



EDITION 9
TRANSPARENCY REPORT
COFFEE COLLECTIVE



Editorial

Guest Article

Stories from Origin

Data on how we buy coffee

Social & Environmental Indicators

EDITION 9

TRANSPARENCY REPORT



EDITORIAL

By Rebecca Vang
CEO of Coffee Collective

Transparency is not a one-time statement. It is a practice. Something you return to, year after year, even when the work behind it is complex, time-consuming, and sometimes uncomfortable. For us, it is also one of the most important ways we stay honest about what we do, why we do it, and who our decisions impact. This year marks the ninth annual Transparency Report from Coffee Collective. We are proud of that milestone. Not because publishing a report is the goal in itself, but because consistency matters. Choosing transparency again and again means we continue to hold ourselves accountable: to our producer partners, to our team, and to everyone who supports our coffee.

Our sourcing is built on long-term relationships, shared progress, and a belief that quality and responsibility must go hand in hand. We want the way we buy coffee to reflect our values: fairness, transparency, quality, and care for the people behind the coffee, and for the craft it takes to bring it to life.

At the same time, we recognise that the broader conversation in coffee is evolving. As highlighted in this year's accompanying article by researcher and author Karl Wienhold, higher quality and higher prices do not automatically translate into a more equitable distribution of value across the supply chain. For us, this underlines why transparency matters. Without openness around pricing and relationships, it is difficult to understand how value is actually shared, and even harder to improve it.

In this report, we share the coffees we bought, who we bought them from, and what we paid, alongside reflections on the work, the priorities, and the choices that shaped the year. We do this because we believe openness can move the industry forward, and because we want our guests and partners to know what they are part of when they choose Coffee Collective.

Thank you for reading, and for being part of the collective.



Beyond the Vibes: Is Specialty Coffee Actually More Equitable?

By Karl Wienhold *Researcher and author*

Is specialty coffee more equitable for farmers than undifferentiated “commodity” coffee? Most in the sector would probably say yes. But why – data, or just vibes? Spoiler: there is no single definitive dataset, but the evidence we do have suggests a more complicated reality. As for the vibes, let’s start there.

Hard work pays off.

A rising tide lifts all boats.

Coffee “bakes” without a decreasing rate of rise.

These refrains are so familiar that they pass as common sense. But widespread acceptance does not make them universally true, only deeply embedded. They reflect a politically non-neutral worldview of free-market meritocracy: the belief that markets deliver fair outcomes based on individual performance. Rooted in 13th-century Christian theology, this perspective treats market outcomes as inherently just, even though markets are shaped by human decisions. When left unexamined, it slips easily into how we interpret coffee markets – for example, assuming that higher-quality coffee necessarily earns farmers higher incomes, and therefore that specialty coffee is more equitable.

This worldview assumes that “value added” equals “value” (as money) captured. The two are often used interchangeably, even by economists, to explain low incomes by labelling certain activities as low productivity, where productivity is measured by price. In effect, low prices are reframed as low productivity, turning market outcomes into apparent personal failings. This circular logic appears in coffee as well: farming is labelled low-value-added, roasting and retail high-value-added, and the solution becomes teaching farmers to “add value”. This only holds if value and price are assumed to be identical – an assumption that depends on believing markets perfectly reflect contribution rather than power.

The speciality coffee contradiction

If there is no invisible Q-grader hand ensuring that prices align neatly with cup quality, but rather negotiated exchanges between buyers and sellers, then compensation can diverge from performance. This possibility is precisely why price transparency exists: it signals that actors with the power to extract rents sometimes choose not to, undermining the idea that markets always deliver just outcomes.

So, is specialty coffee more equitable towards farmers in general? Professor Peter Roberts and I have been exploring this question using data from hundreds of thousands of export transactions from the Specialty Coffee Transaction Guide. The preliminary answer is straightforward: on average, no.

If we define equity relationally – as the share of total revenue allocated to farmers – then a more equitable system would allocate them a larger portion. Comparing retail to FOB (export) prices, the global coffee market average FOB-to-retail ratio is about 23.5%. For low-end specialty and certified coffees, the ratios are 13.1% and 13.3%. At the higher end of specialty, ratios rise to roughly 17-20%, increasing with retail price, but still below the overall market average.

On average, then, specialty appears less equitable in terms of revenue distribution. Yet these averages conceal substantial variation. Within high-end specialty, where individual coffees can be tracked, FOB shares range from 10% to 41.5% of retail. In other words, some firms sell roasted coffee at ten times the cost of green coffee, while others do so at roughly 2.4 times the cost. Both exist within “specialty”.

Farmgate data tells a similar story, though it is harder to interpret due to inconsistent reporting. Around 12,000 transactions show farmgate-to-FOB ratios of 89% for low-end specialty, 87% for certified, and 77% for high-end specialty. As quality – and export price – increase, the share reaching farmers tends to decline. Meanwhile, within specialty, higher retail prices are associated with larger FOB shares, even as the farmer’s share of that amount shrinks.

“But the farmers still get more, so...”

There are caveats. Even with lower shares, absolute prices for farmers and exporters in differentiated markets are higher than in the aggregate market. This raises the familiar question: would you rather have a large slice of a small pie, or a small slice of a large one?

While mathematically sound, this framing creates a false dichotomy. It implies that improving one’s share necessarily comes at someone else’s expense, or that growing the pie benefits everyone proportionally, glossing over existing inequalities. It also assumes that farmers should be satisfied with incremental gains without questioning how value is distributed. In practice, this argument often serves to discourage scrutiny of pricing and transparency, resting on the same belief that markets already deliver what participants deserve.

“But it costs more to process, roast, and package specialty coffee.”

Specialty coffee often does involve higher costs: small-batch roasting, expensive equipment, elaborate packaging, marketing, and origin travel. These are real, but they do not answer the central question. Which of these costs are necessary to deliver the sensory qualities that command higher prices, and which are enabled by the gap between what farmers are paid and what consumers are willing to pay?

Consider roasting. A two-person team working on a 5kg machine costing €50,000 is far less efficient than a four-person team using a 60kg machine costing €250,000. If the output is not meaningfully different, should farmers, who also incur higher costs to produce quality, absorb the difference? A smaller share of retail prices going to green coffee suggests that, on average, the expansion of the pie is not sufficient to meet downstream expectations. The rising tide, it seems, lifts some boats more than others.

Who adds value?

In mainstream economics, value is defined by what the market pays. But this equivalence only holds under conditions of perfect competition, or the absence of power asymmetry, a condition rarely met in practice. Bargaining power, shaped by factors like urgency, risk, and available alternatives, allows actors to capture

value created elsewhere. This is what economists call rent extraction. In specialty coffee, the central question becomes: who makes coffee “special”, and how should the resulting price premium be distributed?

Two common answers are sensory quality and branding. Branding can certainly influence willingness to pay, but it does not produce material attributes. What it does create is control over access to consumers, enabling firms to extract rents – either from suppliers (monopsony) or consumers (monopoly). Sensory quality, on the other hand, is largely determined on or near farms. If that is what drives higher prices, then farmers would be expected to capture a significant portion of the premium.

The data suggests otherwise. Of the average retail price difference between commercial and specialty coffee, approximately 79% accrues to consumption-country actors, 10% to exporters, and just 12% to farmers. For every additional euro consumers pay for specialty coffee, producers capture about 12 cents.

Now what?

Across multiple specialty segments, most of the additional revenue generated by differentiation is not captured by the farmers responsible for it. This stands in contrast to the “reap what you sow” assumption that compensation follows contribution, and instead points to the role of power asymmetries and rent extraction.

Recognising this dynamic as neither natural nor inevitable is a prerequisite for changing it. Within the observed range, there are cases where outcomes are significantly more favourable to farmers, demonstrating that more equitable distributions are possible. If specialty coffee is to remain viable in the long term, these models need to be identified, supported, and replicated.

Unfortunately, they cannot be detected from vibes alone. We still need the data.



Stories from Origin: Peñas Blancas

By Peter Dupont
Co-founder of Coffee Collective

In Pitalito, Colombia, Jhoan Vergara runs the farm Finca Las Flores together with his brother, Diego Vergara. Jhoan has studied microbiology with another coffee farmer called Nestor Lasso. Together with the exporter Lohas Beans, they have developed some post-harvest techniques that, in our opinion, have simply taken the craft to a new level. Over the last few years, they have become very famous in barista championship circles, as several barista champions have used their beans, including in the 2024 and 2025 World Barista Championships.

In January 2026, we introduced one of Jhoan's coffees to our range and received enthusiastic feedback. Jhoan is working with complex fermentation and dehydration techniques that are a whole story in themselves. We describe the techniques as "profile fermentation" – just as we are following roast profiles, and good baristas are working with brewing profiles.

The Vergara brothers have started a project called "Peñas Blancas", which has two meanings – firstly, it is kind of a group of rocks or mountains, and secondly, it is a group of people coming together. What they do is invite the neighbouring farmers into a cooperation where their cherries are processed at Finca Las Flores, following similar fermentation profiles. The Vergara brothers share their knowledge with the other farmers in the project on everything from varieties to pruning and harvesting techniques, to how to fertilise. By joining the Peñas Blancas project, the neighbouring farmers get prices for their coffee that are, on average, 15-20% above the market price.

We very much value seeing that such excellent farmers as Jhoan and Diego not only get a lot of recognition themselves, but also use their knowledge and skills to support the local community.



Stories from Origin: El Nogal

By Sebastian Reichmann

Sustainability Manager at Coffee Collective

The outlook for coffee production, particularly high-quality coffee, is grim. Most reports dedicated to exploring its future viability, or rather non-viability, focus on the detrimental effects of climate change[1]. While the implications of catastrophic runaway climate change pose, without a doubt, the biggest threat to the future viability of coffee production, another, albeit less discussed, spectre haunts the coffee-producing world: the spectre of ageing coffee producers.

Pretty much every coffee-producing region sees producers' average age rising steadily, despite coffee-producing countries generally boasting younger populations. In LATAM, for example, 20% of the total population is between 15 and 24 years old – a percentage that has never been higher. In Africa, approximately 420 million people are registered as aged 15-35 – a number projected to double over the next two decades[2]. Nevertheless, on average, coffee producers, who constitute significant parts of these regions' populations (approximately 25 million people in Latin America[3] and 10 million in Africa[4]), are getting older. According to the International Coffee Organisation (ICO), the average age of coffee farmers across Africa hovers around 60 years[5]. In Colombia, this figure is 56 years[6], in Mexico, 54 years[7], and in Rwanda, over 60 years[8]. Globally, the average age of coffee producers is around 55 years, and fewer than 5% are under 35[9].

Given its all-encompassing severity, it is understandable that climate change takes centre stage in reports on potential future supply chain disruptions. An ageing producer group is obviously a much quieter, and indeed more sector-specific, phenomenon. To some degree, however, this phenomenon might also be less discussed, as it surely is easier for coffee buyers in the global north to depict “external” factors such as climate change as the main risk in their supply chains, rather than the entirely “self-made” fact that growing coffee is such an arduous and unprofitable activity that, when faced with a choice, people will refrain from doing so. In the end, these two phenomena are linked, of course, with climate change making the cultivation of coffee harder and riskier, and at the same time widening the gap between what consumers pay for coffee and what producers receive[10].

It's a story we hear everywhere during our origin travels – younger people show limited interest in following in their parents' footsteps, who, despite backbreaking work, were kept in poverty due to structurally low coffee prices[11]. As a consequence, we see increasing rates of urbanisation and depopulation of the countryside. In this light, the problem is obviously larger than securing a supply of high-quality coffee in the decades to come – it revolves around recognising the importance of rural communities and smallholder farming. An importance that cannot be overstated, given that smallholder farmers not only produce the majority of the world's food[12], and coffee, for that matter[13], but can also play a significant role in shaping more sustainable agricultural systems. A wide body of research supports the notion that small-scale agriculture that adopts sustainable practices can be both financially more sustainable for producers[14] and ecologically regenerative[15].

As such, it is incredibly exciting and nourishing to share with you again this year the coffee of Neyver Salas Quispe and his farm, El Nogal. Neyver is a young man of 25 who took over his grandparents' farm after finishing high school at 18. Over the last seven years, he has devoted all his time and energy to improving the quality of the coffee through better farming practices and infrastructure improvements. During our visit last year, we were exchanging ideas about Neyver's vision of speciality coffee as a viable way – not just out of poverty, but also towards a profession as a coffee farmer that fills him with pride and excitement. Having mostly exchanged with coffee farmers past their forties, it was a refreshing experience to talk with Neyver and witness the rejuvenating effect of an infusion of youthful energy into this profession. Neyver is bursting with ideas and plans, ranging from long-term visions to short-term practical experiments in coffee processing – very much inspired by information he finds online and by social media exchanges with other coffee producers. Not that such a digitally informed and youthfully enquiring approach to coffee production is inherently superior to a way of working that is rooted in decades of experience and a drive not towards revolution but evolutions of every aspect of the work. The point is that the diversity of perspectives, rooted in different phases of life, most likely constitutes not only a refreshing experience for the coffee buyer, but also a critical necessity for the industry's future, given the multiple crises it faces today. Consequently, the utmost priority should be given to abandoning philanthropic notions of “helping coffee farmers escape poverty”, and instead to stop perpetuating unjust and exploitative structures and to build businesses around fair and just compensation for the hard work of growing coffee. Only then will young people see the profession of a coffee farmer as a viable future perspective.



- [1] see for example: Bilen C, El Chami D, Mereu V, Trabucco A, Marras S, Spano D. A Systematic Review on the Impacts of Climate Change on Coffee Agrosystems. *Plants* (Basel). 2022 Dec 25;12(1):102. doi: 10.3390/plants12010102
- [2] International Coffee Organization. (n.d.). Youth in coffee. [Youth in coffee page](#)
- [3] Harvey, C. A., Pritts, A. A., Zwetsloot, M. J., Jansen, K., Pulleman, M. M., Armbrrecht, I., Avelino, J., Barrera, J. F., Bunn, C., Hoyos García, J., Isaza, C., Muñoz-Ucos, J., Pérez-Alemán, C. J., Rahn, E., Robiglio, V., Somarriba, E., & Valencia, V. (2021). Transformation of coffee-growing landscapes across Latin America: A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-021-00712-0>; United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2024, December 23). Coffee value chains: Enhancing traceability in Latin America. <https://unctad.org/news/coffee-value-chains-enhancing-traceability-latin-america>
- [4] African Centre for a Green Economy. (n.d.). Coffee as a driver of rural livelihoods: Brewing resilience in East Africa. <https://africancentre.org/coffee-as-a-driver-of-rural-livelihoods-brewing-resilience-in-east-africa/>
- [5] International Coffee Organization. (2015, August 26). Sustainability of the coffee sector in Africa (ICC-114-5 Rev. 1). <https://www.ico.org/documents/cy2014-15/icc-114-5-r1e-overview-coffee-sector-africa.pdf>
- [6] Specialty Coffee Association. (2015, August 4). Farmer profitability: Managing risk in the supply chain. <https://scanews.coffee/2015/08/04/farmer-profitability-managing-risk-in-the-supply-chain/>
- [7] United States Department of Agriculture. (2024). Coffee annual: Mexico (Report No. MX2024-0025). https://apps.fas.usda.gov/newgainapi/api/Report/DownloadReportByFileName?fileName=Coffee%20Annual_Mexico%20City_Mexico_MX2024-0025.pdf
- [8] Centre for the Promotion of Imports from Developing Countries. (n.d.). Youth inclusion project helps keep Rwandan coffee sector alive. <http://www.cbi.eu/story/youth-inclusion-project-helps-keep-rwandan-coffee-sector-alive>
- [9] Coffee Intelligence. (2024, January). Coffee's generation gap. <https://intelligence.coffee/2024/01/coffees-generation-gap/>
- [10] Karl Wienhold, Peter W. Roberts, Is the rising tide of specialty coffee lifting all boats?, *World Development*, Volume 195, 2025, 107103, ISSN 0305-750X, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2025.107103>.
- [11] Dragusanu, R., Giovannucci, D., & Nunn, N. (2022). The economics of fair trade. *Journal of Fair Trade*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.13169/jfairtrade.4.2.0002>
- [12] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2015). Youth and agriculture: Key challenges and concrete solutions. <https://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/260535/icode/>
- [13] International Coffee Organization. (n.d.). Market development toolkit. <https://ico.org/market-development-toolkit/page/index/5>
- [14] Pretty, J. (2007). Agricultural sustainability: Concepts, principles and evidence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 363, 447–465. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2007.2163>
- [15] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (n.d.). Smallholders and family farmers. https://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/nr/sustainability_pathways/docs/Factsheet_SMALLHOLDERS.pdf



Stories from Origin: El Mesón

By Klaus Thomsen
Co-founder of Collective

Coffee pickers are crucial to quality – and to even getting any coffee to begin with – yet they are often the most overlooked part of the chain. Who are they?

In most coffee-producing regions, the hilly landscape makes mechanical harvesting impossible. Ever seen those large flat fields with rows of coffee trees? That's probably at low elevation in Brazil. But elsewhere, the altitude ranges from 1,500 all the way to 2,400 masl, with steep mountainsides and rough terrain. Some farms even have a difference of 400 masl between their lowest and highest plots of land – or over twice the altitude of the highest point in Denmark (Møllehøj, 170 masl, if you were wondering). That kind of landscape can only be harvested using manual labour.

And as coffee cherries ripen at different intervals on the same branch, to achieve quality coffee you need to do what is called “selective hand picking” – only picking the ripe cherries and leaving the unripe ones for another week, returning to the trees maybe 10 times during a two-month harvest period. The sweetness you experience in the final cup is a direct result of carefully picking fully ripe cherries. It's hard work, on steep slopes, often under a scorching sun unless you get up at 5 to complete a day's work before noon, carrying bags of coffee up and down mountains.

However, pickers are also at the bottom of the hierarchy when you look at the long chain of coffee from seed to cup. They are the lowest paid and most forgotten. Often, they are migratory workers, moving from farm to farm up the mountain, as the lowest elevations harvest first and the highest last. Sometimes they travel across countries too.



Some farmers manage to pick all their coffee themselves, but others hire pickers to help during the harvest season. It's estimated that in Colombia alone there are over 1 million pickers employed in coffee. Often, pickers are employed without contracts and only receive cash payment on the day, depending on the weight of cherries they have picked. There is no safety net, no benefits, and no access to medical care or schools, or any of the things a Danish worker takes for granted. Pickers are paid at the time of harvest, but a farmer doesn't receive income until much later, when the coffee is sold and exported.

The Pickers Project by Azahar was created to address these issues. Azahar Coffee is a Colombian specialty coffee exporter dedicated to price transparency and ensuring farmers earn sustainable wages above market rates. In 2021, they founded the non-profit Manos al Grano Foundation to professionalise working conditions for pickers.

This includes real contracts between farmers and pickers, including healthcare, pensions, and legal payment through the banking system. In addition, there is ongoing training, so a quality dimension is built into the programme.

Currently (May 2026), 34 farms and 128 coffee pickers are supported across Huila and Nariño through Manos al Grano.

At Coffee Collective, we don't wish to take any credit for the important work done by Azahar and Manos al Grano, but we do want to support it and shine a spotlight on something that should become the global standard or best practice for specialty coffee.

This past year, we've bought an astoundingly sweet and juicy Colombian coffee from Luz Diva's farm, El Mesón, and below is a list of the coffee pickers at Luz Diva's farm who were employed through Manos al Grano & The Pickers Project this past year:

Zone	Municipality	Producer	Farm	Coffee Picker	Hometown	Age
Huila-sur	ACEVEDO	LUZ DIVA FIERRO	EL MESON	DUVAN CHATES MARTINEZ	PITALITO	21
Huila-sur	ACEVEDO	LUZ DIVA FIERRO	EL MESON	ROSA ELVIRA URIBE CARDOZO	CIENAGA-MAGDALENA	43
Huila-sur	ACEVEDO	LUZ DIVA FIERRO	EL MESON	JHOAN SEBASTIAN RAMOS GOMEZ	PITALITO	18
Huila-sur	ACEVEDO	LUZ DIVA FIERRO	EL MESON	HAIR RICARDO BOLAÑOS BENAVIDES	SAN BERNARDO - NARIÑO	34
Huila-sur	ACEVEDO	LUZ DIVA FIERRO	EL MESON	JOSE DIEGO CHATES MARTINEZ	PITALITO	28
Huila-sur	ACEVEDO	LUZ DIVA FIERRO	EL MESON	HENRY ALEXANDER VIDAL DELGADO	BOGOTA - CUNDINAMARCA	20

Check out more info on the Pickers Project and Manos al Grano at <https://manosalgrano.org>.

Data on how we buy coffee

At Coffee Collective, we value complete transparency from farm to cup. We have strong tracing structures to collect all the data presented in the transparency table. A trusting relationship with our suppliers allows us to fully understand all the processes that work together to deliver the final coffee experience.

We hope our take on sustainable relationships can inspire other companies to set up similar structures and incorporate them into their own businesses. Hopefully, our transparency can inspire consumers and others to ask questions and obtain relevant facts and data from coffee companies, going beyond the beautiful stories we all in the coffee industry excel at telling.

After decades of historically low prices on the global coffee market, we saw a significant rise in early 2025. In February, the ICO Composite Indicator Price (I-CIP) reached an all-time high of 354.32 US cents/lb. Prices remained volatile throughout the year and, towards mid-December, dropped down to 283.21 US cents/lb. Early hopes of lasting corrections to low prices were thus deflated, and these developments highlight our view that farmers need long-term security through profitable incomes.

At Coffee Collective, we have long-lasting relationships with farms, often spanning more than a decade. We value these mutual relationships and remain open to creating new ones. And while price transparency cannot be seen as an end in itself, we are convinced that it plays an integral role in the long-term process of countering the exploitative structures in today's coffee market.



How to read the transparency table

- Relationship (years): Shows how many years we have worked directly with the producer, farm or cooperative.
- Return to Origin (USD/lb FOB) :The FOB price ("Free On Board") reflects the price paid for the coffee before export and international shipping. It includes the value returned to the producing country.
- Producer Price (USD/lb): Shows the price paid directly to the producer or cooperative where available. In some cases this is the same as the FOB price, while in others additional costs such as milling, logistics or export handling are deducted between producer and export stage.
- Market Price (USD/lb): Refers to the market reference price during the period where the coffee was contracted. Market prices fluctuate significantly throughout the year and are included to create context around the price paid for each coffee.
- Why transparency matters - Coffee prices alone never tell the full story of value distribution, quality or sustainability. However, we believe sharing this data openly is an important step towards greater accountability and a more informed conversation about how coffee is traded.

Transparency Table

Farmer/Coffee (The table presents 100% of Coffee Collectives purchases in 2025)	Relationship (years)	Quantity bought (kg)	Return to Origin (USD/lb FOB)	Market price (USD/lb)	Producer price (USD/lb)
Finca Vista Hermosa, Huehue, Guatemala	19	6,930	5.25	3.63	Same as FOB
Dattera, Cerrado, Brazil	19	16,756	4.96	3.72	Same as FOB
Kieni, Nyeri, Kenya (AA + AB)	15	16,980	5.94	3.71	4.86
Gichathaini, Nyeri, Kenya	3	2,000	5.95	4.05	5.75
Konyu, Nyeri, Kenya	3	4,000	6.35	4.05	6.14
Jaime Casalles, Huila, Colombia	12	2,275	6.59	3.78	3.38
Duver Rojas, Huila, Colombia	12	420	6.00	3.52	2.89
Edilfonso Yara, Huila, Colombia	12	735	8.10	4.01	4.10
Takesi, Yanacachi, Bolivia	9	688	27.85	4.09	Same as FOB
Caranavi Farmers, Caranavi, Bolivia	2	1,579	4.80	3.43	3.67
Machaca, Caranavi, Bolivia	2	422	8.08	3.43	6.77
Uluri, Caranavi, Bolivia	2	1,549	9.18	3.28	7.72
Planadas, Tolima, Colombia	6	525	5.40	3.52	2.78
Camacho, Huila, Colombia	2	525	6.80	3.52	3.21
Aga, Yirgacheffe, Ethiopia	3	14,400	6.00	4.04	Same as FOB
Reshad, Djimma, Ethiopia	2	7,200	4.10	3.92	Same as FOB
Mulugeta, Sidama, Ethiopia	2	8,340	6.17	4.02	Same as FOB
Legesse, Sidama, Ethiopia	1	600	10.00	3.92	Same as FOB
Bekele, Sidama, Ethiopia	2	7,800	6.62	3.92	Same as FOB
El Vergel, Chiapas, Mexico	1	2,070	5.69	3.63	4.69
Triunfo Verde, Chiapas, Mexico	2	12,075	4.90	3.63	4.00
Onesimo, Chiapas, Mexico	1	276	6.57	3.63	4.38
Silvia, Chiapas, Mexico	2	552	9.15	3.63	7.88
Anabella, Acatenango, Guatemala	1	1,415	6.26	3.57	Same as FOB
Morales, Huehuetenango, Guatemala	1	60	21.00	3.63	Same as FOB
Pompeyo, Fraijanes, Guatemala	1	300	9.10	3.63	Same as FOB
Palacios, Huehuetenango, Guatemala	1	2,070	5.25	3.63	Same as FOB
Jhoan, Huila, Colombia	1	1,522	20.05	4.00	10.95
Yenifer Rojas, Huila, Colombia	12	240	9.05	3.73	5.34
Tolima Farmers, Tolima, Colombia	1	2,450	4.75	4.03	3.11
El Mesón, Huila, Colombia	1	1,680	8.35	4.03	4.37
Senderito, Nariño, Colombia	1	504	6.64	4.03	3.69
El Nogal, Cajamarca, Peru	2	300	14.55	4.10	12.53
La Lima, Cajamarca, Peru	1	1,590	6.19	4.10	5.85
La Pomarosa, Cajamarca, Peru	1	210	14.00	4.10	15.48
Peña de Leon, Cajamarca, Peru	1	1,470	5.43	4.10	4.92
El Morito, Cajamarca, Peru	1	5,520	4.75	4.10	4.20
Faustino, Cajamarca, Peru	1	138	12.00	4.10	8.30
Marcos Flores, Cajamarca, Peru	1	2,277	6.20	3.98	5.20
Total volume / weighted averages		130,442	6.04	3.83	



Transparent Coffee Evaluation

By Peter Dupont

Co-founder of Coffee Collective

We are very happy to see the development of transparency and quality in the coffee market during the period that Coffee Collective has existed (since 2007).

Today, it is possible for coffee farmers to get higher prices if the quality is better. From a global perspective, though, very few have access to buyers willing to pay more for better coffee. But nevertheless, the number is growing just as the prices paid per pound of the best coffees are rising.

Many farmers aspire to this, dream of it, and work very hard to raise the quality of their coffee. And that, of course, raises the question of what is better quality?

The fast answer might be that the higher the cupping score on the SCA cupping form, the better the quality. But that is an answer that we think is problematic.

Since the beginning of Coffee Collective, we have not used the common cupping sheets because we find them overcomplicated and, as such, not very transparent. And the calculation from a very complicated form to a single digit that should describe quality, we find, is oversimplifying. How does an 87 coffee taste? You could get that same number with two very different tasting coffees.

The biggest concern we have is that, for too many farmers, these methods are alienating them from understanding the quality of their own product. Unfortunately, what we often see is that buyers have a cupping lab with people in white coats who cup the coffee and let the farmer know the score of their coffee. It's done in a way where farmers frequently don't dare to argue about the quality. In addition, it might be very hard for them to figure out what they can do to improve their quality to get a higher price if they just get told their coffee is "82".

What we unfortunately also often see in specialty coffee is that a lot of people who have even been educated in the dominating cupping methods are short-cutting the real analysis that the methods consist of. Probably because they are too complex and time-consuming. So a lot of people will be using the cupping sheets "backwards", starting with the cupper thinking the final score, for instance, is 86 and then filling out all subcategories with a flat average that gives the sum 86 in the end.

We see this as a very serious problem where the dominating methods for evaluating quality just become a power tool for the buyers to shortcut price negotiations because they present a tool that erroneously is considered scientific and with the capacity to objectively describe a coffee's quality.

Over the last few years, we have been working together with the Danish company Coffee Mind. They are sensory scientists who have extensively researched common methods of coffee quality evaluation, including the latest quality evaluation form from SCA, and came to criticize them from a scientific point of view. They agree with us that the methods are unnecessarily complicated.

What we prefer to do instead can be described as follows:

The first thing is the physical evaluation of the coffee. And here we use the common methods from SCA for measuring humidity, screen sizes and grading. This is a good basis for evaluating quality in a transparent manner, where the farmer can more easily learn what to do to improve quality.

The next thing for us is the sensory evaluation. Here, we believe there are some parameters that can be described more or less objectively. These are sweetness, acidity and bitterness. We also use the more technical category of "clean cup".

To us, good quality starts with a certain amount of sweetness and a certain level of clean cup. This shows that the coffee has a significant amount of fully ripe cherries (to give enough sweetness) and has been treated carefully in the post-harvest process and while on the tree (clean cup).

Then, for us, the next level up in the quality range is more acidity. How much acidity is in a coffee is more or less objective. But whether you like it or not gets to be more subjective. And this marks that at this point we are moving into descriptors of the quality that we still believe are objective, but it's subjective if you like it or not.

When going higher on our quality scale, the aromas need to come next. What lifts the quality higher for us is when there are fruity or floral aromas. The more elegant and intense these aromas are, the higher the quality for us.

Together with Coffee Mind we are testing this way of working as scientifically as possible, and so far, it has brought a lot of support for our approach. We hope that by sharing this, we can inspire more people to join the conversation of how we can create more transparent ways of evaluating the quality of coffee.

Social & Environmental Indicators

At Coffee Collective, transparency and accountability are key to our approach as a value-based organization. Since 2016, we have tracked social indicators to assess employee well-being, workplace diversity, and overall trust. These include union membership, gender balance, nationalities. Since we in 2019 became B Corp certified we have added parameters we report on as well as when EU and the Danish “Erhvervsstyrelse” have made recommendations for Sustainability Reporting for SME's we expanded the number of parameters we report on.

By collecting and publishing these data, we hold ourselves accountable and identify areas for improvement.

For us, diversity and balance go hand in hand. Diversity means having employees from different backgrounds with varying levels of experience, while balance ensures that teams include a mix of industry experience, gender representation, and language diversity. Achieving this requires long-term recruitment strategies, thorough job onboarding, clear communication, and well-defined expectations. When employees feel valued and supported, they perform better, trust their employer, and stay with the company longer.

At Coffee Collective, we believe transparency creates clarity, and that principle is at the core of how we build a responsible and inclusive workplace.

HUMAN RESOURCE TABLE

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Employee satisfaction (1-5)	-	-	-	-	4.54	4.52	4.37	4.38	4.25	4.27
Employee trust towards CC as an employer (1-5)	-	-	-	-	4.68	4.66	4.41	4.33	4.27	4.48
Number of full time union employees	33	41	38	39	33	49	65	76	63	61
Number of different nationalities	7	12	10	14	15	19	25	21	21	23
Employee turnover	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	27%	32%
Sickness absence	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.1%	3.17%	3.36%
Work accidents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	6	3
Female employees (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55%	64%	60%
Female managers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52%	66%	60%
Female salaries compared to male salaries in "white collar" positions (%)	1.6%	1.97%	-2%	2.07%	0.2%	0.87%	-4.86%	-11.39%	-18.7%	-16.94%
Female boardmembers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	29%	43%
Wage difference between CEO and employees	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	191%	272%	309%

- *Disclaimer: Female and male identification is based on cpr. numbers. We acknowledge that this is not exhaustive, but it based on the data we have access to. And on our respect for peoples privacy in terms of personal gender identity.
- Number of full-time union employees covers employees of who have union regulated or similar terms in the organization. Full-time employee here is defined as 30-37 hours per week.
- Wage difference in "white collar positions" reflects negatively on female employee salaries. We have more females in "white collar positions" overall than male, however the males in "white collar positions" overall have higher management roles even as there are less of them. Males in "white collar positions" also have overall a longer maturity (anciennitet) in the company; 6.14 years vs. 5.13 years for females in these roles.
- Since the 2024 report we have updated the method of calculating wage differences in "white collar positions" to include founders and CEO wages.
- "White collar positions" are at CC defined as roles above sous chef level. White collar roles incl. Managers, office employees, bar managers, bakery manager, head baker and whole sale assistants. (it does not incl. baristas, bakers, roasters)
- Since barista positions are regulated by union agreement, wage and extras are equal for all.
- Wage related info is taken from a wage report for December 2025.
- Wage difference between CEO and employee median wage include all staff, excl. reserve staff who work a few hours inconsistently a month. The median is calculated from hourly wage of all staff, and reported as the difference between the CEO and median hourly wage.
- Work Accidents are based on reporting to HR and to EASY portal.

ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS

Electricity in KWH	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Godthåbsvej	54,878	57,664	64,793	78,243	78,049	91,849	84,457
Jægersborggade	28,352	25,296	25,501	28,254	29,689	31,804	30,954
Kristen Bernikows Gade	23,194	20,442	19,784	22,118	22,346	24,841	25,470
Booth in Torvehallerne	20,583	24,020	n/a	27,500	27,791	n/a	26,275
Warehouse at Esromgade	1,783	2,097	3,412	1,912	705	429	486
Sankt Hans Torv	-	6,501	22,338	18,528	16,313	18,576	19,660
Telefon Kiosken	-	4,090	9,577	9,676	7,917	-	-
Collective Bakery	-	-	112,921	175,648	171,609	165,314	165,286
Carlsberg Byen	-	-	-	4,242	17,750	18,188	171,94
Guldsmedegade	-	-	-	-	-	34,536	36,147