

| Consultation Results Synopsis Information to Stakeholders on the Outcome of the Consultation on Mango Price Review | |
|---|---|
| To | Interested stakeholders in Fairtrade Mango |
| Consultation Period | 17.06.2019 – 17.07.2019 |
| Standards Committee Meeting for Decision | 25 & 26 September 2019 |
| Project Manager Contact Details | Ester Freixa Serra, Pricing Project Manager, e.freixa-serra@fairtrade.net , +49 (0) 228 949 23 242. |

Contents

| | |
|--|--------|
| PART 1 Introduction | - 1 - |
| 1.1. General Introduction | - 1 - |
| 1.2. Abbreviations | - 2 - |
| 1.3. Project objectives | - 2 - |
| 1.4. Next Steps | - 2 - |
| PART 2 Consultation - Outcome | - 3 - |
| 2.1. Consultation process | - 3 - |
| 2.2. Classifying stakeholders' responses | - 3 - |
| 2.3. Consultation results overview | - 4 - |
| ANNEX – Detailed tables | - 16 - |

PART 1 Introduction

1.1. General Introduction

Fairtrade International's Standards & Pricing (S&P) Unit would like to thank all stakeholders for the time and effort they have put into participating in the consultation on the definition on price setting model for Mango 2019. Mango is a complex product and all feedback provided has helped Fairtrade S&P to understand the situation.

The consultation timelines have been from June 17th and July 17th but some responses have been also welcomed after this timeline. This has allowed producer organization to have internal discussions before providing their opinions. By end of July 2019, the S&P unit has received all responses and has started the compilation and analysis process. A total of 39 stakeholders have provided their views to the proposals for price setting models for Mango.

Together with the results of the research carried out by the Standards & Pricing Unit, this information provides the basis for our recommendation to the Standards Committee. The Standards Committee's decision on the implementation of the price review for Fairtrade mango will be taken in full knowledge of stakeholders' comments. This document aims to present the outcome of the consultation in the most transparent possible way without disclosing confidential stakeholder information. Should you have any queries or remarks concerning this report, please contact the Project Manager Ester Freixa Serra at: e.freixa-serra@fairtrade.net or call +49 (0) 228 949 23 242.

- 1 -

Mango Price Review - Consultation Results Synopsis

10.09.2019

1.2. Abbreviations

COSP: Cost of Sustainable Production
FMP: Fairtrade Minimum Price
FP: Fairtrade Premium
HL: Hired Labour Organization
NFO: National Fairtrade Organization, Fairtrade country organizations in the consumer markets
SC: Standards Committee
SPO: Small-scale Producer Organization
S&P: Standards & Pricing

1.3. Project objectives

The overall goal of the project, as stated in the project assignment, is to review and announce new Fairtrade Minimum Prices and Fairtrade Premiums according to the classification (geographically and product based) of the fresh mango and prepared and preserved categories (fresh, for processing, for drying, pulp and dried) agreed.

The specific objectives to achieve this goal are:

- To collect costs of sustainable production (COSP) for mango (fresh and prepared and preserved), from all relevant regions for Fairtrade.
- To review the classification of regions and products following the report “Mango definition and classification” by Julie Francoeur, May 2016.
- To recommend new Fairtrade minimum prices and Fairtrade premiums following the recommended classifications.
- To announce new prices following the results from consultation and approved by the Director S&P or Standards Committee.

For more information on the scope and specific objectives of the project, you may consult the [project assignment](#).

1.4. Next Steps

The results of this consultation are shared in our website, and specifically with SC members, in preparation to the SC meeting on September 25th and 26th. The stakeholders may bring any additional input forward in the coming days.

The consultation results together with research carried out by the Pricing team and with the discussions with the Project Team will be the basis for the final recommendations to the SC. The final decisions on the recommendations will be taken by the SC in the aforementioned meeting.

If there are further inputs the stakeholders may contact directly the Project Manager or file a complaint by reporting to S&P following the procedure on [complaints Fairtrade Standards](#).

PART 2 Consultation - Outcome

2.1. Consultation process

The consultation phase took place in between June 17th and July 17th. A consultation document in 4 languages ([English](#), [Spanish](#), [French](#) and [Portuguese](#)) was shared via email with certified producers organization (8 HL and 49 SPO) and traders (180), with Fairtrade system staff and it was also published in our [website](#).

We received a total of 39 responses from stakeholders to the full consultation document. A total of 20 Producers from which 9 are also traders responded, as well as a total of 16 Traders. From the Fairtrade system a total of 3 full questionnaires were received.

| REGION | Countries | Fairtrade system | Producer | Producer and Trader | Trader | Grand Total |
|---------------------------------------|--|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Central America, Mexico and Caribbean | Nicaragua Mexico | | 2 | | | 2 |
| South America | Brazil Peru | | 5 | 3 | 5 | 13 |
| South- Eastern Asia | Thailand | | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| Southern Asia | India Sri Lanka | | 3 | 2 | | 5 |
| Western Africa | Burkina Faso Cameroun Cote d'Ivoire Ghana | | | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Europe | France Switzerland Germany United Kingdom | 3 | | | 8 | 11 |
| Grand Total | | 3 | 11 | 9 | 16 | 39 |

In addition, input on specific items was received separately via E-mail from 4 stakeholders. Those will also be considered and commented in the overview of responses below.

2.2. Classifying stakeholders' responses

Each stakeholder has been classified into 1 or more of the following categories:

- relevant to fresh mango for direct consumption,
- relevant to fresh mango for processing,
- relevant to mango pulp,
- relevant to dried mango,

depending on the products reported as the most important (question 4).

For those who said they are producing/buying mango pulp and dried mango, the stakeholders have been categorized as relevant for “mango for processing” as well.

Also the stakeholders are classified under 1 or more region relevance. For instance, NFOs and FLOCERT answers are included as relevant to all regions, while traders have been classified per producer regions depending on the responses to question 5; and producers directly into the regions they fall into.

This means you will see the responses of those considered to be relevant to the specific question and the rest separated. Example: question 8 on the elimination of varieties for Thailand and Southern Asia: the results will be separated into those being producers or buying from Thailand and Southern Asia, separated from the rest of responses.

2.3. Consultation results overview

This section summarizes the responses to the consultation by topics and questions. This document is synthesized as much as possible to provide concise information to all stakeholders while preserving anonymity in responses. This section, although an important input for the recommendations that will be presented to the SC in September 25 & 26, does not reflect the final proposals for decision. Further discussion based on this input will take place with the project team before bringing final recommendations to the SC.

Elimination of varieties from Thailand and Southern Asia.

The responses on whether to eliminate the prices for specific varieties in Thailand and Southern Asia indicate that a majority of respondents are in favour of eliminating specific variety prices. Nevertheless, those against are stakeholders from Asia and the certification body (FLOCERT). The rationales provided is that prices and COSP for each relevant variety are different and the average generic price proposed for Southern Asia would let the lower priced varieties (i.e. Totapuri) out of the Fairtrade system.

Consultation document question 8

Do you agree with the elimination of specific varieties FMP and FP from Thailand and Southern Asia?

| | Stakeholder type | YES | NO | Not relevant / n.a. | Grand Total |
|---|---------------------|-----------|----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Stakeholders relevant to Southern Asia | Fairtrade system | 2 | 1 | | 3 |
| | Producer | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| | Producer and Trader | | 1 | | 1 |
| | Trader | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| | Total | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| Rest | Producer | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| | Producer and Trader | 2 | | 6 | 8 |
| | Trader | 4 | 2 | 6 | 12 |
| | Total | 8 | 4 | 16 | 28 |
| Grand Total | | 12 | 8 | 19 | 39 |

Elimination of prices for processed mango-dried mango and mango pulp- and mango for drying.

Dried mango and mango for drying

The majority of respondents answered positively to the elimination of prices for “dried” and “for drying” mango (question 9 and 10). It is understood that this brings simplification, as in many of the current prices the “for drying” FMP are equal values as the “for processing” FMP.

Some of the negative responses are based on the fact that conversion ratios and processing costs are different for dried and for pulp, and as such should remain separate. In the current proposal, different processing costs or conversion ratios per each product and country would not be accounted because

the price to be used would be the “for processing” FMP, and to arrive to the processed product price the additional costs and conversion factors would need to be considered in the calculation. As a result of the consultation, it is necessary that Fairtrade Standards & Pricing invests more time in explaining how to use “for processing” FMP and FP by organizations selling “processed” products as it is clarified in the Trader Standard requirement 4.2.3 concerning price adaptation to different levels in the chain.

The only concerning comment provided is that the quality and maturity state of the fruit for the mangoes to be used for drying needs to be different than for pulping. For instance, mango for drying requires bigger sized and not damaged mangoes, while for pulp this is not the case.

Consultation document question 9

Do you agree with the elimination of FMP and FP for “dried mango”?

| | Stakeholder type | YES | NO | Not relevant / n.a. | Grand Total |
|---|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Relevant to dried & for drying | Fairtrade system | 2 | | | 2 |
| | Producer and Trader | 1 | 3 | | 4 |
| | Trader | 5 | 1 | | 6 |
| | TOTAL | 8 | 4 | | 12 |
| others | Fairtrade system | 1 | | | 1 |
| | Producer | 4 | 3 | 4 | 11 |
| | Producer and Trader | | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| | Trader | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| | TOTAL | 9 | 8 | 10 | 27 |
| Grand Total | | 17 | 12 | 10 | 39 |

Consultation document question 10

Do you agree with the elimination of FMP and FP for “mango for drying”?

| | Stakeholder type | YES | NO | Not relevant / n.a. | Grand Total |
|---|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Relevant to dried & for drying | Fairtrade system | 2 | | | 2 |
| | Producer and Trader | 2 | 2 | | 4 |
| | Trader | 4 | 2 | | 6 |
| | TOTAL | 8 | 4 | | 12 |
| others | Fairtrade system | 1 | | | 1 |
| | Producer | 4 | 3 | 4 | 11 |
| | Producer and Trader | | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| | Trader | 5 | 3 | 2 | 10 |
| | TOTAL | 10 | 8 | 9 | 27 |
| Grand Total | | 18 | 12 | 9 | 39 |

Mango pulp

In the case of eliminating prices for mango pulp, stakeholders are mostly against. Some rationales from the negative responses to question 11 are similar to the ones provided in question 9 and 10. It is stated that the processing costs and conversion ratios are different. In addition, it is also indicated that mango pulp is a worldwide commodity and having specific prices for this product simplifies negotiations and trading of the product.

Consultation document question 11

Do you agree with the elimination of FMP and FP for “mango pulp”?

| | Stakeholder type | YES | NO | Not relevant / n.a. | Grand Total |
|--|------------------|-----|----|---------------------|-------------|
|--|------------------|-----|----|---------------------|-------------|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Relevant pulp to | Fairtrade system | 2 | | | 2 |
| | Producer and Trader | 1 | 3 | | 4 |
| | Trader | 2 | 2 | | 4 |
| | TOTAL | 5 | 5 | | 10 |
| others | Fairtrade system | 1 | | | 1 |
| | Producer | 4 | 5 | 2 | 11 |
| | Producer and Trader | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| | Trader | 2 | 5 | 5 | 12 |
| | TOTAL | 8 | 13 | 8 | 29 |
| Grand Total | | 13 | 18 | 8 | 39 |

FMP for organic mangoes

Consultation document question 12

Do you agree to apply a unique organic differential to all FMP for all regions and mango products?

There are more responses (25) accepting the application of a unique organic differential than rejecting it (10). But the values proposed (between 0.02 and 0.35) are all different depending on the respondents' region and situation. The rationales in the consultation indicated that each region and product should actually have a specific FMP based on the conventional one, but always proportional to it and or based on COSP information. For instance, the values 0.10 or 0.15 are too high in percentage terms on some of the values proposed (e.g. 0.18 for Western Africa for processing).

Setting FMP and FP only at the regional level

Stakeholders are mostly in favour of simplifying the prices and setting only prices per region, for the regions with Fairtrade mango production and sales (*Central America, Mexico & Caribbean; South America; South- Eastern Asia; Southern Asia; Western Africa*). Most of the negative responses are found in South America and Western Africa and Traders from Europe.

In South America both Peruvians and Brazilians stakeholders state that costs of production and farm characteristics are quite different between the two countries and an average price would not fit them both. For instance, Peruvians mostly agree on a higher FMP proposed (questions 18 and 19 later) for the region, while Brazilians propose lower FMP values.

In Western Africa, the stakeholders highlight the fact that Ghana has higher costs of production and prices compared to the rest of the countries. Cameroun stakeholders also indicate they would prefer a specific price for their country.

Consultation document question 13

Do you agree to only have FMP and FP for mango products per region (*Central America, Mexico & Caribbean; South America; South- Eastern Asia; Southern Asia; Western Africa*)?

Table 1 Responses to Question 13 per region and type of stakeholder

| REGION | Stakeholder type | YES | NO | Grand Total |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----|----|-------------|
| Central America, Mexico and Caribbean | Producer | 2 | | 2 |
| | Trader | | | |
| South America | Producer | 4 | 1 | 6 |
| | Producer and Trader | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | Trader | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| South- Eastern Asia | Producer | | 1 | 1 |
| | Trader | 1 | | 1 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Southern Asia | Producer | 3 | | 3 |
| | Producer and Trader | 2 | | 2 |
| Western Africa | Producer and Trader | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| | Trader | 2 | | 2 |
| Europe | Fairtrade system | 3 | | 3 |
| | Trader | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| Grand Total | | 23 | 16 | 39 |

In regards to the “Worldwide (except regions with specific prices)” FMP and FP for Mangoes, most of the stakeholders are in agreement, as it will facilitate the process and reduce the time to enter to the system. But they express that this should be done only if there is follow up from Fairtrade and these new producer organizations will have the possibility to request FMP and FP specific for their region after they enter.

Consultation document question 14

Do you agree to create a “Worldwide (except regions with specific prices)” pricing region for mango, applicable to any other region?

| REGION | Stakeholder type | YES | NO | Not relevant / n.a. | Grand Total |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Central America, Mexico and Caribbean | Producer | 2 | | | 2 |
| | Trader | | | | |
| South America | Producer | 3 | 2 | | 5 |
| | Producer and Trader | 2 | 1 | | 3 |
| | Trader | 2 | 3 | | 5 |
| South- Eastern Asia | Producer | | 1 | | 1 |
| | Trader | | | 1 | 1 |
| Southern Asia | Producer | 2 | 1 | | 3 |
| | Producer and Trader | 2 | | | 2 |
| Western Africa | Producer and Trader | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| | Trader | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| Europe | Fairtrade system | 3 | | | 3 |
| | Trader | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| Grand Total | | 22 | 13 | 4 | 39 |

FOB prices elimination

Overall there are more negative responses (13) than positive (10). For 16 respondents these question is not relevant. Those against the elimination indicate that maintaining FOB FMP helps the commercial negotiations and their opinion is that it should be kept. But when asking about which differential should be used (question 16 below), stakeholders disagree with the unique value proposed. The responses indicate that export and packaging costs differ considerably between countries and some of them state that this should be done on a country or regional basis.

Consultation document question 15

Do you agree to eliminate FOB FMP and FP for all “mango, fresh” products?

Table 2 Response to Question 15

| Stakeholder type | YES | NO | Not relevant / n.a. | Grand Total |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Fairtrade system | 2 | 1 | | 3 |
| Producer | 3 | 5 | 3 | 11 |
| Producer and Trader | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Trader | 2 | 4 | 10 | 16 |
| Grand Total | 10 | 13 | 16 | 39 |

Consultation document question 16

Only if “NO” has been selected in Question 15:

Do you agree to set a unique EXW – FOB differential of 0.18 USD / kg for all regions (based on the results of the COSP research)?

Table 3 Response to Question 16, by those who answered NO to question 15

| Response question 16 | Count of responses |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| YES | 6 |
| NO | 3 |
| NO, 0.25 | 1 |
| Not relevant / n.a. | 3 |
| Grand Total | 13 |

Currency of the FMP and FP

According to the responses, almost all respondents agreed that US Dollar should be the currency used for mango FMP and FP for all regions except Western Africa. For Western Africa, stakeholders relevant to the region agree that EUR is more appropriate.

Consultation document question 17

Do you agree to set prices for Western Africa in Euros per kg of fresh mangoes?

Table 4 Responses to Question 17 Western Africa in Euros

| | Stakeholder type | YES | NO, USD | Not relevant / n.a. | Grand Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Relevant to Western Africa | Fairtrade system | 3 | | | 3 |
| | Producer and Trader | 3 | | | 3 |
| | Trader | 7 | 1 | | 8 |
| | TOTAL | 13 | 1 | | 14 |
| others | Producer | 1 | 4 | 6 | 11 |
| | Producer and Trader | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| | Trader | 1 | 4 | 3 | 8 |
| | TOTAL | 3 | 11 | 11 | 25 |
| Grand Total | | 16 | 12 | 11 | 39 |

Do you agree to set prices for all other regions (other than Western Africa) in USD per kg of fresh mangoes?

Table 5 Responses to Question 17 All regions (except Western Africa) in USD

| Stakeholder type | YES | NO | Not relevant / n.a. | Grand Total |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Fairtrade system | 3 | | | 3 |
| Producer | 8 | | 3 | 11 |
| Producer and Trader | 7 | | 2 | 9 |
| Trader | 13 | 1 | 2 | 16 |
| Grand Total | 31 | 1 | 7 | 39 |

FMP FOR MANGOES FRESH

The responses for question 18 (see annex for detailed responses) are considered depending on whether the respondent is relevant or not to the corresponding region, relevant meaning that it includes producers from the region, traders who indicated buying from the region and NFOs. In

addition, information on the reported percentage Fairtrade Premium in the period between Q4 2017 and Q3 2018 is indicated as a weighing proxy on the responses received.

Consultation document question 18

Do you agree to all values proposed in Table 6 (see table below)?

Proposed prices for:

Central America, Mexico & Caribbean: the majority of relevant respondents (5) agree to the proposed 0.62 USD/kg price, whereas 2 respondents disagree. Opinions against an increase from a traders' perspective buying from Mexico is that the increase proposed might price them out of the market. The respondents in disagreement with the proposal reported low or no Fairtrade Premium in the period mentioned.

South America: the majority of relevant respondents (9) disagree with the proposed 0.56 USD/kg price, in those cases higher prices between 0.62 and 0.70 were amongst the proposed prices. Only 5 respondents agreed with the proposed prices. The respondents in disagreement with the proposal reported higher Fairtrade Premium than those in favour in the period mentioned.

Southern Asia: the majority of relevant respondents (9) agree with the proposed 0.51 USD/kg price. The respondents in agreement with the proposal all reported Fairtrade Premium in the period mentioned.

South-Eastern Asia: the majority of relevant respondents (4) agree with the proposed 0.51 USD/kg price. One producer disagreed. The reported FP amounted to 1.0% respectively for the producer and trader relevant for these question.

Western Africa: the majority of relevant respondents (6) disagree with the proposed 0.38 EUR/kg price, which is considerably higher than the current FMP. Some stakeholders prefer lower price with the reasoning that the costs are lower and that this price would price them out of the market. One respondent proposed a price of 0.26. Some respondents from Ghana and Cameroun indicated preference for a higher price (either 0.5 or 1). The respondents in disagreement with the proposal reported Fairtrade Premium in the period mentioned.

Worldwide: the majority of stakeholders were not in favour of the worldwide price (17) while 9 respondents agreed with the proposal. For this question, 13 responses were left blank, which leaves a considerable gap in responses.

Other inputs provided relevant to all regions are:

- Prices (referring to the FMP) should not be lower than the current level
- In question 18 respondents show disagreement, but many stakeholders indicate they are more concerned with the “for processing” as they do not sell/buy fresh mangoes for direct consumption.
- Some stakeholders indicate the prices should be homogenous for all regions.

Table 6 presents the proposals from question 18 (see annex for detailed responses), about the values of the FMP for conventional mangoes fresh Ex Works.

Table 6 Proposals from question 18 for FMP for Mangoes fresh, EXW, Conventional, compared to the current FMP per region

| Region | Proposed FMP | Current FMP | Currency/ units |
|---|--------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Central America, Mexico & Caribbean | 0.62 | 0.75 (except Mexico 0.55) | USD/kg |
| South America | 0.56 | 0.70 | USD/kg |
| Southern Asia | 0.51 | - | USD/kg |
| South- Eastern Asia | | 1.18 | USD/kg |
| Western Africa | 0.38 | 0.17 except Ghana is 0.25 | EUR /kg |
| Worldwide (except regions with specific prices) | 0.53 | - | USD/kg |

FMP FOR MANGOES for processing

The responses for question 19 (see annex for detailed responses) are considered depending on whether the respondent is relevant or not to the corresponding region, relevant meaning that it includes producers from the region, traders who indicated buying from the region and NFOs. In addition, information on the reported % Fairtrade Premium in the period between Q4 2017 and Q3 2018 is indicated as a weighing proxy on the responses received, this is a commercial activity proxy in the Fairtrade market in the past year.

Consultation document question 19

Do you agree to all values proposed in Table 7 (see below)?

Proposed prices for:

Central America, Mexico & Caribbean: the majority of relevant respondents (4) disagree to the proposed 0.38 USD/kg price, whereas 3 respondents agreed. Opinions against an increase are mainly received from a traders' perspective preferring to keep the current level (alternatively a more conservative increase of 0.20-0.25 maximum). The respondents in disagreement with the proposal reported low or no Fairtrade Premium in the period mentioned.

South America: the majority of relevant respondents (11) disagree with the proposed 0.33 USD/kg price, in those cases lower prices between 0.265 and 0.12 were amongst the proposed prices. Most producers from Peru agree or want a slight increase (0.38). Brazilian producers and traders prefer lower price (0.12, 0.20). Five stakeholders agreed with the proposed prices. The respondents in disagreement with the proposal reported higher Fairtrade Premium than those in favour in the period mentioned.

Southern Asia: the majority of relevant respondents (6) disagree with the proposed 0.28 USD/kg price. The disagreement is mostly related to having one price for all varieties. The value proposed could be fine for most varieties but not for Totapuri which is priced much lower than the FMP proposed. The respondents in disagreement with the proposal reported higher Fairtrade Premium in the period mentioned than those in favour.

South-Eastern Asia: the majority of relevant respondents (3) agree with the proposed 0.28 USD/kg price. One producer organization strongly disagrees with the proposal and current price level is preferred.

Western Africa: the majority of relevant respondents (6) disagree with the proposed 0.18 EUR/kg price, which is higher than the current FMP. Most stakeholders prefer maintaining the current price levels. One proposed price was 0.16.

Worldwide: the majority of stakeholders were not in favour of the worldwide price (22) while 8 respondents agreed with the proposal. For this question 9 responses were left blank, which leaves a considerable gap in responses. Only few stakeholders made proposals of values around 0,14-0.16.

Other inputs provided that are relevant to all regions are:

- Overall the responses indicate that the FMP for mangoes for processing should be lower than the proposed levels.
- Is important to differentiate by varieties and by destination of the product (for drying and for pulping)

Table 7 summarizes the responses that stakeholders provided to question 19 (see annex for detailed responses) on the values of the FMP for conventional mangoes for processing at Ex Works level.

Table 7 Proposals from question 19 for FMP for Mangoes for processing, EXW, Conventional, compared to the current FMP per region

| Country/Region | Proposed FMP | Current FMP | Currency/ units |
|---|--------------|--|-----------------|
| Central America, Mexico & Caribbean | 0.38 | 0.105 | USD/kg |
| South America | 0.33 | For drying in Peru is 0.105, for processing 0.235 | USD/kg |
| Southern Asia | 0.28 | Totapuri and other varieties =0.051 Kesar = 0.141 Alphonso = 0.211 | USD/kg |
| South- Eastern Asia | | 0.40 | USD/kg |
| Western Africa | 0.18 | 0.14 | EUR/kg |
| Worldwide (except regions with specific prices) | 0.30 | - | USD/kg |

FP for “fresh” (question 22)

Specific responses to each region FP are summarized in the Table 8 below.

The comments which are relevant to all regions are as follows:

- Some stakeholders express they would like to have a unique FP level for everyone (0.08 USD/kg).
- There is a majority accepting the proposal on unifying the methodology of calculating the FP as the 15% of the FMP. But then the values proposed should be recalculated to the FMP finally recommended.

Consultation document question 22

Do you agree to all values proposed in Table 8?

The responses for question 22 are considered depending on whether the respondent is relevant or not to the corresponding region. In addition, information on the reported % Fairtrade Premium in the period between Q4 2017 and Q3 2018 is indicated as a weighing proxy on the responses received, this is a commercial activity proxy in the Fairtrade market in the past year.

Proposed prices for:

Central America, Mexico & Caribbean: the majority of relevant respondents (3) agreed to the proposed 0.093 USD/kg FP, whereas 2 respondents disagreed. The producers agreed and traders did not answer to this as they mostly are interested in “for processing” prices.

South America: the majority of relevant respondents (10) disagree with the proposed 0.084 USD/kg FP. Brazilian producers prefer lower FP (0.03 was one proposal). Peruvians prefer the current level (0.14). Traders also prefer lower (0.02 or 0.05 proposed). Only four stakeholders reported being in favour (one producer and 3 traders). The respondents in disagreement with the proposal reported higher Fairtrade Premium in the period mentioned than those in favour.

Southern Asia: the majority of relevant respondents (6) disagree with the proposed 0.077 USD/kg FP, no alternative was indicated. Only 3 stakeholders relevant to the region agree with it. As in previous cases, the concerns with the different varieties was reiterated in this question. The respondents in disagreement with the proposal reported higher Fairtrade Premium in the period mentioned than those in favour.

South-Eastern Asia: the majority of relevant respondents (3) disagree with the proposed 0.077 USD/kg FP, that includes producers and traders from Thailand.

Western Africa: the majority of relevant respondents (6) agree with the proposed 0.057 EUR/kg FP, which is lower than the current FP. Overall 4 respondents were in disagreement. Most stakeholders prefer maintaining the current price levels. Although alternative proposals were: 0.016, 0.076, and 0.06.

Worldwide: the majority of stakeholders were not in favour of the worldwide price (19) while 10 respondents agreed with the proposal. For this question 10 responses were left blank, which leaves a considerable gap in responses. Two stakeholders offered alternative proposals of 0.03 and 0.093.

Table 8 Proposed FP values (USD / KG) for Conventional Mangoes Fresh, Price level= EXW, for defined regions

| Country/Region | Proposed FP | Current FP | Currency/ units |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|------------|-----------------|
| Central America, Mexico & Caribbean | 0.093 | 0.14 | USD/kg |
| South America | 0.084 | 0.14 | USD/kg |
| Southern Asia | 0.077 | - | USD/kg |
| South- Eastern Asia | | 0.14 | USD/kg |
| Western Africa | 0.057 | 0.08 | EUR/kg |

| | | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Worldwide (except regions with specific prices) | 0.08 | Does not exist now ¹ | USD/kg |
|---|------|---------------------------------|--------|

FP for “for processing”

Specific responses to each region FP are summarized in the Table 9 below.

Similar to FP for fresh mangoes:

- Some stakeholders express they would like to have a unique FP level for everyone (0.03 or 0.05 USD/kg).
- There is majority acceptance on the proposal on unifying the methodology for calculating the FP as the 15% of the FMP. But then the values proposed should be recalculated to the FMP finally recommended.
- FP applying to organic should be calculated on the conventional price, so those are both the same.

Consultation document question 23

Do you agree to all values proposed in Table 9?

The responses for question 23 are considered depending on whether the respondent is relevant or not to the corresponding region. In addition, information on the reported % Fairtrade Premium in the period between Q4 2017 and Q3 2018 is indicated as a weighing proxy on the responses received, this is a commercial activity proxy in the Fairtrade market in the past year.

Proposed prices for:

Central America, Mexico & Caribbean: the majority of relevant respondents (4) agreed to the proposed 0.057 USD/kg FP, whereas 3 respondents disagreed. The producers agree, and traders disagree one proposal mentioned an alternative 0.02. As mentioned in a previous question the traders participating in the consultation were mostly interested in “for processing”.

South America: the majority of relevant respondents (8) disagree with the proposed 0.050 USD/kg FP, and 6 respondents agreed. Some producers proposed 0.03 instead. Some disagree that the value is more than double for some cases (Peru for drying). The respondents in disagreement with the proposal reported higher Fairtrade Premium in the period mentioned than those in favour.

Southern Asia: the responses were equally divided in favour and against. Some indicate it should be percentage of the FOB price. Some propose 0.05 instead. The respondents in agreement with the proposal reported slightly higher Fairtrade Premium in the period mentioned than those in favour.

South-Eastern Asia: There is disagreement by producers with a FP lower than the previous value, but a trader states a decrease is needed of the current level.

Western Africa: the majority of relevant respondents (8) agree with the proposed 0.03 EUR/kg FP, which is equal to the current FP. Only 1 producer is against the proposal and indicates it should be higher.

¹ Only country with prices is South Africa (extension for Western African one into ZAR, so 0.08 EUR/kg)

Worldwide: the majority of stakeholders were not in favour of the worldwide price (18) while 10 respondents agreed with the proposal. For this question 11 responses were left blank, which leaves a considerable gap in responses. Only 3 other values were proposed: 0.03, 0.057 and 0.5.

Table 9 Proposed FP values (USD / KG) for Conventional Mangoes for processing, Price level= EXW, SPO/HL² for the defined regions

| Country/Region | Proposed FP | Current FP | Currency/ units |
|---|-------------|--|-----------------|
| Central America, Mexico & Caribbean | 0.057 | 0.01965 | USD/kg |
| South America | 0.050 | 0.01965 Peru for drying 0.03 for processing South America | USD/kg |
| Southern Asia | 0.042 | Totapuri 0.025 Kesar 0.045 Alphonso 0.055 | USD/kg |
| South- Eastern Asia | | 0.05 | USD/kg |
| Western Africa | 0.030 | 0.03 | EUR/kg |
| Worldwide (except regions with specific prices) | 0.045 | - | USD/kg |

MANGO pulp FMP and FP

Few stakeholders were able to answer to the specific more technical questions about the conversion factors and prices of the EXW price of the fresh mangoes for pulping. This is a challenging section as it was complicated and not fully understood. Nevertheless, as question 11 (on the elimination of Mango pulp FMP and FP) was mostly rejected, the answers are presented to the setting of a Mango pulp EXW (question 21). In the consultation it was not possible to come to calculations based on the formula proposed, and only 1 respondent indicated the price should be around 400-450 USD / kg of pulp (EXW).

Table 10 Relevant responses to Question 21 . Do you agree to set a unique worldwide price for Mango pulp at the EXW level?

| Stakeholder type | Questions 21 | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer and Trader | no | 1 | |
| | no | 2 | 0.15% |
| | yes | 1 | 9.39% |
| Trader | no | 1 | 0.71% |
| | no | 1 | 1.96% |
| | yes | 1 | 1.21% |
| | yes | 1 | 4.26% |
| FLOCERT/NFO | yes | 1 | 29.28% |
| TOTAL | Yes | 4 | 44.14% |
| | No | 5 | 2.82% |

For the FP for Mango pulp, there seems to be stronger agreement that the 15% calculated on the EXW is accepted by majority.

² HL organizations cannot sell "for drying" fruits and vegetables (except Ghana and South Africa).

Table 11 Relevant responses to Question 24 Do you agree to set a fix FP for mango pulp at the worldwide level only as 15% of the FMP value proposed before?.

| Stakeholder type | Question 24 | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer and Trader | no | 1 | |
| | yes | 2 | 0.15% |
| | yes | 1 | 9.39% |
| Trader | no | 1 | 0.71% |
| | n.a. | 1 | 1.96% |
| | n.a. | 1 | 1.21% |
| | Yes | 1 | 4.26% |
| FLOCERT/NFO | n.a. | 1 | 29.28% |
| | Yes | 4 | 13.80% |
| TOTAL | No | 2 | 0.71% |
| | n.a. | 3 | 32.45% |

Date of validity

Most of the stakeholders' preference on the date of validity is October 1st 2019 (21 responses), but the respondents that indicated beginning of next year (January 2020) actually have more transactions reported in Fairtrade.

Consultation document question 25

Which date of validity would you suggest for the new FMP and FP to be applied?

| Q25 Response | No Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|--|--------------|---|
| 1st October 2019 Total | 21 | 29.76% |
| Later, 1st December 2019 Total | 1 | 1.04% |
| Later, 1st January 2020 Total | 7 | 67.15% |
| None, never | 3 | 6.63% |
| Other answers (related to harvest, etc) | 4 | 11.57% |

ANNEX – Detailed tables

Question 18: Do you agree with the proposed values?

Proposed FMP values (USD / KG) for Conventional Mangoes Fresh,
Price level= EXW, for defined regions

| Country/Region | Proposed FMP | Currency/ units | Do you agree with the price |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---|
| Central America, Mexico & Caribbean | 0.62 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| South America | 0.56 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| Southern Asia | 0.51 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| South- Eastern Asia | | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| West Africa | 0.38 EUR | EUR/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| Worldwide (except regions with specific prices) | 0.53 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |

Question 19: Do you agree with the proposed values?

Proposed FMP values (USD / KG) for Conventional Mangoes for processing,
Price level= EXW, SPO/HL³ for the defined regions

| Country/Region | Proposed FMP | Currency/ units | Do you agree with the price |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|---|
| Central America, Mexico & Caribbean | 0.38 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| South America | 0.33 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| Southern Asia | 0.28 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| South- Eastern Asia | | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |

³ HL organizations cannot sell “for drying” fruits and vegetables (except Ghana and South Africa).

Fairtrade International – STANDARDS & PRICING

| | | | |
|---|-------------|--------|---|
| West Africa | 0.18 | EUR/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| Worldwide (except regions with specific prices) | 0.30 USD/kg | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |

Question 18 answers

| Stakeholder type | Q18 Central America, Mexico and Caribbean RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| Producer | yes, 0.62 | 2 | |
| Producer and Trader | no, lower | 1 | 0.15% |
| Trader | no, lower | 1 | |
| Fairtrade system | yes, 0.62 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q18 South America RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer | no, 0.70 | 2 | 17.25% |
| | no, 0.70 or more | 1 | 6.04% |
| | yes, 0.56 | 1 | 0.30% |
| | (blank) | 1 | 2.34% |
| Producer and Trader | no, 0.62 | 2 | 9.39% |
| | no, 1 | 1 | |
| Trader | no, 0.62 | 1 | |
| | no, 0.65 | 1 | 0.33% |
| | No, to any | 1 | 1.21% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 2.65% |

Question 19 answers:

| Stakeholder type | Q19 Central America, Mexico and Caribbean RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| Producer | yes, 0.38 | 2 | |
| Producer and Trader | No, 0.105 | 1 | 0.15% |
| Trader | No, 0.105 | 1 | |
| Fairtrade system | No, to any | 1 | |
| | No, USD 0.20 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q19 South America RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer | No, 0.265 | 1 | 16.24% |
| | No, 0.12 | 1 | 2.34% |
| | yes, 0.33 | 1 | 1.01% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 0.30% |
| | (blank) | 1 | 6.04% |
| Producer and Trader | No, 0.38 | 2 | 9.39% |
| | No, 0.90 | 1 | |
| Trader | No, 0.12 | 1 | 4.26% |
| | No, 0.38 | 1 | |
| | No, to any | 2 | 0.71% |

Fairtrade International – STANDARDS & PRICING

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|---|--------|
| | (blank) | 3 | 4.97% |
| Fairtrade system | yes, 0.56 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 7.87% |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|---|--------|
| | No, USD 0.20 | 1 | 1.21% |
| | yes, 0.33 | 1 | 0.33% |
| | (blank) | 1 | 2.65% |
| Fairtrade system | No, to any | 1 | |
| | yes, 0.33 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q18 Southern Asia RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer | yes, 0.51 | 2 | 2.32% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 3.38% |
| Producer and Trader | yes, all table | 1 | |
| Trader | yes, 0.51 | 1 | 0.71% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 2.65% |
| | (blank) | 2 | 3.17% |
| Fairtrade system | yes, 0.51 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q19 Southern Asia RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer | No, to any | 1 | 3.38% |
| | yes, 0.28 | 2 | 2.32% |
| Producer and Trader | No, to any | 1 | |
| Trader | No, 0.20 USD | 1 | 1.21% |
| | No, to any | 2 | 2.68% |
| | (blank) | 1 | 2.65% |
| Fairtrade system | No, different per variety | 1 | |
| | yes, 0.28 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q18 South-Eastern Asia RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer | No, to any | 1 | 1.04% |
| Trader | (blank) | 1 | 1.04% |

| Stakeholder type | Q19 South-Eastern Asia RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer | No, look comment | 1 | 1.04% |
| Trader | yes, 0.28 | 1 | 1.04% |

Fairtrade International – STANDARDS & PRICING

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|---|--------|
| Fairtrade system | yes, 0.51 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 7.87% |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|---|--------|
| Fairtrade system | No, to any | 1 | |
| | yes, 0.28 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q18 Western Africa RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer and Trader | no, 1 | 1 | |
| | no, lower | 1 | 0.15% |
| | (blank) | 1 | 6.48% |
| Trader | no, 0.26 | 1 | |
| | no, lower | 1 | |
| | No, to any | 1 | 0.77% |
| | yes, 0.38 | 1 | 5.04% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 2.65% |
| | (blank) | 2 | |
| Fairtrade system | No, to any | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q19 Western Africa RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer and Trader | No | 1 | |
| | No, 0.14 | 1 | 0.15% |
| | (blank) | 1 | 6.48% |
| Trader | No, 0.14 | 3 | 5.04% |
| | No, current levels | 1 | |
| | No, to any | 1 | 0.77% |
| | (blank) | 3 | 2.65% |
| Fairtrade system | No, to any | 1 | |
| | yes, 0.16 EUR/kg | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 7.87% |

Question 22: Do you agree with the proposed values?

Proposed FP values (USD / KG) for Conventional Mangoes Fresh,
Price level= EXW, for defined regions

| Country/Region | Proposed FP | Currency/ units | Do you agree with the price |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---|
| Central America, Mexico & Caribbean | 0.093 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| South America | 0.084 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| Southern Asia | 0.077 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| South- Eastern Asia | | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |

| | | | |
|---|-------|--------|---|
| West Africa | 0.057 | EUR/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| Worldwide (except regions with specific prices) | 0.080 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |

Question 23: Do you agree with the proposed values?

Proposed FP values (USD / KG) for Conventional Mangoes for processing,
Price level= EXW, SPO/HL⁴ for the defined regions

| Country/Region | Proposed FP | Currency/units | Do you agree with the price |
|---|-------------|----------------|---|
| Central America, Mexico & Caribbean | 0.057 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| South America | 0.050 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| Southern Asia | 0.042 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| South- Eastern Asia | | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| West Africa | 0.030 | EUR/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |
| Worldwide (except regions with specific prices) | 0.045 | USD/kg | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no, instead: |

Question 22 answers:

| Stakeholder type | Q22 Central America, Mexico and Caribbean RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| Producer | yes, 0.093 | 1 | 0.15% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | |
| Producer and Trader | (blank) | 1 | |
| Trader | (blank) | 1 | |

Question 23 answers:

| Stakeholder type | Q23 Central America, Mexico and Caribbean RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| Producer | yes, 0.057 | 1 | 0.15% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | |
| Producer and Trader | No, 0.02 | 1 | |
| Trader | No, 0.02 | 1 | |

⁴ HL organizations cannot sell “for drying” fruits and vegetables (except Ghana and South Africa).

Fairtrade International – STANDARDS & PRICING

| | | | |
|-------------|----------------|---|--------|
| FLOCERT/NFO | No, 0.08 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | No, to any | 1 | |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 7.87% |

| | | | |
|-------------|----------------|---|--------|
| FLOCERT/NFO | No, 0.05 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q22 South America RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer | No, 0.03 | 1 | 0.30% |
| | No, 0.14 | 2 | 17.25% |
| | No, to any | 1 | 2.34% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 6.04% |
| Producer and Trader | No, 0.05 | 1 | |
| | No, 0.093 | 2 | 9.39% |
| Trader | No, 0.02 | 1 | 4.26% |
| | No, 0.93 | 1 | |
| | No, to any | 2 | 1.92% |
| | yes, 0.084 | 1 | 0.33% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 2.65% |
| FLOCERT/NFO | No, 0.08 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | No, to any | 1 | |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q23 South America RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer | No, 0.02 | 1 | 2.34% |
| | No, 0.03 | 2 | 16.54% |
| | yes, 0.05 | 1 | 1.01% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 6.04% |
| Producer and Trader | No, 0.057 | 2 | 9.39% |
| | No, to any | 1 | |
| Trader | No, 0.02 | 1 | 4.26% |
| | No, 0.057 | 1 | |
| | No, to any | 2 | 1.92% |
| | yes, 0.05 | 1 | 0.33% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | |
| | (blank) | 1 | 2.65% |
| FLOCERT/NFO | No, 0.05 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q22 Southern Asia RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|

| Stakeholder type | Q23 Southern Asia RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|

Fairtrade International – STANDARDS & PRICING

| | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|---|--------|
| Producer | No, to any | 1 | 3.38% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 2.32% |
| | (blank) | 1 | |
| Producer and Trader | No, to any | 1 | |
| | No, to any | 2 | 1.92% |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 2.65% |
| | (blank) | 1 | 1.96% |
| FLOCERT/NFO | No, 0.08 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | No, to any | 1 | |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 7.87% |

| | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|---|--------|
| Producer | No, to any | 1 | |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 5.70% |
| Producer and Trader | No, to any | 1 | |
| | No, to any | 2 | 3.17% |
| | yes, 0.042 | 1 | 0.71% |
| FLOCERT/NFO | (blank) | 1 | 2.65% |
| | No, 0.05 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q22 South-Eastern Asia RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer | No, to any | 1 | 1.04% |
| | (blank) | 1 | 1.04% |
| FLOCERT/NFO | No, 0.08 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | No, to any | 1 | |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q23 South-Eastern Asia RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|------------------|---|-----------------|---|
| Producer | No, FP should not be lower than before. | 1 | 1.04% |
| | yes, 0.042 | 1 | 1.04% |
| FLOCERT/NFO | No, 0.05 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 7.87% |

Fairtrade International – STANDARDS & PRICING

| Stakeholder type | Q22 Western Africa RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer and Trader | kind of yes | 1 | 6.48% |
| | no, 0.076 | 1 | |
| | (blank) | 1 | 0.15% |
| Trader | No, to any | 1 | 0.77% |
| | yes, 0.057 | 1 | |
| | yes, all table | 3 | 7.69% |
| | (blank) | 3 | |
| FLOCERT/NFO | No, 0.06 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | No, to any | 1 | |
| | yes, all table | 1 | 7.87% |

| Stakeholder type | Q23 Western Africa RESPONSE | No of Responses | Sum of %PREMIUM % from Q4 2017 to Q3 2018 |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Producer and Trader | yes, 0.03 | 1 | 0.15% |
| | (blank) | 2 | 6.48% |
| Trader | No, to any | 1 | 0.77% |
| | yes, 0.03 | 2 | 5.04% |
| | yes, 0.03 (but organic kept the same) | 1 | |
| | yes, all table | 2 | |
| | (blank) | 2 | 2.65% |
| FLOCERT/NFO | No, 0.03 | 1 | 29.28% |
| | yes, all table | 2 | 7.87% |

