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 such a mechanism to be 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 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;
  - 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;
  - 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.
  - 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.
On the governance model, one stakeholder noted that it would be important to first consider the functions of the new SAICM beyond 2020 framework 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 and it was suggested to see the financial implications for this role. Several stakeholders favored a light governance mechanism and questioned whether the option to have a consultant doing the tasks would be sustainable. One stakeholder noted that a CB Clearinghouse mechanism could constitute for private sector involvement and it was recalled that the private sector also had other roles, including in supporting establishing national legislations. 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. 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. 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, however, noted that it could potentially be added with the text in para ALT 10.
- 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

Brazil’s general comments on the private sector involvement:

As previously stated by GRULAC countries in written comments about the Integrated Approach to financing: “We consider that, at the international level, financial contributions from private sector should be of a voluntary nature. Financial support from the private sector should be explored and encouraged, avoiding mandatory language. Any mandatory contribution from the private sector should be the object of internal legislation in the countries concerned.”

In terms of language, we propose to use “life cycle”, instead of “value chain” in paragraph 1 (SAICM/IP.4/2). In paragraph 10 (SAICM/IP.4/2), we propose to substitute “supply chain” for “value chain.”

In paragraph 9 (SAICM/IP.4/2), after “extended producer responsibility”, we would like to suggest including “as set forth in national regulations.”

As for paragraph 11 (SAICM/IP.4/2), we prefer the wording presented by ALT 11. However, we suggest the paragraph begins by “The financial sector should develop guidance (…)”.

Finally, when it comes to the proposal made by ICCA for the establishment of a Capacity Building Clearinghouse, we appreciate the discussion. Although we still have some doubts and concerns about its functioning and effectiveness, we are open to discuss the proposal and how it could be linked to existing platforms and even the idea of creating a clearinghouse mechanism to publicly track development aid and other possible sources of financing (current discussions within VWG 4 on financial considerations).