Maintaining Soil Productivity	CG-SR2.1	Generic and Smallholder	At least 25% of the productive area is covered by a layer of organic matter (dead and decaying biomass - mulch, grass, leaves, branches, etc.) and/or nitrogen-fixing cover crops.	✓	✓								
CG-SR2.2		Generic and Smallholder	At least 50% of the productive area is covered by a layer of organic matter (dead and decaying biomass - mulch, grass, leaves, branches, etc.) and/or nitrogen-fixing cover crops.	✓	✓									
CG-SR2.3		Generic and Smallholder	All of the productive area is covered by a layer of organic matter (dead and decaying biomass - mulch, grass, leaves, branches, etc.) and/or nitrogen-fixing cover crops.	✓	✓									
CG-SR2.4		Generic and Smallholder	Pruned branches, twigs, leaves and other live barrier materials are mulched and/or left as a soil amendment.	✓	✓									
CG-SR2.5		Generic and Smallholder	At least 25% of the productive area is planted with nitrogen-fixing, leguminous trees.	✓	✓									
CG-SR2.6		Generic and Smallholder	At least 50% of the productive area is planted with nitrogen-fixing, leguminous trees.	✓	✓									
CG-SR2.7		Generic and Smallholder	All of the productive area is planted with nitrogen-fixing, leguminous trees.	✓	✓									
CG-SR2.8		Generic	Soil analysis is conducted every two years to identify nutrient deficiencies (macro and micro nutrients) and organic matter content.	✓								✓		
CG-SR2.9		Generic	Foliar analysis is conducted every two years to identify nutrient deficiencies (macro and micro nutrients).	✓								✓		

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
	CG-SR2.10	Generic	The formula of applied nutrients and non-synthetic soil amendments is customized in response to results of soil and foliar analyses.	✓									
CG-CB1: Maintaining a Coffee Shade Canopy	CG-CB1.1	Generic and Smallholder	Native trees are removed only when they constitute a human hazard or when they significantly compete with coffee plants	✓	✓								
	CG-CB1.2	Generic	The farm has a shade management plan including: identifying areas with gaps in shade, plots where shade is appropriate or not, plans for replanting invasive exotic/non-native trees with native species, identified resources for appropriate shade tree lists, identified resources from which to source shade trees and a timeline for implementation.	✓								✓	
	CG-CB1.3	Generic	The farm is implementing the shade management plan according to the plan's timeline.	✓								✓	
	CG-CB1.4	Generic and Smallholder	At least 10% of the farm (including productive AND non-productive area) has canopy cover.	✓	✓								
	CG-CB1.5	Generic and Smallholder	Canopy cover in the productive area has a diversity of tree species	✓	✓								
	CG-CB1.6	Generic and Smallholder	Invasive species are not used for canopy cover in the productive area.	✓	✓								
	CG-CB1.7	Generic and Smallholder	Where conditions permit, locally native epiphytes, lianas and woody vines are retained in the canopy cover in the productive area.	✓	✓							✓	
	CG-CB1.8	Generic and Smallholder	Canopy cover in the productive area is kept at biologically significant levels (i.e., the level of canopy cover changes the farm's micro-climate, produces a noticeable leaf layer on the ground and creates an obvious habitat for a range of plant and animal species, etc.).	✓	✓					✓			
	CG-CB1.9	Generic and Smallholder	At least 40% of the productive area of the farm has canopy cover.	✓	✓					✓			
	CG-CB1.10	Generic and Smallholder	At least 75% of the canopy cover in the productive area is comprised of locally native species and/or the canopy consists of at least 10 species that are locally native or can be shown to contribute to the conservation of native biodiversity.	✓	✓					✓			
	CG-CB1.11	Generic and Smallholder	Shade canopy in the productive area consists of at least 2 identifiable canopy layers.	✓	✓					✓			
	CG-CB1.12	Generic and Smallholder	Cavity trees and standing and/or fallen dead trees are left in the field to naturally decay.	✓	✓								
CG-CB2: Protecting Wildlife	CG-CB2.1	Generic and Smallholder	Hunting threatened or rare wildlife species and unauthorized collection of flora and fauna are not allowed on the property.	✓	✓								
	CG-CB2.2	Generic	There are specific implemented measures (e.g., 'no hunting' or 'no trespassing' signs, gates, fences, guards, etc.) to prevent unauthorized hunting and collection of flora and fauna.	✓									
	CG-CB2.3	Generic	Farm management has created a list of wildlife species native to the region and identified which of those species are classified as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered according to the IUCN red list (http://www.redlist.org) or local government source.	✓								✓	
	CG-CB2.4	Generic	A written wildlife management plan is developed and implemented on the farm (e.g., management and workers are trained, action steps are outlined, timeline to completion, etc.).	✓						✓		✓	
	CG-CB3.1	Generic and Smallholder	No conversion of natural forest to agricultural production since 2004.	✓	✓				✓				

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
CG-CB3: Conservation Areas	CG-CB3.2	Generic	Farm has made an assessment of areas of high conservation value (areas with significant intact forest, primary forest canopy cover, rare flora and fauna communities, important habitat elements, critical watershed values, importance to local communities' traditional cultural identity).	✓								✓	
	CG-CB3.3	Generic	Farm has had an assessment completed by ecologists and/or biologists for areas of high conservation value.	✓						✓		✓	
	CG-CB3.4	Generic	Areas of high conservation value are clearly defined, protected, and managed to maintain their high conservation values.	✓							✓		
	CG-CB3.5	Generic	If areas of high conservation value do not exist on the farm, managers have implemented a plan to restore natural habitat or conditions on a portion of the farm (ecological restoration).	✓						✓	✓	✓	
	CG-CB3.6	Generic	If areas of high conservation value exist on the farm, they are protected from future development through the declaration of private reserves, conservation emphasis areas or legal conservation easements.	✓						✓	✓		
	CG-CB3.7	Generic	At least 5% of the total farm area is set aside as a conservation emphasis area or as required by local law.	✓									
	CG-CB3.8	Generic	More than 10% of the total farm area is set aside as a conservation emphasis area or as required by local law.	✓						✓			
	CG-CB3.9	Generic	If multiple areas of high conservation value exist on the farm, biological corridors are established to connect these conservation value areas.	✓						✓	✓		
	CG-CB3.10	Generic	Multiple plant species that contribute to biodiversity have been planted where space allows within the farm (e.g., borders, roads, trails, paths, etc.).	✓									
	CG-CB3.11	Generic	A nursery has been established or identified as a source of native tree and plant species for ecological restoration activities.	✓						✓			
	CG-EM1: Ecological Pest and Disease Control	CG-EM1.1	Generic and Smallholder	Farm does not use pesticides that are listed by the World Health Organization as Type 1A or 1B, or that are banned according to national, regional, or local laws.	✓	✓				✓			
CG-EM1.2		Generic	Farm keeps purchase records of pesticides, specifying date, product, product formulation, quantity, supplier, and price of purchase for each pesticide.	✓							✓	✓	
CG-EM1.3		Generic and Smallholder	Agrochemicals are stored in a locked place with controlled access and separate from food products and living and social areas	✓	✓						✓		
CG-EM1.4		Generic and Smallholder	Agrochemical storage site has adequate ventilation.	✓	✓						✓		
CG-EM1.5		Generic	Agrochemicals that are stored have original manufacturer's labels and are clearly organized and separated according to toxicity and use	✓							✓		
CG-EM1.6		Generic	Agrochemical storage site has safeguards to control spills (e.g., physical barriers to prevent external contamination).	✓							✓		
CG-EM1.7		Generic	There are contingency plans for handling pesticide spills and overexposure.	✓							✓	✓	
CG-EM1.8		Generic	Agrochemicals are mixed and spraying equipment loaded in ventilated areas. If products are mixed in the field, because of distance from storage, precautions are taken and plans are in place to handle accidents, spills or contamination	✓							✓	✓	

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
	CG-EM1.9	Generic	Farm has an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan for monitoring for pests and diseases and symptoms of nematode infestation.	✓								✓	
	CG-EM1.10	Generic	There is a written Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan that is properly implemented in the field and includes regular monitoring for pests and diseases and symptoms of nematode infestation.	✓							✓	✓	
	CG-EM1.11	Generic and Smallholder	Farm takes physical action to control sources of infestation.	✓	✓						✓		
	CG-EM1.12	Generic and Smallholder	Pesticides (not including herbicides) are applied only on a spot-application basis, depending on the type and severity of infestation.	✓	✓						✓		
	CG-EM1.13	Generic and Smallholder	Pesticides (not including herbicides) are only applied as a last resort (after cultural and physical controls have failed).	✓	✓						✓		
	CG-EM1.14	Generic	Farm maintains records of pesticide application specifying the date, product, product formulation, quantity, and location or area of the farm for each pesticide application.	✓							✓	✓	
	CG-EM1.15	Generic	Farm maintains written records of total toxic load calculation for productive area on the farm.	✓							✓	✓	
	CG-EM1.16	Generic	Total toxic load is decreased over time by reducing pesticide use or selecting less toxic alternatives.	✓						✓	✓		
	CG-EM1.17	Generic	Spraying equipment is maintained in good working order and cleaned in the agrochemical storage or mixing areas after use.	✓							✓		
	CG-EM1.18	Generic and Smallholder	Empty chemical containers are rinsed and punctured, or as required by local regulations, and appropriately disposed of to prevent further use or injury.	✓	✓						✓		
CG-EM2: Farm Management and Monitoring	CG-EM2.1	Generic	Farm managers have developed and implemented a written C.A.F.E. Practices work plan AND improvement activities are tracked and documented.	✓								✓	
	CG-EM2.2	Generic	Farm managers hold at least one annual meeting with all permanent employees to discuss C.A.F.E. Practices improvement plans and activities.	✓								✓	
CG-EM3: Long Term Productivity	CG-EM3.1	Generic and Smallholder	The farm implements a coffee pruning program to promote new tissue generation (intended to contribute to increased productivity and coffee quality).	✓	✓								
	CG-EM3.2	Generic	On farms older than 25 years, the farm annually renovates or replants at least 5% of the total coffee planted area with coffee varieties that maintain or improve the coffee quality profile.	✓						✓	✓		
	CG-EM3.3	Generic	Farm is developing or working with a research institute to establish alternatives (e.g., new varieties, graft seedlings, etc.) to reduce nematode infestations and the incidence of soil fungus as well as reduce the use of pesticides.	✓						✓			
CG-CC1: Climate Change	CG-CC1.1	Generic	The farm keeps written records of climate change risks and impacts on coffee production (e.g., change in temperature, rainfall).	✓						✓		✓	
	CG-CC1.2	Generic	The farm has developed and is implementing a written plan to minimize impact of climate change on coffee production.	✓						✓		✓	
	CG-CC1.3	Generic	The farm is participating in a formal project to calculate and reduce farm greenhouse gas emissions over time.	✓						✓			
Environmental Leadership: Coffee Processing													

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
CP-WC1: Minimizing Water Consumption	CP-WC1.1	Generic and Smallholder	The total volume of water used for pulping, washing, and sorting for coffee processing operations is tracked and recorded, documenting the annual total water used and volume per Kg of coffee cherry processed.		✓	✓					✓*	✓	Indicator should be evaluated "Not Applicable" for mills that process 3500 Kgs or less in green coffee.
	CP-WC1.2	Generic	If water is used for separating coffee cherry before pulping, then a siphon of less than 3 cubic meters is used.			✓					✓		
	CP-WC1.3	Generic	Processing facility recycles water used for both transporting coffee cherry and the pulping process.			✓					✓		
	CP-WC1.4	Generic and Smallholder	The amount of water used (liters of water per Kg green coffee) shows a decrease over time (until the ratio in CP-WC1.5 is achieved).		✓	✓					✓*	✓	Indicator should be evaluated "Not Applicable" for mills that process 3500 Kgs or less in green coffee.
	CP-WC1.5	Generic and Smallholder	The ratio between water (used for pulping and washing) and coffee cherry is no more than 1:1 ratio (volume of water to volume of cherry).		✓	✓					✓*		
	CP-WC1.6	Generic	The mill demonstrates awareness of whether or not water stress exists in the watershed in which they are operating and takes steps to maximize efficiency.			✓							
CP-WC2: Reducing Wastewater Impacts	CP-WC2.1	Generic and Smallholder	Wastewater from pulping and washing is managed in a way that does not contaminate the environment, including water bodies.		✓	✓							
	CP-WC2.2	Generic	If wastewater from pulping and washing is released into a leach field or lagoon or sprayed onto fields, the distance between the edge of the fields or lagoon is a minimum of 40 meters from all permanent water bodies (e.g., perennial streams, springs, lakes, wetlands).			✓					✓		
	CP-WC2.3	Generic and Smallholder	If wastewater is discharged into a water body or a drainage system, the following wastewater tests are conducted at all exit points (and meet established environmental regulatory norms) and are recorded on a monthly basis during operations. In the absence of environmental regulatory norms, the following parameters must be met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biological oxygen demand (1000 mg/L or ppm) • Chemical oxygen demand (1500 mg/L or ppm) • pH (5.0-9.0) 		✓	✓					✓*	✓	Indicator should be evaluated "Not Applicable" for mills that process 3500 Kgs or less in green coffee.
	CP-WM1.1	Generic and Smallholder	Processing wastes are managed in such a way as to not contaminate the local environment.		✓	✓							

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
CP-WM1: Waste Management	CP-WM1.2	Generic and Smallholder	Skin, pulp, mucilage, and unacceptable cherries are composted or processed by worms.		✓	✓							
	CP-WM1.3	Generic and Smallholder	Organic processing byproducts are used as soil amendments by the farm or, in the case of an independent processor, distributed to local farmers.		✓	✓							
	CP-WM1.4	Generic	Processing waste solids are recovered from sedimentation ponds, composted and used by coffee farms.			✓					✓		
CP-EC1: Energy Conservation	CP-EC1.1	Generic	The quantity of energy used on-site for coffee processing operations is recorded documenting both the annual total energy used AND, quantity of energy used per Kg of green coffee processed.			✓					✓	✓	
	CP-EC1.2	Generic and Smallholder	At least 25% of parchment coffee is patio (sun) dried or dried in other energy efficient ways (e.g., greenhouses, raised beds, radiant solar drying systems).		✓	✓							
	CP-EC1.3	Generic	The quantity of wood or other fuel (except parchment skin) used for drying coffee is recorded, documenting both the annual AND per Kg of green coffee processed totals.			✓					✓	✓	
	CP-EC1.4	Generic	Wood used for drying coffee comes from pruning of coffee, shade trees, responsibly managed forests or other minimal impact harvests (e.g., salvage).			✓					✓		
	CP-EC1.5	Generic	The amount of total energy used per Kg of green coffee shows a decrease over time.			✓				✓	✓	✓	
	CP-EC1.6	Generic	Milling operation demonstrates innovation in energy sourcing through either the on-site production of renewable energy or purchase of offsets, or both (e.g., solar, wind, water, geothermal, biomass) beyond any locally available conventional source.			✓				✓	✓	✓*	Receipts of purchase are required for carbon offsets. Documentation NOT required for onsite production.
CP-RM1: Dry Mill Resource Management	CP-RM1.1	Generic	The quantity of energy (e.g., electricity and diesel) used on-site for coffee processing operations is recorded, documenting both the annual total energy used, AND quantity of energy used per Kg of green coffee processed.			✓						✓	
	CP-RM1.2	Generic	Records indicate the total amount of energy used per Kg of green coffee shows a decrease over time.			✓				✓	✓	✓	
	CP-RM1.3	Generic	Parchment hulls from dry milling are recovered for use in mechanical coffee dryers, generating energy or other beneficial uses.			✓							
	CP-RM1.4	Generic	Milling operation demonstrates innovation in energy sourcing through either the on-site production of renewable energy or purchase of offsets, or both (e.g., solar, wind, water, geothermal, biomass) beyond any locally available conventional source.			✓				✓		✓*	Receipts of purchase are required for carbon offsets. Documentation NOT required for onsite production.
CP-MT1: Management	CP-MT1.1	Generic	Entity has a system and is tracking C.A.F.E. Practices coffee from initial purchase through point of export.			✓	✓		✓			✓	

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
and Tracking Systems	CP-MT1.2	Generic	Mill has a system and is tracking C.A.F.E. Practices coffee from initial purchase or intake through final sale or output.			✓			✓			✓	
Producer Support													
PS-MT1: Management and Tracking Systems	PS-MT1.1	Smallholder	All supply chain entities have and implement a system to track the movement of C.A.F.E. Practices coffee from initial purchase through point of export.					✓	✓			✓	
	PS-MT1.2	Smallholder	Organization has an annually updated list of producers participating in the C.A.F.E. Practices program.					✓	✓			✓	
	PS-MT1.3	Smallholder	Each farm in the supply chain receives a receipt for coffee purchased.					✓	✓			✓	
	PS-MT1.4	Smallholder	Participating farmers are given a written agreement or identification card when they commit to implementing C.A.F.E. Practices guidelines.					✓				✓	
	PS-MT1.5	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization keeps C.A.F.E. Practices farm verification reports from previous verifications documenting status of compliance of each farm accompanied by a farm map and description.					✓			✓	✓	
	PS-MT1.6	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization actively shares and explains C.A.F.E. Practices verification results with at least 30% of participating farmers, including necessary improvements.					✓			✓	✓	
PS-HP1: Hiring Practices	PS-HP1.1	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has documented materials for training members in its network on legal hiring practices, including but not limited to: legal minimum wage, age verification, access to education, and related laws.					✓				✓	
	PS-HP1.2	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has documented materials for training members in its network on: forced, bonded, indentured or involuntary convict labor or trafficked labor.					✓				✓	
PS-SR1: Controlling Surface Erosion	PS-SR1.1	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has a detailed soil management plan that includes erosion reduction strategies.					✓				✓	
	PS-SR1.2	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has identified resources for erosion controls.					✓					
	PS-SR1.3	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of erosion controls (grasses, shrubs, etc.) to more than 10% of producers in the network.					✓					
	PS-SR1.4	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of erosion controls (grasses, shrubs, etc.) to more than 25% of producers in the network.					✓					
	PS-SR1.5	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of erosion controls (grasses, shrubs, etc.) to more than 50% of producers in the network.					✓		✓			
PS-SR2: Maintaining Soil Productivity	PS-SR2.1	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization's soil management plan includes the analysis of soil samples from representative farms in the network to identify nutrient deficiencies.					✓				✓	
	PS-SR2.2	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization's soil management plan includes a foliar analysis from representative farms in the network to identify nutrient deficiencies.					✓				✓	
	PS-SR2.3	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has developed and is implementing its soil and/or foliar analysis plan every two years.					✓			✓		
	PS-CB1.1	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has a shade management plan including: identified areas with gaps in the shade canopy and replacement of invasive exotic/non-native trees with native species.					✓				✓	

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
PS-CB1: Maintaining Shade Canopy	PS-CB1.2	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization facilitates access to or distributes shade tree seeds or seedlings.					✓					
	PS-CB1.3	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has developed a shade tree nursery and makes seedlings available to farmers.					✓		✓			
PS-CB2: Protecting Wildlife	PS-CB2.1	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has a written list of wildlife species native to the region and identified which of those species are classified as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered according to the IUCN red list (http://www.redlist.org , or local government resource) and shares it with the producers in the network.					✓				✓	
	PS-CB2.2	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization provides training to at least 30% of the farmers in the network on the value of wildlife diversity (animals and birds) and discourages hunting or trapping.					✓				✓	
PS-CB3: Conservation Areas	PS-CB3.1	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has facilitated an assessment of and discussion with the farmer groups about areas of high conservation and ecological value (e.g., areas with significant intact forest, primary forest canopy cover, rare flora and fauna communities, important habitat elements, critical watershed values, importance to local communities' traditional cultural identity).					✓				✓	
PS-EM1: Ecological Pest and Disease Control	PS-EM1.1	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization does not buy, distribute or apply pesticides prohibited under the World Health Organization Type 1A or 1B lists, or that are banned according to national, regional, or local laws.					✓	✓				
	PS-EM1.2	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization keeps records of all purchases, distribution or sales of pesticides, including: dates, product name, product formulation, active ingredients, quantity, purchase and sales prices					✓			✓	✓	
	PS-EM1.3	Smallholder	If Producer Organization buys, distributes or applies agrochemicals, all agrochemicals are stored in a locked place with controlled access away from food products.					✓			✓		
	PS-EM1.4	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization trains and educates at least 30% of the farmers in the network on correct procedures, storage conditions, and appropriate application of agrochemicals.					✓			✓	✓	
	PS-EM1.5	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization trains at least 30% of the farmers in the network on correct use of Personal Protective Equipment, and facilitates access to, or purchase of, PPE.					✓			✓	✓	
	PS-EM1.6	Smallholder	If coffee pest (e.g., coffee berry borer) infestation exists, Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of biological control agents or traps for more than 10% of affected producers in network.					✓			✓		
	PS-EM1.7	Smallholder	If coffee pest (e.g., coffee berry borer) infestation exists, Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of biological control agents or traps for more than 25% of affected producers in network.					✓			✓		
	PS-EM1.8	Smallholder	If coffee pest (e.g., coffee berry borer) infestation exists, the Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of biological control agents or traps for more than 50% of affected producers in network					✓		✓	✓		
PS-EM2: Management and Monitoring	PS-EM2.1	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has developed a written farm management plan with supporting documents, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the farm production systems and coffee productivity (coffee production per hectare, total annual coffee production) of the farmer network • Producer Support Organization's farmer training plan • Ecological pest and disease management measures 					✓				✓	

Indicator				Applicable Entities					Attributes				
Criterion	Code	Scorecard	Description	ML	S	P	W	PSO	ZT NC	Extra Point	N/A	Doc Req	Add. Notes
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil quality improvement strategies • Producer Support Organization farmer resource sharing 										
	PS-EM2.2	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization implements a farm monitoring program to track farm activities and improvements in C.A.F.E. Practices for more than 5% of the producers in its network.					✓				✓	
	PS-EM2.3	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization implements a farm monitoring program to track farm activities and improvements in C.A.F.E. Practices for more than 15% of the producers in its network.					✓				✓	
	PS-EM2.4	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization implements a farm monitoring program to track farm activities and improvements in C.A.F.E. Practices for more than 25% of the producers in its network.					✓		✓		✓	
	PS-EM2.5	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization holds at least one annual planning meeting(s) to develop a written annual work plan which details which C.A.F.E. Practices activities are to be done in the coming year.					✓				✓	
	PS-EM2.6	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has created a complete set of materials used for training network members on: health and safety including use of personal protective equipment (PPE); shade management; integrated pest control and disease management including correct pesticide container disposal; pruning, weeding and general agricultural practices; coffee processing and drying					✓				✓	
	PS-EM2.7	Smallholder	Producer support organization has trained more than 10% of producers in the network on topics covered in PS-EM2.6.					✓					
	PS-EM2.8	Smallholder	Producer support organization has trained more than 25% of producers in the network on topics covered in PS-EM2.6.					✓					
	PS-EM2.9	Smallholder	Producer support organization has trained more than 50% of producers in the network on topics covered in PS-EM2.6.					✓					
PS-CC1: Climate Change	PS-CC1.1	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization keeps written records of climate change risks and impacts on coffee production (e.g., change in temperature, rainfall).					✓				✓	
	PS-CC1.2	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization has developed and is implementing a training program to reduce impact of climate change.					✓				✓	
	PS-CC1.3	Smallholder	Producer Support Organization is participating in a formal project to calculate and reduce farm greenhouse gas emissions over time.					✓		✓		✓	