

ISSUES CAPTURED FROM THE COFFEE BILL IN NAIVASHA ON 19/11/2020

THE COFFEE BILL 2020.

SECTION OF THE BILL	ISSUES AND COMMENTS BY COMMITTEE	AGREED ACTION	Coffee Directorate Comment
Short title	 Members wondered why we are bringing back the Board after killing it earlier for AFA and now we want to go back there again? What advised that? What is new and different in the Bill? 		This is to bring more attention to sector specific commodities
Composition of the Board — clause 4	The bill has proposed a board of 13 members which is not in tandem with the Mwongozo guidelines which proposes 9 members.	This will be revised to align it to Mwongozo.	This has been incorporated into the bill in line with the Mwongozo guideline
Kenya Coffee council – clause 22	 Members wanted to know the role of the coffee council when there is a Board and who will be superior to the other 	It was proposed having either but not both or constituting one council for more	The council is removed from the bill as advised to create one centre of power

		acres ditions and in at	
		commodities not just	
NA 1 1: CII	T C 1 1 1:	one.	
Membership of the	The Council membership was	The clause will be	Council deleted
Council -clause	observed not to be compliant with	revised with a view	
22(3)	Mwongozo.	to accommodate the	
	The constitutional requirements on	views of the	
	the gender parity is lacking.	members and align it	
	The member suggested that the Read membership reads to law	to Mwongozo.	
	Board membership needs to lay		
	more emphasis on small scale		
Establishment of	farmer who are the majority.	The clause will be	Coffee Deceared Foundation(CDF)
Establishment of	The Bill talks of establishing the CRI		Coffee Research Foundation(CRF)
the Coffee	which is already established under the	revised to transfer	established
Research	Kenya Agricultutral and Livestock	CRI from KALRO	
Institute(CRI)	Research Organization (KALRO).	rather than	
-clause 23)		establishing it.	
National and	On the functions of the Board and the	The delineation on	This was done where it was not clear
County Government	county governments, the member	the functions of the	
functions-	wanted to know what the Bill has	two levels of	
clause 31	done to avoid the conflict and	government has	
	confusion that has been there	been addressed but	
	between the two levels of	will be revised to	
	government.	make it clearer.	
Exemptions to	Members observed that exemption	To be reviewed to	This was corrected to be clear
licensing	clause be examined to avoid	avoid creating a	
clause 36(2)	malpractices	loophole for mischief.	
Apportioning of	The 1% levy to the county	The clause to be	This was revised to indicate that the
levies with 1%	governments for coffee development	revised to sharpened	funds will be used to promote coffee
going to the	is vague. This leaves room for	to make it more	production and quality standards.
County	misappropriation.	specific on what	
clause 67(2)©		aspect of coffee	
		development.	

Dispute Resolution Committee – clause 73	Creation of a Dispute Resolution Committee was cited as not being in tandem with the current trends thus not the way to go.	It was recommended that the best practice on dispute resolution is through the High Court.	This was adopted with modification in the relevant section of the bill
	•		
ANY OTHER GENERA	AL COMMENT		
SECTION OF THE BILL	ISSUES AND COMMENTS BY COMMITTEE	AGREED ACTION	CD COMMENT
	The members made the following general remarks and comments; - • Guaranteed Minimum Returns (GMR)	should be considered and provided for in the Coffee Bill	 GMR was adopted and incorporated into the bill but with observation that it may not be practical to implement given that coffee prices are globally determined by supply and demand. and Kenyan coffee prices are discovery in nature through auction conducted weekly and paid per quality. Unless the Country adopts farm gate sale of coffee, fundamentally shifting from auction system.

	Branding is good for the entire Kenyan coffee but going to regional brands is not a good idea We may need to rethink licensing and instead of two levels as is currently the case, we should have this centralised.	Adopted in the bill as GI Licences that transcend counties were left to the Board to licences while county specific remained with counties
	Members recalled their experience in Nebraska in the USA. Though the market for Kenya coffee has a great potential, the marketing and promotion is poor and thus the need for greater promotion so that farmers can produce more.	This was just a comment. No action required
Comments from the Chair.	Spell the benefits the bill will bring to the farmers e.g. in form of bonuses	The benefits will accrue sequentially
	The CRI levy should be 1% not 2% to avoid overburdening the farmer	Adopted the 2% given that production was low and the requirements for research was high

stick to a society or factory which at times has debts but instead have a level of freedom. Farmers should not be forced to stick to a society or factory which at times has debts but instead have a level of freedom. Farmers should have the autonomy to choose their own millers not forced to certain millers.	The bill provides for this
NCE- there is a need to demonstrate how it will fetch more money for the farmers?	NCE is a meeting venue of buyers. Does not determine the price of coffee. Price is discovered on the floor of auction
Bring it out in the bill that there will be no borrowing using farmer's assets as collateral The Chair wondered how the Cherry Advance Fund is helping farmers.	This was adopted in the bill but with observation that Growers need financial support for farm inputs (on loan),advances for picking and processing during the critical time of harvest. This is a short period but critical. The Marketing Agents use the

	crop as hypothecation in extending
	short term financing.

09/12/2020