



Swiss Sustainable  
Coffee Platform

# SSCP Technical Notes





## Table of contents

Introduction	1
Ambition 1	2
Ambition 2	5
Ambition 3	6
Ambition 4	8
Ambition 5	9
Ambition 6	11
Glossary: Definitions & Methodologies	13

### Introduction

This document is a complementary, explanatory document designed to illustrate and clarify the ambitions set out in the [SSCP Roadmap](#). It provides detailed context, definitions, and descriptions for each ambition, including relevant references, explanations of applied methods (where applicable), as well as a glossary of definitions.

As a living document, the Technical Notes will be continuously updated and refined to reflect lessons learned in practice and feedback from SSCP members and other stakeholders. Its primary purpose is to complement the Roadmap by making its ambitions more tangible and actionable, without altering the agreed Roadmap content itself.



## Ambition 1: Coffee farming households reduce, or even close, their living income gap. All coffee farm workers earn at least a minimum wage, and their wages increase towards a living wage.

Achieving a decent standard of living for coffee farmers and workers requires clear definitions:

- **Living wage** is the monthly wage an individual must earn to contribute to a decent standard of living.
- **Living income** is the total annual net income of a household, including both farm and off-farm earnings needed to achieve a decent standard of living.
- **The living income gap**, which SSCP aims to reduce, is the difference between the actual income earned by farming households and the living income benchmark (LIB) (i.e. the income required to reach a decent standard of living).

The ambition is to reduce, or even close, the living income gap for all farming households. The distinction between closing and reducing the living income and living wage gap tackles LiCOP's Aligned Inclusive Living Income Narrative and Indicators, understanding that "targets that promise that 100% of farmers will reach a living income incentivize a move away from the most vulnerable, as they are not likely to reach the living income benchmark due to factors beyond the program's control".

As for farm workers, permanent workers of big farms are in a better position to achieve higher wages than temporary workers of smaller farms. This ambition aims for both permanent and temporary workers to earn at least the minimum wage. Yet, to go beyond achieving this minimum wage, SSCP members seek to reduce the living wage gap for all workers, to ultimately achieve a living wage.

To achieve this ambition of reducing the living income gap, the proposed contributions are twofold: (A) implementing concrete activities acting upon various levers, and (B) to understand the effects of interventions on moving the needle.

### Interventions

Reducing the living income and wage gap requires a coordinated, multi-stakeholder approach, involving both public and private sector actors. SSCP promotes a smart mix of interventions, expecting supply chain members to engage collaboratively and strategically along several impact levers:

- **Securing financial incentives for sustainable production:** Promoting fair,

transparent pricing mechanisms such as offering premiums or bonuses that contribute to improved incomes, fostering responsible procurement practices.

- **Establishing measures such as price mechanisms or incentives directly linked to Living Income Benchmarks**, particularly in case of low coffee prices (e.g. Living Income Reference Prices).
- **Improving yields and/or reducing production costs:** by providing technical assistance, training, and input access to boost on-farm productivity within sustainable boundaries, and supporting more efficient farming practices, incl. reducing input costs
- **Proposing measures to support the reduction of household costs**, e.g. by offering access to affordable services for health, education, etc.
- **Diversifying income:** Encouraging and enabling off-farm income activities to stabilise household incomes and reduce dependency on coffee alone.



- **Assessing living income and wage** related risk in key origin countries, mitigating it and monitoring its progress.
- **Participating in relevant joint living income and living wage studies:** More information can be found below in “Living Income and Living Wage Measurement”.
- **Acting upon enabling conditions:** Including infrastructure development, market access, climate adaptation strategies, and capacity-building efforts.

To assess the contribution of Micro and SMEs, SSCP will consider the ways in which these supply chain members explore to make sourcing more sustainable, taking into account the levers mentioned above.

To assess the large companies’ and key players’ contribution, SSCP will consider the number of levers that supply chain members’ interventions act upon: either three levers (Intermediate Level) or four levers including price mechanisms or incentives linked directly to LIB (Advanced Level). Interventions can be both projects that are implemented directly by companies as well as interventions established through SSCP’s established funding schemes.

SSCP also relies on partnerships with NGOs, research institutions, and the public sector to leverage networks, expertise, and resources.

## Living Income and Living Wage Measurement

To evaluate the impact of living income efforts—including understanding household income, its contributing factors, and their consequences—a range of methodologies is often used. While this methodological diversity reflects strong sectoral interest, it also results in fragmented efforts and inefficiencies.

Conducting different living-income and living wage relevant studies in the same countries, without coordination, using divergent methodologies and without data sharing, leads to siloed data collection, missed opportunities for collaboration, and higher overall costs for the sector.

These sector-wide inefficiencies are worsened by the free-rider problem, where organisations may rely on publicly available data without contributing to their generation. This discourages collaboration and leads to duplication of efforts, often with limited comparability of the studies’ results.

Thus, SSCP seeks to unite forces and proposes a joint, data-driven approach in selected countries by:

- Using harmonised and compatible methodologies
- Ensuring findings are broadly accessible and actionable
- Using resources efficiently through pooled

funding of SSCP members and other actors in the sector

- Wherever feasible, combining studies to cover actual household income studies with living income benchmarks, and potentially Living Income Reference Price or others, in a single effort

Given the data similarity across various study types, combining efforts is both efficient and cost-effective. In this spirit, SSCP engages with key stakeholders to conduct these studies jointly, including its members, partners and other actors in the sector. SSCP’s research sector will generate evidence and foster collaboration by conducting studies and engaging colleagues from the Global South.

SSCP expects micro and SMEs to actively participate in capacity building efforts in topics relevant to their sourcing countries, and to closely engage with the SSCP Coordination office to receive support to enhance living income and wages in their own supply chains.

SSCP expects large companies and key players to actively participate in joint studies that are relevant to their supply chains, whether these are coordinated by SSCP or by other organisations. A study is considered relevant to a company only if it sources from the country in which the study is conducted.

Participation in studies entails for supply chain members to contribute funding, ensuring that a sample of farmers in their supply chain can be interviewed, and be open to sharing results. The studies also seek to involve risk assess-



ments in key origin countries aimed at defining strategies to mitigate risks and progress towards Living Income and Living Wage. Where the study/studies are coordinated by SSCP, the data gathered will only be published at an aggregated level. Each participating supply chain member will receive a dossier with figures corresponding to their supply chains. NGOs will provide on-site support and access to their interventions.

### Methods and References

Living income and living wage derive from the cost of a decent standard of living, as determined by recognised methodologies. Several such methodologies exist, and SSCP will support existing efforts of using harmonised methodologies to understand and improve living income and wage across the sector. Examples of such collaborative efforts are done by the ICO Public-Private Taskforce on Living and Prosperous income and the GCP-affiliated Country Platforms.

For studies related to living income and wage, harmonised methodologies, validated by multiple actors, allow for the comparison of results:

- The Household Income methodology helps identify the actual incomes of farming households and,
- Living Income Benchmarks (LIBs) developed by the Anker Research Institute determine how much households need to earn to achieve a living income.

By comparing the LIB (“should be”) with actual income data (“is”), we can identify the income and living wage gap.

Using the dataset and including additional datapoints thus gathered can make it possible to calculate a [Living Income Reference Price \(LIRP\)](#) based on Fairtrade’s methodology.

The [Living Income Community of Practice](#) further gathers methodological knowledge to draw upon. The [Global Living Wage Coalition](#), based on the Anker Research Institute’s studies, also presents data relevant to assess wages in selected countries. For implementing any of these studies, we will seek guidance, support and collaboration with partner entities such as Sustainable Food Labs and the ICO Living and Prosperous Income Taskforce.

As of February 2026, the following studies are planned (see table below). Moving forward, SSCP proposes to implement one integrated study per selected country/region and period, encompassing the data collection needed to determine the actual household incomes, the Living Income Benchmark (LIB), and potentially, the Living Income Reference Price (LIRP).

Year	Study	Lead
2026	CHIS Perú (Baseline)	SSCP
2028	CHIS	SSCP

This plan is non-exhaustive and subject to change. It will be adjusted in accordance with the strategic interests of the platform and its members. Therefore, further efforts can be integrated into the following preliminary planning.

Further countries that could be envisioned are Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Indonesia, Vietnam, India, Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, or any other country that is deemed relevant by SSCP and its members.



## Ambition 2: Human rights risks like child labour and forced labour are addressed through effective due diligence processes.

Human rights challenges in the coffee sector are deeply rooted in structural vulnerabilities such as poverty, informal employment, limited access to education, and weak law enforcement. These systemic drivers require coordinated, long-term solutions that go beyond individual company action.

While a requirement only at an advanced stage, alignment with national frameworks and systems is encouraged for all members to ensure efficiency and efficacy of due diligence efforts.

- Alignment with national frameworks can be achieved by implementing the following measures:
- Align indicators and tools used in private monitoring systems with those of national frameworks to increase consistency;
- Support the development and implementation of data-sharing protocols that facilitate interoperability between private and public systems;

- Collaborate on the use of unique household identifiers where applicable to avoid overlaps and gaps in monitoring data;
- Provide feedback on national monitoring indicators to improve alignment with field realities and company practices;
- Share risk assessment results with relevant public bodies to enable targeted, coordinated interventions;
- Facilitate referrals of identified cases of child or forced labour from private systems to public social protection and remediation services.

### Methods and References

SSCP encourages its members to base their HRDD efforts on internationally recognised frameworks and standards, including:

- The [UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights](#) (UNGPs), which set out the corporate responsibility to respect human rights
- The [OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct](#), which provides actionable steps for integrating HRDD into business operations.
- [International Labour Organization's General Principles](#) and operational guidelines for fair recruitment
- [U.S. Department of Labor's Comply Chain](#)

By aligning with these frameworks and engaging at the appropriate ambition level, SSCP members can meaningfully contribute to the eradication of child and forced labour in coffee supply chains – while building more resilient, inclusive, and sustainable value chains.



### **Ambition 3: Coffee production supports deforestation- and conversion-free coffee supply chains and actively supports the restoration of degraded forest ecosystems and other relevant ecosystems.**

The most commonly used definitions around forest, deforestation and degradation stem from FAO and the Accountability Framework initiative (AFi). While both definitions are well-aligned, in its deforestation definition, AFi focuses on natural forests, while FAO also includes tree plantations.

For coffee sourcing that needs to comply with the EUDR, the definitions in the legal text ([EUDR Legal Text](#)) and the FAQs apply while being based on the definitions by FAO. For the sake of completeness, the definitions by FAO and by AFi are mentioned.

For exports of coffee to non-EU countries, either the FAO or the AFi definitions can be chosen to adhere to Ambition 3. Regarding restoration of degraded forest ecosystems, the AFi definitions shall be taken into account as FAO focuses on reforestation which is a narrower concept than restoration.

**Definition of Forest by FAO** (see [FRA 2000 on definitions of forest and forest change](#)): Land with tree crown cover (or equivalent stocking level) of more than 10 percent and area of more than 0.5 hectares (ha). The trees should be able to reach a minimum height of 5 meters (m) at maturity *in situ*.

May consist either of closed forest formations where trees of various storeys and undergrowth cover a high proportion of the ground; or open forest formations with a continuous vegetation cover in which tree crown cover exceeds 10%. Young natural stands and all plantations established for forestry purposes which have yet to reach a crown density of 10% or tree height of 5m are included under forest, as are areas normally forming part of the forest area which are temporarily unstocked as a result of human intervention or natural causes, but which are expected to revert to forest.

Includes: forest nurseries and seed orchards that constitute an integral part of the forest; forest roads, cleared tracts, firebreaks and other small open areas; forest in national parks, nature reserves and other protected areas such as those of specific scientific, historical, cultural or spiritual interest; windbreaks and shelterbelts of trees with an area of more than 0.5 ha and width of more than 20m; plantations primarily used for forestry purposes, including rubberwood plantations and cork oak stands.

Excludes: Land predominantly used for agricultural practices.

**Definition of Forest by AFi** (see [Accountability Framework](#)): Land spanning more than 0.5 hectares with trees higher than 5m and a canopy cover of more than 10%, or trees able to reach these thresholds *in situ*. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or other land use. Forest includes natural forests and tree plantations.

**Definition of Deforestation by FAO** ([EUDR Legal Text](#) and [FRA 2000 on definitions of forest and forest change](#)): The conversion of forest to agricultural use, whether human-induced or not. Deforestation refers to change of land cover with depletion of tree crown cover to less than 10%.

**Definition of Deforestation by AFi** (see [Accountability Framework](#)): Loss of natural forest as a result of: (i) conversion to agriculture or other non-forest land use; (ii) conversion to a tree plantation; or (iii) severe and sustained degradation.

It has to be noted that AFi refers specifically to natural forests while the FAO definition refers to all forests which also include tree plantations.



### Definition of Forest Degradation by FAO

([FRA 2000 on definitions of forest and forest change](#)):

Takes different forms, particularly in open forest formations, deriving mainly from human activities such as over-grazing, over-exploitation (for firewood or timber), repeated fires, or due to attacks by insects, diseases, plant parasites or other natural sources such as cyclones. In most cases, degradation does not show as a decrease in the area of woody vegetation but rather as a gradual reduction of biomass, changes in species composition and soil degradation.

### Definition of Forest Degradation by AFI (see

[Accountability Framework](#)): Changes within a natural ecosystem that significantly and negatively affect its species composition, structure, and/or function and reduce the ecosystem's capacity to supply products, support biodiversity, and/or deliver ecosystem services.

### Definition of Conversion by AFI (see

[Accountability Framework](#)): Loss of a natural ecosystem as a result of its replacement with agriculture or another land use, or due to a profound and sustained change in a natural ecosystem's species composition, structure, or function.

- Deforestation is one form of conversion (conversion of natural forests).
- Conversion includes severe and sustained degradation or the introduction of management practices that result in a profound and sustained change in the ecosystem's species composition, structure, or function.

- A change to natural ecosystems that meets this definition is considered to be conversion regardless of whether or not it is legal

**Definition of Forest Restoration** (see [Accountability Framework](#)): The process of assisting the recovery of an ecosystem, and its associated conservation values, that has been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. This definition refers to restoration as a means to remedy environmental harms or reverse the loss of environmental values.

## Methods and References

**SSCP Collaborative Impact Projects** consist of building partnerships across regions but also result in sustainable landscape projects focusing on one region or jurisdiction. Sustainable landscapes rely on multistakeholder collaboration between private, public, and civil sector actors, ensuring that sustainability solutions are both scalable and locally embedded.

These efforts set, monitor and evaluate sustainability, climate, and forest conservation targets at a jurisdictional level. By fostering multi-stakeholder governance and aligning public and private sector efforts, landscape approaches ensure diverse input and ownership of sustainability initiatives and support compliance with international and national regulations. More information can be found in the SSCP Collaborative Impact Call.

**Traceability:** The requirement in the intermediate and advanced levels of "Ensuring that traceability system implementation costs do not fall on farmers" means that the companies are responsible to realise traceability by providing either mapping services to farmers or the tools for farmers/ cooperatives/extensionists to map the farms so that costs don't have to be borne by the farmers. The aforementioned services can also be provided by suppliers of coffee.



## Ambition 4: Regenerative Agriculture practices on coffee plantations are widely adopted.

There is currently a lack of a universally accepted definition of Regenerative Agriculture. However, advances regarding defining Regenerative Agriculture have been made with the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative (SAI) Platform having proposed an industry-aligned definition in 2023:

Regenerative Agriculture is an **outcome-based farming approach that protects and enhances soil health, biodiversity, climate, and water resources—while improving farmer livelihoods**. Enhanced livelihoods result from more stable and higher yields, which may also contribute to greater food security ([SAI Platform](#)).

Other coffee-related initiatives by private companies, certification bodies such as Rainforest Alliance, and the Global Coffee Platform are also defining Regenerative Agriculture as a set of practices leading to improved outcomes in relation to soil fertility, water quality, biodiversity and farmer livelihoods ([Rainforest Alliance](#), [GCP - RegenCoffee](#)).

A list of regenerative practices can be found below:

- Minimising soil disturbance
- Permanent soil cover (e.g., cover crops, mulching, or residue cover)
- Agroforestry
- Hedgerows and green buffers
- Riparian buffers
- Manure and nutrient management (including compost, organic fertilizers, and bio-char)
- Integrated Weed, Pest and Disease Management (reduction of herbicide, pesticide and fungicide use, use of biocontrol)
- Efficient irrigation
- Good Agricultural Practices (e.g., pruning, renovation, resistant varieties)

Please note that the regenerative practices applied need to be adapted to local circumstances.

### Methods and References

[SAI Platform](#) for high-level definition of regenerative agriculture and regenerative practices.

[Regenerative Agriculture Standard](#) by Rainforest Alliance, GCP – RegenCoffee Framework, and other company programmes for a set of regenerative practices adapted to coffee.



## Ambition 5: Coffee production works toward net zero emissions in alignment with global climate goals.

**Paris Agreement:** [Full legal document](#) established in 2015 and ratified in 2016, currently 195 of 198 nations have committed to it (April 2025).

**Definition of Net Zero by 2050:** limit the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels” and pursue efforts “to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.”

**Definition GHG Emissions:** Seven greenhouse gases (GHGs) are acknowledged under the UN Framework convention on Climate Change: CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, HFCs, PFCs, SF<sub>6</sub>, and NF<sub>3</sub>.

**GHG emission accounting under the Paris Agreement:** There are multiple processes under the UN Framework convention on climate change to measure progress on GHG emission reduction, including the Global Stocktake, under the Nationally Determined Contribution Tracking, and through the IPCC Assessment Report.

**Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi):** SBTi can so far be seen as the globally most recognized and comprehensive effort for companies to establish meaningful and credible carbon reduction targets.

**Definition of Scope:** To help delineate direct and indirect GHG emission sources, improve transparency, and provide utility for different types of organisations and different types of climate policies and business goals, three “Scopes” (Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3) are defined for GHG accounting and reporting purposes.

When measuring the company’s emissions, these Scopes indicate which emitting activities can be limited to the company’s own actions (Scope 1 and 2) and which activities are extended to actions in the company’s value chain (Scope 3) ([Guidance Document SBTi](#))

Please note that for the agricultural commodities sector, around 80-90% of the Scope 3 emissions stem from land use change such as deforestation.

### **Scope 3 for SMEs:**

While SBTi does not require SMEs to set Scope 3 emissions for near-term targets, SMEs must commit to measuring and reducing their Scope 3 emissions for 2050. This should help SMEs build a foundation for their emissions reduction efforts, which can then be expanded to include more comprehensive Scope 3 emissions reduction targets as their capabilities and resources grow.

### **Examples of Reporting Schemes:**

GRI (Global Reporting Initiative), SASB (Sustainability Accounting Standards Board), TCFD (Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures), and ESRS (European Sustainability Reporting Standards).

### **Methods and References**

Corporate capacity on the topic of decarbonisation and emission reduction might significantly vary in the coffee value chain, and across SSCP member companies. While some have been working on the topic of emission reduction already, with standardised approaches, including a corporate sustainability strategy, internal assessment of Scope 1,2, and 3, others might be at the beginning of their corporate decarbonisation process.

Thus, instead of proposing one formalised approach for all SSCP members, the methods and references below outline specific examples to increase capacity and incentivise the decarbonisation of the sector as a whole.



### Scope 3 Emissions Focus

Given that the majority of emissions in the coffee value chain fall under Scope 3 — particularly at the farm level and in upstream logistics, activities can include the following (not exclusive):

- Activity-based data collection where feasible (e.g., fertiliser use, processing methods, transport distances).
- Use of regionally relevant emission factors, or, where unavailable, proxy values from comparable crops (e.g., cocoa or tea), until sector-specific values are available.
- Engagement with farm-level or jurisdictional data, where practical, to refine estimates and support targeted action

Examples of Applicable Tools and Initiatives:

- Sustainable Coffee Challenge: [Guidance Document on “Coffee & Forest Mapping & Monitoring”](#)
- GHG Accounting Manual for Cocoa (Quantis, World Cocoa Foundation) – as a methodological template for coffee.
- Cool Farm Tool – a commonly used emissions calculator in agricultural contexts, adaptable for coffee.
- EX-ACT (FAO) – for broader project-level assessment of agricultural interventions.

### Further Guidance on SBTi:

MSMEs and Intermediate Best practices for climate action can be found under various resources, including SBTi Services, SBTi Case studies for emission data, and other sector-relevant publications.

Advanced Compliance with SBTi guidelines (currently under revision, see draft Corporate Net-Zero Standard V2). Dedicated SBTi Sector Guide for Forest, Land and Agriculture (FLAG).



## Ambition 6: Coffee is sourced using schemes that transparently ensure sustainable agriculture practices.

### Intermediate Level

For the intermediate level, we will rely on the **Equivalence Mechanism (EM) established by the Global Coffee Platform (GCP)**. The EM is a system designed to assess and recognise sustainability schemes in the coffee sector against a common baseline: the Coffee Sustainability Reference Code (CSRC).

It seeks to ensure that different sustainability standards or schemes—whether private, national, or voluntary—are aligned with a shared set of principles and practices for sustainable coffee production and trade. It aims to allow for greater transparency, comparability, and credibility in sustainability efforts across the sector.

The process looks as follows:

1. Voluntary Schemes Apply: Sustainability schemes (like certifications or codes of conduct) can apply to be benchmarked.
2. Benchmarking Against CSRC: GCP evaluates the scheme's requirements and assurance systems against the CSRC and GCP's Operational Criteria for Equivalence.
3. Recognition: If the scheme meets the criteria, it is recognised as equivalent and listed on GCP's List of GCP-Recognised Sustainability Schemes.

4. Ongoing Monitoring: Recognised schemes may be subject to periodic reviews or updates to maintain alignment.

Currently, approximately thirty 3rd and 2nd Party assurance schemes are accepted by GCP under the EM. For further information, please visit: For further reference: GCP Equivalence Mechanism – Global Coffee Platform

### Advanced Level

Advanced Level sourcing should be based on sustainability schemes that are compliant with ISEAL's Code of Good Practice or demonstrate equivalent assurance and impact through independent verification. ISEAL alignment is considered a leading benchmark and aspiration for the sector.

The ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Sustainability Systems is a globally recognised framework that outlines the core principles and requirements for the credible design, implementation, and improvement of sustainability systems—such as standards, certification schemes, and company-led programs.

It helps ensure these systems are transparent, inclusive, effective, and impact-oriented.

Key components are:

1. Standard-Setting
  - Ensures the development of sustainability standards is inclusive, transparent, and evidence-based.
  - Requires engagement with diverse stakeholders and public consultation processes.
2. Assurance
  - Guides how systems assess compliance, including certification, verification, and auditing.
  - Promotes credibility, consistency, and risk-based approaches.
3. Claims and Labelling
  - Establishes criteria for making truthful, verifiable sustainability claims to consumers and partners.
4. Monitoring & Evaluation
  - Requires systems to measure and report impacts, and to use data for continuous improvement.
5. Governance & Improvement
  - Encourages good governance, accountability, and adaptive management over time.



The ISEAL Code supports:

- Credibility and trust in sustainability claims.
- Alignment among systems, improving comparability and reducing duplication.
- Stronger environmental, social, and economic outcomes through responsible practices.

ISEAL regularly revises the Code to reflect emerging best practices. The current version, the ISEAL Code of Good Practice, was released in December 2023.

Currently, **ISEAL Code Compliant** are the following schemes:

Rainforest Alliance Sustainable Agriculture Standard

Fairtrade International, Small Producer Organization & Coffee Standard

Fair Trade USA Agriculture Production Standard

## Methods and References

For further reference: [GCP Equivalence Mechanism – Global Coffee Platform](#)

ISEAL's Code of Good Practice for Sustainability Systems: [ISEAL Codes of Good Practice](#)



## Glossary

### Conversion by AFi:

Loss of a natural ecosystem as a result of its replacement with agriculture or another land use, or due to a profound and sustained change in a natural ecosystem's species composition, structure, or function.

- Deforestation is one form of conversion (conversion of natural forests).
- Conversion includes severe and sustained degradation or the introduction of management practices that result in a profound and sustained change in the ecosystem's species composition, structure, or function.
- A change to natural ecosystems that meets this definition is considered to be conversion regardless of whether or not it is legal.

(see [Accountability Framework](#))

### Deforestation by AFi:

Loss of natural forest as a result of: (i) conversion to agriculture or other non-forest land use; (ii) conversion to a tree plantation; or (iii) severe and sustained degradation (see [Accountability Framework](#)).

It should be noted that AFi refers specifically to natural forests while the FAO definition refers to all forests which also include tree plantations.

### Deforestation by FAO:

The conversion of forest to agricultural use, whether human-induced or not. Deforestation refers to change of land cover with depletion of tree crown cover to less than 10% ([EUDR Legal Text](#) and [FRA 2000 on definitions of forest and forest change](#)).

### Direct supply chain:

For coffee to be categorised as sourced through a direct supply chain, there shall be a relatively stable partnership and collaboration, in which the individual coffee farmers / farming families are known (registered). Such partnership and collaboration may cover issues such as price, quality, good agricultural practices, social, human rights and environmental issues, certification requirements, etc.

This partnership and collaboration between the coffee sourcing company and the producers may be conducted through cooperatives, farmer organisations and / or other intermediaries embedded within the direct supply chain.

### Forest by AFi:

Land spanning more than 0.5 hectares with trees higher than 5m and a canopy cover of more than 10%, or trees able to reach these thresholds in situ. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or other land use. Forest includes natural forests and tree plantations ([Accountability Framework](#)).

### Forest Degradation by AFi:

Changes within a natural ecosystem that significantly and negatively affect its species composition, structure, and/or function and reduce the ecosystem's capacity to supply products, support biodiversity, and/or deliver ecosystem services ([Accountability Framework](#)).

### Forest Degradation by FAO:

Takes different forms, particularly in open forest formations, deriving mainly from human activities such as over-grazing, over-exploitation (for firewood or timber), repeated fires, or due to attacks by insects, diseases, plant parasites or other natural sources such as cyclones. In most cases, degradation does not show as a decrease in the area of woody vegetation but rather as a gradual reduction of biomass, changes in species composition and soil degradation ([FRA 2000 on definitions of forest and forest change](#)).

### Forest Restoration:

The process of assisting the recovery of an ecosystem, and its associated conservation values, that has been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. This definition refers to restoration as a means to remedy environmental harms or reverse the loss of environmental values ([Accountability Framework](#)).



### GCP Equivalence Mechanism:

The GCP Equivalence Mechanism is a framework that assesses whether sustainability schemes align with the Coffee Sustainability Reference Code, ensuring they meet minimum expectations in governance, standard-setting, assurance, data, and claims integrity.

### GHG Emissions:

Seven greenhouse gases (GHGs) are acknowledged under the UN Framework convention on Climate Change: CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, HFCs, PFCs, SF<sub>6</sub>, and NF<sub>3</sub>.

### Indirect supply chain:

For coffee to be categorised as sourced through an indirect supply chain, there is no or minimal contact, no partnership and no collaboration between the cocoa sourcing company and the coffee producer. The coffee is typically sourced through (several) intermediaries which do not disclose the individual farmers / farming families that produced the coffee.

### ISEAL Code of Good Practice:

The ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Sustainability Systems (the ISEAL Code) provides a globally recognised framework, defining practices for effective and credible sustainability systems. It integrates and replaces ISEAL's previous Codes of Good Practice on standard-setting, assurance and impacts.

### Living Income (LI):

Living income refers to the net annual income required for a household in a particular place to afford a decent standard of living for all

members of that household. Elements of a decent standard of living include: food, water, housing, education, healthcare, transport, clothing, and other essential needs including provision for unexpected events.

### Living Income Benchmarks (LIB):

Please refer to the [LICOP website](#) for an overview of living income benchmarks and studies. If there is no benchmark available for the region you are working in, please consult the [LICOP FAQ living income benchmarks](#) which provides guidance for using alternatives when there is no benchmark available.

### Living Income Gap:

The difference between the actual income earned by farming households and the living income benchmark (LIB) required to reach a dignified standard of life.

### Living Income Reference Price (LIRP):

The price a typical farmer household with a viable farm size and a sustainable productivity level needs in order to earn a living income from the sales of their crop. Fairtrade establishes generic Living Income Reference Prices for several core products, including cocoa and coffee, at country level, following a robust process of farm economic data analysis and stakeholder consultation.

### Net Zero by 2050:

Limit the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels" and pursue efforts "to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels."

### Paris Agreement:

[Full legal document](#) established in 2015 and ratified in 2016, currently 195 of 198 nations have committed to it (April 2025).

### Regenerative Agriculture:

An outcome-based farming approach that protects and enhances soil health, biodiversity, climate, and water resources—while improving farmer livelihoods. Enhanced livelihoods result from more stable and higher yields, which may also contribute to greater food security ([SAI Platform](#)).

### Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi):

SBTi can so far be seen as the globally most recognised and comprehensive effort for companies to establish meaningful and credible carbon reduction targets.

### Scope (1,2,3):

To help delineate direct and indirect GHG emission sources, improve transparency, and provide utility for different types of organisations and different types of climate policies and business goals, three "Scopes" (Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3) are defined for GHG accounting and reporting purposes.

When measuring the company's emissions, these Scopes indicate which emitting activities can be limited to the company's own actions (Scope 1 and 2) and which activities are extended to actions in the company's value chain (Scope 3) (Guidance Document SBTi)