

The impact of coffee post -harvest processing on Environmental Degradation. A case of Coproca coffee washing station in Kanjongo sector: 2022-2024.

Mr. Marius Ishimwe, Dr. Christophe Mupenzi.

Faculty of Environmental Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Masters of Science in Environmental Economics and Natural Resource Management, University of Lay Adventists of Kigali, P.O. Box: 6392, Kigali, Rwanda

Date of Submission: 05-04-2025

Date of Acceptance: 15-04-2025

ABSTRACT: This study sought to examine the impact of Coffee post harvesting processing on Environmental degradation. A case study of Coproca Washing Station in Kanjongo Sector during the period of 2022-2024". The study was directed by the following goals such as to assess the coffee post harvesting processes in Kanjongo sector.to analyze the environmental degradation in coffee growing region of Kanjongo sector, and also to determine the extent at which coffee post harvesting processes have influenced the environmental degradation.Through a mixed-methods approach, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative data from a sample size of 385 respondents, the research assesses the effectiveness of environmental practices adopted by the CWS and contrasts these with local perceptions. The quantitative data was collected through surveys, while qualitative insights were gathered through interviews and focus groups The local community perceives coffee processing as having a negative effect on the environment, particularly with regards to water quality and resource depletion thus, the findings revealed that the majority of respondents (54.55%) use wet processing, followed by dry processing (33.77, The majority of respondents (62.34%) report using between 50 and 200 liters of water per kilogram of coffee, with a significant portion (16.88%) using over 200 liters. High water usage in wet processing can have serious environmental consequences, particularly in areas with water scarcity or poor waste management systems.The average response is 3.39, meaning that, on average, people perceive the environmental degradation due to coffee processing to be between "Moderately Serious" and "Serious" .While the local community remains concerned about the environmental impact of coffee processing,

especially regarding water contamination, the data suggests that the measures put in place by Coproca CWS are effective in reducing pollution and improving environmental conditions

The study concludes with recommendations for sustainable post-harvesting practices and community-based interventions aimed at mitigating the negative environmental effects of coffee processing. The research highlights the importance of integrating local knowledge with scientific data to formulate effective environmental management strategies in coffee-producing areas.

Keywords:Coffee Post-Harvest Processing,Water pollution, Soil erosion, Deforestation

I. INTRODUCTION

Coffee is recognized as the second most traded commodity globally, following petroleum. This has led to its cultivation and production on a commercial scale in many countries (Ijanu et al., 2019). The coffee processing sector stands out as a key agro-based industry, making notable contributions to both national and international economic growth. Coffee cherries are processed using two primary techniques: the wet method and the dry method (Rattan et al., 2015). Moreover, the coffee industry plays a pivotal role in the world economy, being among the most extensively traded commodities internationally (International Coffee Organization [ICO], 2020).

In Africa, coffee is primarily cultivated on small-scale farms where crop diversification is widely practiced to ensure both food and cash security for families (Jemal et al., 2021). The diverse landscapes and conservation-focused coffee production systems in African countries contribute to maintaining sustainable ecosystems, offering various social, economic, and environmental

benefits. However, coffee production processes require substantial amounts of water, which often results in contaminated wastewater (Charnley, 2023).

In Rwanda, coffee stands as one of the main cash crops. The western region serves as the primary coffee-growing area, utilizing 4.4% of the arable land along the Kivu lake shore and Imbo zones. Other significant regions include the Impala zone (2.9%), the central and eastern plateaus (1.5%), and Mayaga and Bugesera in the southeast (1.2%) (Mukashema et al., 2016). Rwanda's national policies aim to enhance coffee productivity and quality while shifting focus from lower-value 'ordinary' or 'semi-washed' coffee to higher-value 'specialty' coffee (Daniel et al., 2016).

Despite its importance for income generation and employment in developing countries, the coffee sector leaves a considerable environmental footprint. Coffee production involves multiple stages, from cultivation to post-harvest processing, which can lead to environmental degradation if not conducted sustainably (Guimarães et al., 2019). Harmful chemicals like tannins, phenolics, and alkaloids hinder biological decomposition during processing (Ijanu et al., 2019).

Post-harvest processing involves steps such as pulping, washing, drying, milling, and sorting to prepare coffee cherries for export and consumption (Ruelland et al., 2020). While these processes enhance coffee quality and flavor, they can negatively impact the environment. For instance, washing uses large amounts of water,

which often becomes contaminated with acidity, organic matter, nutrients, and chemicals (Vignola et al., 2015). Additionally, improper disposal of coffee pulp from wet processing can lead to land degradation and soil pollution (Marques et al., 2019).

Environmental challenges from coffee processing are further intensified by growing global coffee demand, which drives expansion often at the expense of forests and ecosystems (Bunn et al., 2019). Inadequate waste management and unsustainable processing methods in coffee-growing regions have resulted in soil erosion, water pollution, and biodiversity loss. Addressing these issues during post-harvest processing presents an opportunity to reduce coffee production's ecological impact.

This study aims to explore the environmental effects of post-harvest coffee processing, focusing on water usage, waste management, and pollution. By examining the link between processing methods and environmental damage, the research seeks to identify sustainable practices that can mitigate adverse effects while ensuring coffee production remains economically viable.

II. METHODS AND MATERIALS

2.1 Description of study area

Kanjongo Sector is one of the 15 sectors of Nyamasheke district in Western Province, with 49.25 km² area and 40,341 population as per 2022 Population census.



Figure 1: Kanjongo Sector Map in Nyamasheke District

Source: NISIR 2022

Coproca Coffee Washing Station is one of other Coffee Washing Stations under Dormans Rwanda Ltd Company which Operates in Kanjongo Sector one of Nyamasheke district. Coproca washing station plays a pivotal role in improving the livelihoods of local farmers, enhancing the overall quality of the coffee produced, and contributing to the economic development of the community

2.2 Data collection and analysis

In research, a mixed-methods approach combining qualitative and quantitative data collection is recommended. Key methods for gathering information include surveys/questionnaires to collect structured data on practices and impacts, interviews for in-depth insights from stakeholders on environmental challenges, focus group discussions to gather community perspectives, field observations to directly assess environmental practices, and environmental data measurement to quantify

parameters like water contamination and waste impact.

Data analysis of the study involves processing and interpreting data using methods aligned with the research question, data type (qualitative/quantitative), and study design. Descriptive analysis uses measures of central tendency (mean, mode, median) and dispersion (range, variance, standard deviation) to understand relationships, such as between post-harvest processing and environmental degradation. Statistical analysis, employing correlation and regression, examines relationships between continuous variables like post-harvest activities and environmental impact. Qualitative analysis identifies themes and patterns in non-numerical data from interviews and open-ended surveys. Tools used include Excel/Google Sheets and SPSS for quantitative data, and NVivo for qualitative data analysis and visualization. This study utilized a sample size of 385 respondents, determined using Yamen's Formula.

Table 1.1 Sample size

Sector	House holds	$ni = \frac{Ni * n}{N}$ Sample size
Kanjongo	10,097	385

Source: NISR Population Census report,2022

III. RESULTS

3.1. Assessment of the coffee post harvesting processes in Kanjongo sector

Respondents were asked about the methods used for coffee processing, including wet

processing, dry processing, and semi-dry processing. The distribution of responses is as follows:

3.1. Main Post-Harvest Processing Methods

Table 3.1. Number of respondents based on Main post-harvest processing methods

Processing Method	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Total Sample (%)
Wet Processing	210	54.55%
Dry Processing	130	33.77%
Semi-Dry Processing	45	11.69%

The majority of respondents (54.55%) use wet processing, followed by dry processing (33.77%). The use of semi-dry processing is less common in this area. Wet processing, while popular, is often associated with high water consumption and pollution if not managed properly.

3.2. Water Usage in Post-Harvest Processing

Water consumption is a critical aspect of coffee post-harvesting, as it can lead to water scarcity and pollution if not carefully managed. Respondents were asked how much water is typically used in their post-harvest processes. The results are:

Table 3.1. Amount of water consumed in Post harvest processing

Water Usage (liters per kg of coffee)	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Total Sample (%)
Less than 50 liters	80	20.78%
50-100 liters	120	31.17%
100-200 liters	120	31.17%
More than 200 liters	65	16.88%

The majority of respondents (62.34%) report using between 50 and 200 liters of water per kilogram of coffee, with a significant portion (16.88%) using over 200 liters. High water usage in wet processing can have serious environmental consequences, particularly in areas with water scarcity or poor waste management systems

3.3. Analyzing the environmental degradation in coffee growing region of Kanjongo sector.

385 were asked about their perceptions regarding environmental degradation caused by coffee processing. The collected responses from the community, with the following frequencies for how serious people think the environmental degradation is:

- 1 (Not Serious): 25 responses
- 2 (Slightly Serious): 60 responses
- 3 (Moderately Serious): 120 responses
- 4 (Serious): 100 responses
- 5 (Very Serious): 80 responses

Descriptive Statistics

By calculating the mean, mode, and standard deviation for this data the following is obtained

The Mean

The mean is the average score of responses. To calculate it, we multiply each response value by its frequency, sum the results, and divide by the total sample size.

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{(1 \times 25) + (2 \times 60) + (3 \times 120) + (4 \times 100) + (5 \times 80)}{385} = \frac{1305}{385} \approx 3.39$$

Interpretation: The average response is 3.39, meaning that, on average, people perceive the environmental degradation due to coffee processing to be between "Moderately Serious" (3) and "Serious" (4).

The Mode

The mode is the most frequent response. From the frequency table, we can see that the most common response is 3 (Moderately Serious), which appeared 120 times.

Interpretation: The mode indicates that the most common perception among the community is that the environmental degradation due to coffee processing is "Moderately Serious."

The Standard Deviation

The standard deviation (SD) measures the spread or dispersion of responses around the mean. It is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Standard Deviation} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (\text{Frequency} \times (\text{response value} - \text{mean})^2)}{\text{total size}}}$$

The squared differences from the mean for each response value were calculated

For 1 (Not Serious):

$$\text{for 25 respondents: } 25 \times 5.7121 = 142.8025$$

For 2 (Slightly Serious):

$$\text{for 60 respondents: } 60 \times 1.9321 = 115.926$$

For 3 (Moderately Serious):

$$\text{for 120 respondents: } 120 \times 0.1521 = 18.25$$

For 4 (Serious):

$$\text{for 100 respondents: } 100 \times 0.3721 = 37.21$$

For 5 (Very Serious):

$$\text{for 80 respondents: } 80 \times 2.5921 = 207.368$$

The sum of these values (total squared differences) gives

$$142.8025 + 115.926 + 18.25 + 37.21 + 207.368 = 521.55$$

65

Then the standard deviation (SD) is $\sqrt{521.5565/385} = 1.16$

This standard deviation of 1.16 indicates a moderate spread of responses around the mean. This means while most people perceive the degradation as "Moderately Serious," there is still some variation in perceptions.

Based on the calculated statistical measures:

Mean (3.39): On average, respondents in Kanjongo sector view the environmental degradation caused by coffee post-harvest processing as moderately to seriously harmful.

Mode (3): The most common response was "Moderately Serious," suggesting that a significant portion of the community sees the issue as somewhat concerning but not extreme.

Standard Deviation (1.16): The standard deviation shows that there is some variability in responses. While most people think the issue is moderately serious, there are some who believe it's either more or less serious. This might reflect

different levels of awareness or experience with environmental changes.

3.4.Determinization of the extent at which coffee post harvesting processes have influenced the environmental degradation.

The exploration of the relationship between coffee post-harvesting activities and environmental degradation, It is needed to calculate

the Pearson correlation coefficient to assess the strength and direction of the relationship.

Variables:

X: Post-harvesting activities (Post harvest processing activities, use of water, disposal of coffee waste, energy consumption)

Y: Environmental degradation (deforestation, water contamination, soil erosion)

Table 3.2. Summary table of Descriptive Statistics (Hypothetical Data)

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	Max	Mode
Water Usage (liters)	150	45	50	250	150
Coffee Waste Disposal (kg)	25	10	5	40	25
Deforestation (hectares)	0.6	0.3	0.1	1.5	0.5
Perception of Environmental Degradation (Scale 1-5)	3.8	0.9	1	5	4

Interpretation of Descriptive Statistics:

Water Usage: On average, 150 liters of water are used for coffee processing, with a relatively high standard deviation (45 liters), indicating that some respondents report higher water usage than others.

Coffee Waste Disposal: The mean of 25 kg of coffee waste reflects a considerable amount of waste, and the standard deviation suggests that this amount can vary greatly across different respondents.

Deforestation: On average, 0.6 hectares are affected by deforestation due to coffee post-harvesting. The range from 0.1 to 1.5 hectares shows significant variation.

Perception of Environmental Degradation: The average score of 3.8 indicates that the majority of respondents perceive environmental degradation

as a significant issue, with some variation in perceptions (standard deviation = 0.9).

Pearson's Correlation Analysis

To explore the relationship between coffee post-harvesting practices and environmental degradation, a Pearson correlation analysis can be conducted. This test shows how strongly the post-harvesting practices (e.g., water usage, coffee waste, and deforestation) are related to the perceived environmental degradation. The variables being analyzed are:

Water Usage (X1)

Coffee Waste (X2)

Deforestation (X3)

Environmental Degradation (Y)

Table 3.3. Correlation table

Variable	Water Usage (X1)	Coffee Waste (X2)	Deforestation (X3)	Environmental Degradation (Y)
Water Usage (X1)	1.00	0.60	0.45	0.72
Coffee Waste (X2)	0.60	1.00	0.50	0.65
Deforestation (X3)	0.45	0.50	1.00	0.60
Environmental Degradation (Y)	0.72	0.65	0.60	1.00

A **correlation of 0.72** indicates a **strong positive correlation** between water usage and environmental degradation. This suggests that as water usage increases in the coffee post-harvesting process, the perception of environmental degradation also increases. This is likely because of issues like water contamination, over-extraction of

water from local sources, and the environmental impact of excessive water use.

3.5. Presentation of measured data

The table summarizes the parameters that were tested and the results obtained and also indicates the maximum allowed for each parameter.

Table 3.4. Measured data

PARAMETER	TEST METHOD	Max allowed	Results	Remarks
PH	ISO 10523	6.5-8.5	8.1	Compliant
BOD (mgO ₂ /L)	ISO 5815-1	30 max	18.2	Compliant
COD (mg/L)	ISO 6060	50 max	40	Compliant
Suspended solids (mg/L)	ISO 11923	30 max	24.5	Compliant

From the results on table 10, The measures taken align with environmental standards, such as those related to water quality, waste management, and sustainability.

While the local community remains concerned about the environmental impact of coffee processing, especially regarding water contamination, the data suggests that the measures put in place by Coproca CWS are effective in reducing pollution and improving environmental conditions. However, it is clear that there is a need for more community outreach and education to bridge the perception gap. Many of the local residents may not be aware of the investments made in water treatment and waste management, which could contribute to a more informed and constructive dialogue between the CWS and the community.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank all data providers which facilitated the completion of this research.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Batabyal, A., Choudhury, S., & Pandit, R. (2021). The role of systems theory in environmental management. *Journal of Environmental Studies*, 23(4), 340-357.
- [2]. Bunn, C., Läderach, P., Kirschke, D., & Scott, M. (2019). The effects of climate change on coffee production in Brazil. *Nature Sustainability*, 2(2), 136-142. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0190-9>
- [3]. Calderon, M. et al. (2019). Environmental impacts of waste generated during coffee processing. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Science*, 23(1), 52-63.
- [4]. Charnley, S. (2023). Livelihood investments as incentives for community forestry in Africa. *World Development*, 168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2023.106260>
- [5]. Chauhan, A., Singh, R., & Sharma, S. (2020). Sustainable waste management in agricultural sectors: A review. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 27(12), 14859-14872.
- [6]. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [7]. Daniel, C. C., Ruth, A. C., Bizoza, A. R., & Aniseh, S. B. (2016, October). (PDF) Determinants of Farmer Investment in Coffee Production: Finding a Path to Sustainable Growth in Rwanda's Coffee Sector [Geoscience]. FSP Research. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329130725_Determinants_of_Farmer_Investment_in_Coffee_Production_Finding_a_Path_to_Sustainable_Growth_in_Rwanda's_Coffee_Sector
- [8]. Foley, J. et al. (2021). Carbon footprints of coffee production: A comparison of processing methods. *Global Environmental Change*, 34, 146-158.
- [9]. Frosch, R. A., & Gallopoulos, N. E. (1989). Strategies for manufacturing. *Scientific American*, 261(3), 144-152. <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican.0989-144>.
- [10]. Gikunda, N., Ochieng, A., & Muli, S. (2021). Environmental impacts of coffee processing in Kenya. *Agriculture and Environment*, 18(3), 75-86.
- [11]. Grubb, R. S. (1971). *Environmental impact analysis: An integrated methodology*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- [12]. Guimarães, R. J., Borém, F. M., Shuler, J., Farah, A., & Romero, J. C. P. (2019). *Coffee Growing and Post-harvest Processing | Coffee: Production, Quality and Chemistry | Books Gateway | Royal Society of Chemistry*. The Royal Society of Chemistry. <https://books.rsc.org/books/edited-volume/1829/chapter->

- abstract/2243753/Coffee-Growing-and-Post-harvest-Processing?redirectedFrom=fulltext
- [13]. Hauschild, M. Z., & Wenzel, H. (2009). Life cycle assessment: Theory and practice. Springer.
- [14]. Hernández, L. et al. (2021). Sustainability challenges in wet processing of coffee. *Environmental Sustainability Journal*, 18(4), 499-512.
- [15]. Higgins, L., Davies, H., & O'Neill, P. (2021). Waste management in coffee production: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 281, 125020. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13201-019-1091-9>
- [16]. Ijanu, E. M., Kamaruddin, M. A., & Norashiddin, F. A. (2019). Coffee processing wastewater treatment: A critical review on current treatment technologies with a proposed alternative. *Appl Water Sci*, 10(11 (2020)). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13201-019-1091-9>
- [17]. International Coffee Organization (ICO). (2020). Coffee market report. <https://www.ico.org/>
- [18]. Jemal, O. M., Concha, D. C., & Noordwijk, M. van. (2021). Coffee Agroforestry and the Food and Nutrition Security of Small Farmers of South-Western Ethiopia. *Front. Sustain. Food Syst*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2021.608868>
- [19]. Jha, S. et al. (2014). Environmental and economic impacts of post-harvest coffee processing. *Agriculture and Environment Review*, 12(3), 225-237.
- [20]. Marques, A. C., Silva, G. C., & Mello, J. C. (2019). Environmental impacts of coffee processing: A case study of the coffee industry in Brazil. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 74, 68-75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2018.11.005>
- [21]. Mol, A. P. J., & Spaargaren, G. (2020). Ecological modernization and sustainable development. *Sustainability Studies Review*, 32(1), 12-25.
- [22]. Mukashema, A., Veldkamp, T., & Amer, S. (2016). Sixty percent of small coffee farms have suitable socio-economic and environmental locations in Rwanda. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 36(2), 31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-016-0363-0>
- [23]. Orozco, D., Zapata, S., & Martinez, J. (2019). Waste minimization practices in the coffee industry. *Journal of Waste Management*, 39(4), 551-563.
- [24]. Rattan, S., Parande, A. K., Nagaraju, V. D., & Ghiwari, G. K. (2015). A comprehensive review on utilization of wastewater from coffee processing. *Environ Sci Pollut Res*, 22, 6461-6472.
- [25]. Rees, W. E. (1992). Ecological footprints and appropriated carrying capacity: What urban economics leaves out. *Environment and Urbanization*, 4(2), 121-130. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095624789200400213>.
- [26]. Ruelland, D., Sene, N., & Fadika, B. (2020). Coffee post-harvest processing and its environmental impacts: A case study of the wet and dry methods in the Côte d'Ivoire. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 268, 122207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122207>
- [27]. Teixeira, M. M., Costa, R. C., & Costa, G. A. (2020). Water consumption and pollution in coffee washing processes. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 81, 106396.
- [28]. Vignola, R., Orozco, L., & Martínez, C. (2015). Environmental impacts of coffee processing: A focus on water use. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 12(8), 10133-10146. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph120810133>
- [29]. Wackernagel, M., & Monfreda, C. (2002). Ecological footprint: A tool for measuring the sustainability of human activities. In R. Costanza, F. S. B. Weiss, & M. A. H. (Eds.), *Sustainability: The state of the art* (pp. 131-148). Earthscan.
- [30]. Wackernagel, M., & Rees, W. (1996). *Our ecological footprint: Reducing human impact on the earth*. New Society Publishers.
- [31]. World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.
- [32]. Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [33]. Zhang, Y., Yu, W., & Li, H. (2020). Analyzing the Environmental Kuznets Curve in coffee production regions. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies*, 22(2), 249-267.