Comments by the European Union and its Member States

11 January 2021

At first, the EU+MS want to thank again the ICCA for organizing the meeting and providing these notes with the opportunity to comment. The EU+MS suggest slight modifications only, shown in revision mode below. Apart from that, it should be noted that the listing of comments in these notes does not imply agreement by other stakeholders participating in the meeting.

Draft main take-away small group VWG4, December 17, 2020

The small group focused its discussion on two items:

A. Capacity Building (CB) Clearinghouse
B. Commonalities -if any- in the current three paragraphs on private sector involvement

A. Capacity Building Clearinghouse

- The ICCA/industry proposal for a Capacity Building Clearinghouse was explained (draft slides are attached) and participants were requested to reflect if such a Clearinghouse could be part of the new SAICM beyond 2020 framework. The objective of the Capacity Building Clearinghouse is to ultimately support country-driven institutional strengthening at the national level by establishing a common place for capacity building (CB) activities which acts as an intermediary between a country with CB needs and a donor country and/or other stakeholders

- Except for one stakeholder, participants saw a need for or found such a mechanism to be useful, at least, embedded in the new SAICM framework and it was noted that time was needed to further consider the concept, including governance and progress tracking would need further consideration.

- Some participants volunteered to help further shape the concept.

- Comments, not necessarily reflecting the view of other participants, on the CB Clearinghouse include:
  - The wording on CB Clearinghouse would fit best under section “Governance” instead of under “Private sector involvement”.
  - Such a mechanism could allow to see which areas would need funding and it would also allow to see other relevant funding resources including development banks next to the obvious ones (GEF, Special Programme);
  - Such a mechanism could allow to make a global gap analysis and therefore support making informed decisions on funding;
  - It was suggested to build on the UN SP database tool which allows for a quick picture on what funding in the area of Chemicals and Waste was provided to which country under the Special Programme;
  - It was noted that a CB Clearinghouse can scale up all efforts made and deliver on the ground.
  - It was noted that CB Clearinghouse should include an angle for projects to adhere to green and sustainable chemistry and reference was made to existing ECHO Green Database as a possible source of inspiration;
o One stakeholder was not convinced of the need for a CB Clearinghouse mechanism and noted that such a mechanism would deviate the attention away from the efforts put in place to establish national cost recovery systems. It was noted that there is a lack of financial considerations and reference was made to the CIEL/IPEN proposal for an international fund. As a response, it was noted that the CB Clearinghouse should not be seen as the silver bullet that will solve all issues, but rather as a step towards making the current initiatives on enhancing safe chemicals and waste management more efficient and effective.

o Reference was made to the call for tender for projects on Chemicals and Waste in France. It proved useful to have a list of what type of projects were requested for funding as it also led to additional funding from Ministries. A challenge faced was the lack of criteria, in particular for projects that were important but didn’t fit the criteria requested by multilateral funds.

o On the governance model, one stakeholder noted that it would be important to first consider the functions of the new SAICM beyond 2020 framework such a clearinghouse mechanism and then onwards, to consider what structure would fit best. In this regard, there could be a role for the SAICM secretariat and/or IOMC organizations in the management of such a mechanism and it was suggested to see consider also the financial implications for this role.

o Several stakeholders favored a light governance mechanism and questioned whether the option to have a consultant doing the tasks would be sustainable.

o One stakeholder noted that a CB Clearinghouse mechanism could contribute to materialize the for private sector involvement. However, and it was recalled that the other components of realizing private sector involvement in accordance with the Integrated Approach remain valid, in particular anchoring its role and responsibilities in national legislation. Private sector also had other roles, including in supporting establishing national legislations.

o One stakeholder expressed its gratitude towards ICCA to come up with this concept however, the stakeholder noted that the solution was not entirely what was expected. Reference was made to the three pillars of the integrated approach to financing and that in particular in Africa, more was expected from the local industry to support governments in mainstreaming.

o One stakeholder noted that fees to be paid by the industry for the national chemicals legislations is welcome but noted that this was not enough. Call was made towards industry to increase its financing, including the secretariat.

o It was noted that ICCA is the sole non governmental organization which financially contributed to the SAICM secretariat and that efforts are made to take the contributions to the next level. It was also noted that industry is working on a mechanism aimed at enhancing local/regional cooperation between industry and governments and reference was made to good examples in Latin America and ASEAN. Next steps were to replicate these good examples also in Africa.

Commonalities - if any - in the current three paragraphs on private sector involvement
• Participants were requested to identify elements in the current paragraphs that were instrumental.
• One stakeholder expressed the need for the private sector paragraphs to be consistent with the other paragraphs regarding mainstreaming. It was also noted that the paragraphs could best include language that highlights the strong commitment from industry as well as addresses how this commitment could be best made actionable. As such, reference was made to ALT 10 text submitted in IP3 which captured these elements.
• One stakeholder saw merit in all three paragraphs and noted that current text in para 10 captured all relevant parts. It was important to address both the role of the private sector and that of governments in this section, however. Stakeholder further noted that it could potentially be added with the text in para ALT 10 could be further worked on and should be discussed together with para 8.
• Two stakeholders mentioned the need to refer to the increasing global GHS implementation.
• One stakeholder appreciated the specific actionable wording in para ALT 10, however, it was suggested to remain more general and less prescriptive. It was also noted that paragraph 8 should not contain specific policies as countries would have their own way of pursuing sound chemicals management.
• Regarding the next steps, it was suggested for ICCA to share the draft main take away with the participants by Monday, December 21 and allow participants to respond by January 11 the latest.
• SAICM secretariat will ensure the dissemination of the draft minutes to the broader VWG4 registered colleagues.
• Both co-chairs endorsed the above time schedule and thanked all participants for their pleasant and constructive engagement. ICCA was thanked for volunteering to moderate this discussion.
• The meeting adjourned at 14h50