Indonesian Coffee Development Path: Production and International Trade

ABSTRACT

Aims: The objectives of this study are (i) to compare Indonesia's coffee production efficiency among the top five world coffee-producing countries, (ii) to analyze Indonesia's coffee competitiveness against major world coffee producers in the international market, and (iii) to analyze Indonesia's coffee export structure based on unit price of export price to determine profitable differentiation of export destinations.

Methodology:A descriptive comparative analysis was conducted on coffee productivity (kg/ha) in the major coffee-producing countries and on the export unit price (USD/ton) received by Indonesia and other exporting countries.To reveal the comparative advantage of Indonesian coffee in the global market, Symmetry Revealed Comparative Advantage (RSCA) is employed, and GL-Index is utilized as an analysis tool for export destination differentiation.

Results: The results of this study are (i) Indonesian coffee production is very low due to various factors, including production techniques that do not apply innovation to increase production, (ii) the composition of production is dominated by Robusta Coffee which is known to get a lower price than Arabica Coffee, (iii) exports are in the form of low-quality products so that they attain a meager unit price even though Indonesian coffee has competitiveness with SRCA> 0, and (iv) GL-Index analysis shows that the most profitable export destinations for Indonesian coffee are to the United States and Australia and New Zealand, while contrary to what has been assumed, exports to West Europe, Northeast Asia and Middle East and North Africa do not show conclusive results while ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) is not a profitable export destination.

Conclusion: Indonesian coffee needs to be improved at various supply chain stages, especially at the production and export levels. Appropriate policies to address the weaknesses of Indonesia's coffee position have the potential to catch up with the existing productivity and export gaps.

1. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia's agricultural sector plays three strategic roles in the economy [1]: (i) providing food for the community to realize food security, (ii) providing employment, and (iii) reducing poverty. 27.68 million Indonesian households earn income from managing farms [2], which employs 40.69 million people. In the last decade, the agricultural sector's contribution (farm level) to GDP was around 13%, with a downward trend. However, learning from the experience of industrialized countries such as the United States, the contribution of the agricultural sector along with related sectors such as the food industry and culinary services,

23 as well as marketing of products and distribution of production inputs and equipment can
24 reach ten times the GDP of the primary agricultural sector [3].
25
26 Analysis by subsector shows that in the last decade, the plantation subsector has become
27 the main contributor to the agricultural sector GDP, previously led by the food crop
28 subsector. The contribution of the plantation subsector is between 28 and 30%, while the
29 contribution of the food crop subsector is between 20% and 26%, with a declining trend [4].
30
31 Coffee is one of the leading commodities of Indonesia's plantation subsector, along with
32 Palm Oil, Rubber, and Cocoa. FAO [5] shows Indonesia is the world's fourth-largest coffee
33 producer after Brazil, Vietnam, and Columbia. Globally, coffee is one of the most traded
34 agricultural commodities in the world [6], and according to [7], the demand for coffee is
35 growing.
36
37 Smallholder farmers produce more than 95% of Indonesian coffee with an average area of
38 0.6 ha ([8]; [9]; [10]; [11]; [12]; [13]) which is a source of income for nearly two million
39 households ([14]; [13]). Assuming each household consists of at least four individuals, coffee
40 generates income for at least eight million people. Thus, developing coffee agribusiness will
41 contribute significantly to welfare improvement or poverty alleviation in rural Indonesia.
42
43 World Coffee Research [13] believes that the Indonesian government pays less attention to
44 coffee as a commodity due to more significant palm oil and rubber exports to the economy,
45 while public investment in research and development of food crops takes center stage. As a
46 result, Indonesia is known as a producer of lower-quality Robusta Coffee [14], and
47 Indonesia's export market share declined by almost 40% between 2009 and 2018 [[9].
48
49 Various studies have shown a close link between exports and economic growth, which gave
50 rise to the export-led growth hypothesis [15] verified in both developed and developing
51 countries (e.g., [16]; [17]; [18]). For Indonesia, this hypothesis applies nationally ([19]; [20];
52 [21]) as well as in provinces such as North Sumatra [22], East Java [23], and South Sulawesi
53 [24]. The effect of exports as a driver of economic growth will be more significant if a country
54 diversifies its exports, in the sense of increasing exports of commodities with high-added
55 value replacing low-quality commodities ([25]; [26]; [27]).
56
57 The coffee value chain is complex, due to the following factors ([14]; [6]; [28]; [13]): (i) coffee
58 goes through a large number of production stages and many actors are involved along these
59 stages, (ii) coffee is mainly produced in developing countries while most of it is consumed in
60 industrialized countries (representing vertical value chains or North-South linkages), (iii) an
61 increasing number of non-producing countries participate in coffee exports, (iv) the global
62 value chain for coffee is dominated by a small number of critical companies all based in
63 Western Europe or the United States, and (v) the global value chain for coffee is dominated
64 by a small number of significant companies all based in Western Europe or the United
65 States, and (v) the global value chain for coffee is dominated by a small number of
66 significant companies all based in Western Europe or the United States, the major
67 companies based in Western Europe or North America, and (v) increasing inequality in the
68 global coffee value chain in the form of the share of total revenues increasingly shifting in
69 favor of consuming countries (in the 1980s producing countries still controlled 20% of total
70 revenues and consuming countries 55%, in the 1990s the share of total revenues accruing
71 to producing countries fell to 13% while in consuming countries it increased to 78%). Large
72 global roasting companies have dominated the coffee market to such an extent that they
73 control the entire value chain and impose product and process standards that suppliers
74 elsewhere must adhere to [14]. In response to global coffee market conditions, [14] and [12]
75 advocate increasing productivity and improving quality in the sense of product upgrading

76 rather than functional upgrading, while [11] make diversification of market destinations a
77 policy option to increase export value which will lead to an increase in coffee farmers'
78 income.
79
80 This research aims to analyze Indonesia's position in the global market from the production
81 stage to the trade of production products. In detail, the research objectives include (i)
82 comparing Indonesia's coffee production efficiency with that of significant world coffee
83 producers, (ii) analyzing Indonesia's coffee competitiveness against major world coffee
84 producers in the international market, and (iii) analyzing Indonesia's coffee export structure
85 based on export price per unit as a basis for determining profitable export destinations.
86
87 **2. METHODOLOGY**
88
89 Indonesia's position in coffee production among world coffee producers can be assessed by
90 comparing coffee farm productivity (kg/ha). In contrast, the position of Indonesian coffee
91 among other exporting countries' products can be observed by comparing the unit price
92 earned. Productivity information can be obtained from FAO, and unit price data is available
93 from UNComtrade. UNComtrade refers coffee and its derivatives (processed products) into
94 the harmonized system with the code HS-0901.
95
96 The competitiveness of a product in the export market (local, country, region, and world) can
97 be assessed with various analytical techniques/methods [29]. One popular analytical tool is
98 RCA (revealed comparative advantage), which was first introduced by Balassa in 1965. This
99 technique is widely used because the required data is easy to obtain, and the data
100 processing is simple. An export commodity with RCA > 1 indicates that the commodity has a
101 comparative advantage in the export destination market [30]. From the original Balassa RCA
102 formula, [31] inventoried nine modifications/variations. [32] outlined various alternatives for
103 improving the ability to measure RCA that has been developed since the 1980s, such as (i)
104 the Lafaye index, (ii) the symmetric RCA index, (iii) the weighted RCA index, (iv) the additive
105 RCA index, and (v) the normalized RCA (NRCA). In this research, the index used is
106 symmetric RCA (SRCA). The symmetric RCA index is a modification of Balassa's RCA,
107 which aims to ensure that the range of values obtained is between -1 and +1, provided that
108 SRCA > 0 indicates that the observed export commodity has a comparative advantage in the
109 export destination market. In contrast, a value smaller than zero indicates no
110 competitiveness. This comparative advantage index is formulated in equation (1).
111
112   SRCA = (RCA – 1)/(RCA + 1)   (1)
113 Meanwhile, RCA is obtained by formula (2):
114

115 $RCA = \dfrac{Xij\,/Xit}{Xnj\,/Xnt} = \dfrac{Xij\,/Xnj}{Xit\,/Xnt}$ (2)

116
117 Where X denotes export value, i is the exporting country, j is the observed export
118 commodity, t is the set of commodities, and n is the countries. For Indonesian coffee exports
119 in the world market applies:
120 Xij = Indonesia's coffee export value Xnj = world's coffee export value
121 Xit = Indonesia's total export value for all goods Xnt = world's total export value for all
122 goods
123
124 This study applies the product differentiation analysis approach to export market/country
125 destination differentiation. Product differentiation analysis derives from the view that export
126 quality is reflected in the value or price received. Products in the form of raw materials will
127 receive a lower/cheaper price than intermediate goods, which are processed from raw
128 materials and will be further processed into final goods. Final goods, which are consumer

goods, receive a higher price than intermediate goods. Therefore, an increase in export quality can be read from the unit price of the product in question. In intra-industry trade, the pattern of product differentiation can be seen where the position of a product is seen by comparing the export unit price to the import unit price of the same type of product. The comparison of unit prices will result in horizontal intra-industry trade (IIT) categories (the quality of export products is relatively the same as the quality of imported products) and vertical IIT, where the quality of export products is higher than the quality of imported products. Vertical IIT indicates, among other things, that imported products are raw materials or semi-finished goods. At the same time, exports are final goods/consumer goods that have undergone processing and added value. Suppose the proportion of vertical IIT increases over time. In that case, it means that the exports of the observed commodity have experienced a structural change in the form of an increase in export quality. Product differentiation analysis was introduced by [33] as formula (3).

$$1-\alpha \leq \frac{UV_j^x}{UV_j^m} \leq 1+\alpha \quad (3)$$

The ratio $\frac{UV_j^x}{UV_j^m}$ is the GL-Index, which refers to Grubel and Lloyd, who introduced it in 1975 [34]. Product differentiation is denoted by α. Traded products are considered similar (horizontal IIT) if the value per unit of exports (UV_j^x) and the value per unit of imports (UV_j^m) differ by less than α. The value of α is not uniformly determined but varies between 15% and 25%. Researchers who use $\alpha = 15\%$ include [33], [35], and [36], while researchers who use $\alpha = 25\%$ include [37] and [38]. Studies with $\alpha = 15\%$ are generally conducted within the region, such as [34] for ASEAN and [38] for Malaysia-Singapore neighbor trade. Implicitly, trade within a region covers shorter distances with lower transportation costs. This study uses $\alpha = 25\%$ because the scope of the study is global with a distance beyond the ASEAN region, so transportation costs are significant in the unit value of exports. By using the 25% threshold, the value ratio in formula (3) will result in three categories of intra-industry trade:

(i) $\frac{UV_j^x}{UV_j^m} \leq 0.75$, countries faced exporting low-quality commodities.

(ii) $\frac{UV_j^x}{UV_j^m} \geq 1.25$, countries enjoy exporting high-quality commodities (vertical IIT).

(iii) $0.75 \leq \frac{UV_j^x}{UV_j^m} \leq 1.25$, intra-industry trade is horizontal.

Countries that experience structural change in their export sector will experience an increase in the proportion of higher-quality exports ($\frac{UV_j^x}{UV_j^m} \geq 1.25$) from year to year.

In this study, the export destination country is a source of differentiation, given that the world coffee trade pattern separates the position of high-income countries, namely European and North American countries, as exporters of roasted coffee and instant coffee, while countries with lower incomes supply coffee beans [6]. Regarding this provision, the export destination countries that provide benefits for Indonesia are those with $\frac{UV_j^x}{UV_j^m} \geq 1.25$, which UV_j^x is the weighted average of Indonesia's coffee import value and UV_j^m is the unit price in the export destination country in the year of observation.

3.   Results and discussion
3.1.   Overview of Indonesian Coffee Production and Exports

Indonesia's coffee production has shown an increasing trend since 2010. In contrast to the global production composition where Arabica is 60% and Robusta 40%, Indonesian coffee production is dominated by Robusta (80%) while Arabica is less than 20%. In general, Arabica coffee is known to be of higher quality and therefore commands a higher market price than Robusta coffee ([14]; [39]). Indonesian Arabica coffee mainly originating from North Sumatra and Aceh is a specialty in the global market with its trademarks Gayo, Lintong, and Mandheling. Unlike Indonesian Robusta Coffee, Indonesian Arabica Coffee has a strong international reputation for high quality. Export markets for Indonesian Arabica tend to be more stable than Robusta and are dominated by developed markets in North America, Western Europe, and Northeast Asia ([14]; [40]). In contrast to other coffee-producing countries, in the last five years, Indonesia's coffee production has been consumed domestically rather than exported (figure 1).

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
■ Production	648	638.6	691.1	675.8	643.9	639.4	639.3	717.9	756	752.5	762.4	765.4	794.8
■ Export	432.7	346	447	532	382.7	499.6	412.4	464.2	277.4	355.8	375.5	384.5	433.8

Figure 1. Development of Indonesian Coffee Production and Exports 2010-2022 (in 000 tons).

Various studies reveal that Indonesia produces very low productivity per hectare (e.g., [8]; [14]; [12]). The productivity of Vietnam (ranked 2nd as the world's coffee producer) is four times that of Indonesia, while China (ranked 14th) records five times the productivity. Even with Malaysia (the 48th world coffee producer), Indonesia's productivity is only 26.79% (Table 1). Indonesia relies on land area in production, not average production per hectare. The same agricultural pattern has made Indonesia the highest palm oil and rubber producer. However, the productivity of oil palm fresh fruit bunches and latex is far below Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam. Recently, the allocation of agricultural production in Asia has followed a labor-intensive and land-intensive pattern, with China relying on labor to produce vegetables and fruits on a small land area. In contrast, Indonesia, India, Thailand, and Malaysia rely on the land area to produce plantation and grain products such as palm oil, rubber, and rice [41]. The causes of low productivity of Indonesian coffee include (i) natural climate factors, (ii) pests and diseases, (iii) limited use of fertilizer, (iv) lack of pruning, (v) poor planting material and aging stock, (vi) shade-grown coffee (dense canopy of shade), and (vii) diversified livelihoods ([14]; [42]; [7]).

Table 1. Coffee Productivity in Major Producing Countries of the World (2020).

No.	Producing	Production	Area (ha)	Productivity

	Country	(ton)		(kg/ha)
1	Brazil	3 009 402	1 823 403	1 650.4
2	Vietnam	1 683 971	622 637	2 704.3
2	Colombia	885 120	853 700	1 036.8
4	Indonesia	760 963	1 258 032	604.9
5	Ethiopia	482 561	758 523	636.2
6	Honduras	476 345	420 957	1 131.6
7	Peru	363 291	359 508	1 010.5
8	India	319 500	416 741	766.7
9	Uganda	254 088	469 364	541.3
10	Guatemala	225 000	308 217	730.0
11	Nicaragua	174 000	180 416	964.4
12	Laos	165 888	87 817	1 889.0
13	Mexico	165 712	629 300	263.3
14	China	120 000	39 607	3 029.8
15	Costarica	84 096	93 697	897.5
Other ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) members:				
18	The Philippines	64 044	112 024	536.0
30	Thailand	24 614	36 804	668.8
40	Myanmar	8 769	12 772	686.6
48	Malaysia	3 559	1 576	2 258.2
59	Cambodia	384	408	941.2

214 Source: Authors calculation according to FAO (https://fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QCL)

216 Table 2 shows the main world coffee exporters and the price per unit of export (US$/ton) for
217 2022. The information in the table supports the view that the world coffee market is
218 asymmetric with the emergence of exporting countries that are not producing countries.
219 Germany, Italy, and Belgium are not coffee growers but rank in the top 10 as significant
220 exporters. If expanded to the top 20 exporters in the world, the Netherlands, the United
221 States, Switzerland, Canada, Spain, and Poland would be included. These non-producing
222 exporting countries generally receive a higher price per unit than the average price per unit
223 of exports of producing countries, which indicates that the exporting countries, which are
224 generally developed countries, import coffee beans as raw materials and re-export them
225 after processing in a vertical IIT pattern. The United States, Germany, France, Italy, Belgium,
226 Canada, Japan, the Netherlands, and Spain are the world's top 10 coffee importers (import
227 to export, according to [43]. In 2023, the global coffee market generated a sales value of
228 US$ 88.3 billion, of which US$ 11000 was enjoyed by the United States as the country with
229 the most considerable revenue [28].

231 The unit price of Indonesian coffee exports is among the lowest on the world market,
232 together with Vietnamese and Indian products, supporting the view that the quality of exports
233 is very low, in the sense that only simple processing is directly exported (coffee bean with
234 HS code 090111 according to the UNComtrade harmonized system). Switzerland, Canada,
235 the United States, Italy, Poland, the Netherlands, and Germany process these intermediate
236 goods into final products. They can sell them on the world market at three to 30 times the
237 price (roasted coffee and roasted and decaffeinated, HS-090121 and HS-090122).

243 **Table 2. Volume and Unit Price of Coffee Exports by Exporting Country (2022).**

No.	Exporting Country	Volume (ton)	Price (US$/ton)	Producing Country Rank
1	Brazil	2 135 446	4 000	1
2	Vietnam	1 343 221	2 408	2
3	Columbia	640 575	6 390	3
4	Germany	568 704	5 967	-
5	Indonesia	437 954	2 624	4
6	Honduras	323 396	5 307	6
7	Italy	310 134	7 637	-
8	Belgium	307 273	4 778	-
9	Uganda	288 218	2 821	9
10	Ethiopia	273 804	5 527	5
11	India	271 291	2 804	8
12	Peru	237 235	5 011	7
13	Guatemala	194 021	5 752	10
14	Netherlands	164 615	6 747	-
15	Nicaragua	156 889	4 567	11
16	United States	149 653	8 014	-
17	Swizerland	109 409	31 279	-
18	Canada	84 679	10 051	-
19	Spanyol	78 903	4 865	-
20	Poland	71 438	7 184	-

Source: Authors' calculation based on UNComtrade data (https://intracen.org/resources/data-and-analysis/trade-statistics).

3.2. Structure of Indonesia's Coffee Trade

At all times Indonesia posted a surplus on the coffee commodity trade balance. In line with the fluctuating export value, as shown in Figure 1, the surplus value also shows fluctuations (Table 3).

Table 3. The Indonesian Coffee Trade Balance, 2010 - 2022 (in US$).

Year	Export	Import	Balance
2010	814311	34852	779459
2011	1036671	49119	987552
2012	1249519	117196	1132323
2013	1174044	38838	1135206
2014	1039609	46768	992841
2015	1197733	31492	1166241
2016	1008549	48473	960076
2017	1187157	33583	1153574
2018	817789	155778	662011
2019	883123	66186	816937
2020	821937	38280	783657
2021	858558	32694	825864
2022	1149168	60789	1088379

Source: Author's calculation based on UNComtrade data.

259 Almost all of Indonesia's coffee exports are coffee beans, processed from coffee cherries, by
260 removing the coffee skin and packing them in dry conditions. Less than 2% of exports are in
261 the form of further processed products such as roasted and decaffeinated coffee. The
262 difference in selling price of coffee bean and roasted coffee, as well as roasted and
263 decaffeinated, is very substantial, ranging from 2270 - 4354 $/ton, 8581-10,487 $/ton, and
264 10916 - 14247 $/ton, respectively. In the last 12 years, roasted coffee has increased
265 Indonesia's exports and imports. Therefore, the trade balance for this type of coffee has only
266 sometimes posted a surplus, as seen in Table 4.

268 All five major coffee-producing countries export coffee in the form of coffee beans (HS-
269 090111), and all five countries have a comparative advantage in this product category. For
270 further processed products such as roasted coffee (HS-090121), only Columbia has a
271 comparative advantage, and Ethiopia has shown a comparative advantage in the last three
272 years. Using the SRCA criterion, the comparative advantage of Indonesian coffee exports is
273 always lower than that of Columbia, Ethiopia, Brazil, and Vietnam. The comparative
274 advantages of Ethiopia, Columbia, and Brazil have been relatively stable at high levels, while
275 Vietnam has experienced a continuous decline in competitiveness since 2014 (Figure 2).

277 **Table 4. Comparison of Indonesia's Green Coffee and Roasted Coffee Trade Balance,**
278 **2010-2022 (in US$).**

| Year	Coffee Bean			Roasted Coffee		
	Export	Import	Balance	Export	Import	Balance
2010	812360	32182	780178	1233	2535	-1302
2011	1034725	45456	989269	1142	3524	-2382
2012	1243826	112973	1130853	4216	3571	645
2013	1166189	34278	1131911	7501	4493	3008
2014	1030716	41284	989432	8505	4408	4097
2015	1189550	27435	1162115	7851	3979	3872
2016	1000620	44172	956448	7346	4209	3137
2017	1175547	27315	1148232	11361	6112	5249
2018	808735	147123	661612	7812	8287	-475
2019	872355	55729	816626	9136	9876	-740
2020	809164	31478	777686	9671	6669	3002
2021	849373	25338	824035	6584	7266	-682
2022	1136296	49810	1086486	9336	10655	-1319

281 Source: Author's calculation using UNComtrade data.

Figure 2. Comparative Advantage of Indonesian, Brazilian, Columbian, and Vietnamese Coffee Exports (SRCA Index).

Source: Author's calculation based onUNComtrade data.

Indonesia's coffee imports are beans from three countries: Vietnam, Brazil, and Timor Leste. These three countries contribute, on average, 92% of imports, with Vietnam as the leading supplier with a proportion of 65%. As for exports, the destination countries of coffee bean exports are more diverse, with the share of exports to the five main destinations being less than 50% and the ten central destination countries absorbing 70% of the export volume. By comparing the value of Indonesia's coffee bean exports to various destination countries in North America, Europe, Australia, East Asia, and ASEAN against the average import value from primary import sources, it can be observed that high GL-Index values are obtained in trade with North America and Australia and New Zealand. Exports to Europe, Arabia, and East Asia show non-uniform results (exports to South Korea always receive a GL-Index above 1.25, but to China and Japan are more often below 1.25). ASEAN is not a profitable export destination for Indonesia's coffee beans because GL-Index values are smaller than unity (Table 5).

Referring to the results that have been presented, Indonesia's coffee development potential is still tremendous both in terms of production and in terms of international trade. The productivity lag per hectare of land is still substantial at the farm level. Therefore, production can still be increased through certain aspects of cultivation by applying cropping techniques that support increased production, such as the gradual rejuvenation of old plants with new plants with productivity advantages. In addition to applying innovations in the production process, Indonesia also needs to adapt the production process to global trends, such as the emphasis on sustainability aspects in the context of the green economy (Nelson, 2013; Ahn et al., 2019; ICO, 2020; Siles et al., 2022). In the context of replanting to replace aging stock, the composition of Arabica Coffee can be increased from the current 20% to at least balance with Robusta Coffee, given the higher selling price of Arabica Coffee in the international market (Nelson, 2013; Zang et al., 2020; ICO, 2023).

At the post-harvest level (downstream sector), the potential for developing Indonesian coffee exports can be pursued through two different aspects: (i) improving the downstream product process by processing coffee beans into roasted coffee, which requires specific technology and human resource capabilities. The value-added will be even higher if the processing of coffee beans can be increased to decaffeinated coffee, either roasted or in bean form, and

323 (ii) selection of export markets. Coffee consumers have diverse and unique tastes.
324 Therefore, understanding the character of coffee in high demand in export destination
325 countries is very critical so that the processing of coffee beans into derivative products can
326 be tailored to the tastes of consumers willing to pay higher prices. The GL-Index value
327 indicated that Indonesian coffee is highly favored in North America and Australia-New
328 Zealand, less favored in ASEAN, and received different responses in Europe, the Middle
329 East, and East Asia.
330
331 For export development in the form of diversification of export destinations, further research
332 is needed that is more specific and individualized. In addition to the macroeconomic
333 characteristics of destination as well as exporting countries that affect coffee consumption
334 such as income per capita, population, distance, trade openness, and foreign direct
335 investments [e.g. 45], it is necessary to understand the interest profile of coffee drinkers in
336 destination countries. An inventory of coffee profiles preferred by consumers of destination
337 countries such as the Middle East [46] and European countries [47] will provide information
338 for coffee producers to formulate coffee that is specific to the export destination country
339 bothregionally and country individually. Thus, coffee is no longer seen as a mass product but
340 is treated like a branded product in the fashion world that is unique and aimed at individual
341 consumers, popular with peer-to-peer marketing. The characteristics of peer-to-peer markets
342 from the consumer side are easy for buyers to find sellers and engage in convenient,
343 trustworthy transactions, and from the producer side, these markets enable entry by small or
344 flexible   suppliers   [48].

345

346 **Table 5. GL-Index Value of Indonesian Coffee Bean Exports to Various Destination Countries by Region.**

347

Year	USA	Canada	Germany	Italy	UEA	Egypt	Australia	N. Zealand	Japan	China	Singapore	Malaysia
2010	1.68	2.23	1.02	0.97	1.24	0.95	1.40	2.31	1.21	1.10	0.95	0.85
2011	2.21	2.72	1.03	0.82	1.06	0.93	1.34	2.44	1.15	0.93	0.93	0.83
2012	2.19	2.95	1.06	1.03	1.21	1.00	1.48	2.92	1.31	1.03	1.63	0.94
2013	1.39	1.78	0.90	0.90	1.00	0.90	1.19	1.95	1.09	0.83	1.14	0.81
2014	2.28	2.61	1.00	0.92	1.13	0.93	1.54	2.62	1.11	0.97	1.24	0.84
2015	1.88	2.24	0.81	0.86	1.02	0.83	1.32	2.26	1.12	0.93	1.43	0.77
2016	2.24	2.78	1.18	1.03	1.33	1.09	1.83	2.83	1.37	1.30	1.25	0.96
2017	1.73	2.25	0.99	0.89	1.13	0.94	1.39	2.26	1.19	0.87	1.11	0.84
2018	2.57	3.11	1.73	1.02	1.27	1.03	2.55	3.15	1.47	1.95	1.64	0.94
2019	2.34	3.05	1.31	0.92	1.15	0.93	2.03	2.91	1.45	1.60	1.72	0.88
2020	1.82	2.44	1.14	0.80	1.03	0.83	1.14	2.29	1.17	1.51	0.97	0.75
2021	1.72	2.22	1.16	0.88	1.14	0.94	1.35	2.22	1.22	1.52	0.91	0.86
2022	1.45	2.05	0.66	0.62	0.79	0.66	1.40	1.74	0.95	0.96	0.95	0.62

348

349 Source: Authors' calculation based on UNComtrade data.

350

351 Note: A GL-Index value of ≥ 1.25 indicates that the export price in the destination country is higher than the import price of Indonesian coffee for the

352   same   product   category.

4. Conclusion

The study concluded that Indonesian coffee at various stages of the supply chain has shortcomings, including (i) Indonesia's coffee production per hectare is far below the coffee productivity of the world's major coffee-producing countries, (ii) 80 percent of Indonesia's coffee production is of the Robusta variety, which is well known to be of lower quality and therefore priced below the price of arabica coffee, (iii) like other major coffee producers, Indonesia exports processed coffee beans that will become raw materials for the advanced coffee processing industry to produce roasted coffee and decaffeinated coffee, which receive enormous value-added.

It is recommended that Indonesian coffee farmers, 95% of whom are smallholders, receive guidance/counseling in cultivation techniques to increase productivity. In addition, it is necessary to replant old coffee plants by increasing the proportion of Arabica Coffee to at least equal the proportion of Robusta Coffee. At the post-harvest stage, in addition to improving processing into roasted or decaffeinated coffee, it is necessary to identify export destination countries. Export promotion should focus on countries or regions that favor Indonesian coffee and are willing to pay a higher price per unit. Therefore, coffee can no longer be treated as a mass product but as a branded product in the fashion world that is unique and personalized. The relevant approach for such a highly specific product is peer-to-peer markets.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

The first author designed the study, performed analysis, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors read, addedcomments to improve, and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Ministry of Agriculture, Republic of Indonesia. Rencanastrategiskementerianpertanian 2020-2024. Jakarta: Ministry of Agriculture; 2020. Retrieved, August 20, 2022, Available at https://rb.pertanian.go.id/upload/file/ RENSTRA%20KEMENTAN%202020-2024%20REVISI%202%20 (26%20Agt%202021).pdf. Indonesian.
2. Statistic Agency of Indonesia (BPS). Hasil survey pertanianantarsensus 2018 (Results of inter-census agricultural survey 2018). Jakarta: BPS; 2019. Retrieve, Oktober 25, available at https://www.bps.go.id/id/publication/2019/10/31/9567dfb39bd984aa45124b40/hasil-survei-pertanian-antar-sensus--sutas--2018-seri-a2.html. Indonesian.
3. Tampubolon, J. Food and agricultural sector in Indonesia's economic growth during COVID-19 pandemic: an ARDL approach. Agricultural and Resource Economics. 2023; 9(2): 223-244.
4. Bank of Indonesia. Statistik Ekonomi dan Keuangan Indonesia (Indonesian economic and financial statistics). Jakarta: Bank Indonesia; 2023. Database. Retrieve, November 3, 2023, available at https://www.bi.go.id/en/statistik/ekonomi-keuangan/seki/
5. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. FAOSTAT; 2023. Database. Retrieved July 1, 2023, Available: https: //www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QCL.
6. Uttila-Catalan R, Rodriguez-Rivero R, Narvaez V, Diaz-Barcos V, Blanco M, Galeano J. Growing inequality in the coffee global value chain: a complex network assessment. Sustainability. 2022; 14, 672.

7. Siles P, Cerdan CR, Staver C. Smallholder coffee in the global economy: a framework to explore transformation alternatives of traditional agroforestry for greater economic, ecological, and livelihood viability. Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems. 2022; 6, 8080207.

8. Ibrahim HW, Zailani S. A review on the competitiveness of global supply chain in a coffee industry in Indonesia. International Business Management. 2010; 4, 105-115.

9. Darmawan A, Surachman A, Hurriyati R, Hendrayati H. Factors affected the decline of Indonesian coffee competitiveness in export market during 2009-2018. Advance in Economic, Business and Management Research. 2020; 187, 175-179.

10. Pratiti DG, Budiarto R. Comparative advantage and export performance of Indonesia and Vietnam Coffee to the US market during 2001-2019. Agroekonomika. 2021; 10(2): 137-144.

11. Fitriani, Arifin B, Ismono H. Indonesian coffee exports and its relation to global market integration. Journal of Socioeconomics and Development. 2021; 4(1): 120-133.

12. Wambua DM, Gichimu BM, Ndirangu SN. Smallholder coffee productivity as affected by socioeconomic factors and technology adoption. Hindawi International Journal of Agronomy. 2021; 8852371.

13. World Coffee Research. Focus country: Indonesia. 2023. Accessed August 22, 2023, available at https://worldcoffeeresearch.org/focus-country/indonesia.

14. Nelson J. The value chain for Indonesian coffee in a green economy. Buletin RISTRI. 2013; 4(3): 183-198.

15. Kǒnya L. Export-led growth, growth-driven export, both or none ? Granger causality analysis on OECD countries. Applied Econometrics and International Development. 2004; 4(1): 73-94.

16. Yang J. An analysis of so-called export-led growth. IMF Working Paper, WP/08/220. 2008. Retrieved July 24, 2020, available at https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2016/12/31/An-Analysis-of-So-Called-Export-led-Growth-22240.

17. Bosupen M. The export-led growth hypothesis: new evidence and implication. MPRA Paper No. 77917. 2015. Retrieve August 24, 2019, available at https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/77917/.

18. Kristjanpoller W, Olson JE, Salazar RI. Does the commodity boom support the export-led growth hypothesis ? Evidence from Latin America countries. Latin America Economic Review. 2016; 25(6): 1-13.

19. Febiansya PT. Indonesia's FDI-Exports-GDP growth nexus: trade or investment-driven ? Bulletin of Monetary Economic and Banking. 2017; 19(4): 469-488.

20. Tampubolon J, Adelakun OJ. The role of domestic demand in Indonesian Economic Growth. Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology. 2021; 54(10): 266-284.

21. Hodijah S, Angelina GP. Analisispengaruhekspor dan importerhadapterhadappertumbuhanekonomi di Indonesia. JurnalManajemenTerapan dan Keuangan. 2021; 10(1): 53-62. Indonesian.

22. Tampubolon J, Loh A. The effect of domestic demand and export on economic growth of North Sumatra. Jurnal Ekonomi dan Studi Pembangunan (JESP). 2020; 12(2): 108-126.

23. Asiyan S. Pengaruhpenanam modal dalam negeri, penanaman modal asing, dan eksporterhadappertumbuhanekonomi Jawa Timur. JUPE. 2013; 1(3): 1-18. Indonesian.

24. Zulkifli Z. Kontribusiinvestasi dan eksporterhadappertumbuhanekonomi di Propinsi Sulawesi Selatan. Ecces. 2017; 4(2): 163-178. Indonesian.

25. Hausmann R, Hwang J, Rodrik D. What you export matters. Journal of Economic Growth. 2007; 12(1): 1 – 25.

26. Vos R. What we do and don't know about trade liberalization and poverty reduction. UN/DESA Working Paper No. 50. 2007. Retrieved August 22, 2020, available at https://www.un.org/en/development/ desa/policy/organigramme/wp50_2007.pdf.

27. Huchet-Bourdon M, Le Mouel C, Vijil M. The relationship between trade openness and economic growth: some new sights on the openness measurement issue. The World Economy. 2018; 41(1): 59-76.

28. Statista. Database. Coffee market worldwide-statistics & fact. Access on October 25, 2023, available at https://www.statista.com/topics/5945/coffee-market-worldwide/#topicOverview.

29. Tampubolon J. Perdagangan dan bisnisinternasional: teori dan analisisempiris. Yogyakarta: Deepublish. 2020. Indonesian.

30. Tampubolon J. RCA analysis with selected products to enhance prediction power of competitiveness. JESP. 2019; 11(2): 143-157.

31. Utkulu U, Seymen D. Revealed comparative advantage and competitiveness: evidence for Turkey vis-à-vis the EU/15. The 6th Annual Conference, ETSG, Nottingham, September 2004. Retrieved June 20, 2019, available at https://www.etsg.org/ETSG2004/Papers/seymen.pdf

32. Sanidas E, Shin Y. Comparison of revealed comparative advantage indices with application to trade tendencies of East Asian countries. Seoul: Seoul National University. 2010. Available at http://www.akes.or.kr/eng/papers%282010%29/24.full.pdf

33. Abd-el-Rahman K. Firms competitive and national comparative advantages as joint determinants of trade composition. WeltwirtschaftichesArchiv. 1991;127(1), 83–97. Retrieved September 11, 2019, available at https://www.digizeitschriften.de/ dms/im-g/?PID=PPN345575296_0127 %7Clog9, accessed September 11, 2019.

34. Tampubolon J, Nababan TS. ASEAN's factory economy in the fourth industrial revolution era. Ekonomikaregiona [Economy of regions]. 2022; 18(1), 49-63.

35. Leitao NC, Faustino HC, Yoshida Y. Fragmentation, vertical intra-industry trade, and automobile components. Economics Bulletin. 2010; 30(2): 1006–1015.

36. Sureci Y, Tahiri YG, Tahiri Y. Measurement of vertical and horizontal intra-industry trade in agricultural food products: the case of China and Brazil. Journal of Academic Social Science Studies. 2016; 45, 145–154.

37. Fontagne L, Freudenberg M, Gaulier G. Disentangling horizontal and vertical intra-industry trade. CEPII Working Paper No. 2005–10. 2005. Retrieved September 11, 2019, available at http://www.cepii.fr/PDF_PUB/wp/2005/wp2005–10.pdf.

38. Chin MY, Teo CL, Puah C-H. Intra-industry trade between Malaysia and Singapore in SITC 7: an ARDL bound test approach. International Journal of Economics and Management. 2016; 10(1): 109–124.

39. Zhang D, Vega FE, Infante F, Solane W, Johnson ES, Meinhardt LW. Accurate differentiation of green bean of Arabica Coffee and Robusta Coffee using nanofluidic array of single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) markers. Journal of ADAC International. 2020; 103(2): 315-324.

40. International Coffee Organization. Coffee market report, November 2023. Accessed December 4, 2023, available at https://icocoffee.org/.

41. Yang J, Chen C. Agricultural trade between China and ASEAN: dynamic and prospect In: Chen C, Duncan R, editors. Agriculture and food security in China: what effect WTO accession and regional trade agreements? Canberra: ANU E-Press and Asia Pacific Press. 2008.

42. Ahn NH, Bokelman W, Nga DT, Minh NV. Toward sustainability or efficiency: the case of smallholder coffee farmers in Vietnam. Economies. 2019; 7, 66.

43. Baldwin R, Lopez-Gonzalez J. Supply-chain trade: a portrait of global patterns and several testable hypotheses. The World Economy. 2015; 38(11): 1682–1721.

44. International Coffee Organization. ICO coffee development report 2020 – the value of coffee sustainability, inclusiveness, and resilience of the coffee global value chain. Retrieved November 15, 2023, available at https://isuu.com/internationalcoffeeorg/docs/cdr2020/1.

509   45. Estehu F, Goshu D. Determinants of Ethiopian coffee exports to its major trade partners:
510   a dynamic gravity model approach. Foreign Trade Review 2021; 56(1): 185-196.
511   46. Around the Middle East in six coffees. Accessed December 22, 2023, available at
512   https://www.middleeasteye.net/discover/coffee-turkey-yemen-marocco-middle-east-
513   around.
514   47. How Europeans take their coffee. Accessed December, 22, 2023, available at
515   https://www.olivemagazine.com/guides/hiw-to/how-europeans-take-their-coffee/.
516   48. Einav L, Farronato C, Levin J. Peer-to-peer markets. NBER. 2015; Working Paper
517   21496. Retrieved December 22, 2023, available at https://nber.org/papers/w21496.
518