

DEBATE

Lucia Sinapi-Thomas, Executive Director of Capgemini

I suggest we now open up to a few questions from the room.

Meir Sheerit, Former Member of the Israeli Knesset, Former Minister of Intelligence Affairs and the Committee of Atomic Energy, Former Minister of the Interior

I enjoyed listening to you and it is really encouraging to see that there really is a chance to change the situation of the world in the future. It is funny, but I am also glad that the President of Brazil lost the election because maybe they will now stop destroying the Amazon Forest, which contributes a lot to the quality of life. I wonder if you have heard about some of the methods that are now checked in Israel by high-tech people. They think it may be possible to develop things to absorb carbon from the air, I do not know how, but by doing that they will significantly change the situation for the better. Have you heard about this, or do you know something about it?

Florent Andrillon, Global Head of Sustainability Services at Capgemini Invent

I will be brief because there can be a very long conversation about direct air capture technologies. We have a company on the West Coast that is working on projects like that, which are basically biomimicry, copying nature and using materials that can transform and capture carbon from the air. There is a lot of innovation in that field, I would say it is at an early stage of the science, but there is a lot of investment at this stage.

Livia Ribeiro de Souza, Co-Founder and Chief Technology Officer at Mimicrete Ltd.

As a Brazilian I am very happy that Lula won too and that we have a bit more of a chance with the Amazon Forest. It is interesting when you go to meetings with cement producers in the UK and they are mainly talking about the possibility of carbon capture, which is very fundamental for that industry as well. I know that there are some technologies out there but there is a lot that still needs to be developed on that front.

Lucia Sinapi-Thomas

You wanted to add something, Bruno.

Bruno Langlois, Business Development and Partnership Director at Carbios

I just wanted to add one comment, which is general about everything we are developing here. If you look at new technology, you still need to produce materials to make those technologies efficient. This kind of huge vacuum cleaner that can capture CO₂ will use a lot of minerals to

build these kinds of ceramics or zeolites, from what I know of these technologies, and we still have the issue of the raw materials. We need to be more circular because to build those huge vacuum cleaners leaves us with the issue of the waste we are generating today. We need to address the circularity and reduce our consumption of raw materials. Those ceramics need to be mined and there are also a lot of issues when you are mining the earth. Our iPhones or telephones if you are a Samsung lover, only weigh 500 grams but if you carried with them the waste you generated, they would weight tens of kilos.

Stanislas Cozon, Executive Vice President of Capgemini

Thank you for this fascinating panel. I particularly loved the biomimetics idea, it is very inspiring that nature can teach us how to protect nature. I see you combine some regulations, some incentives, and there is a need for money, but I wondered why not find a circular funding mechanism. By that I mean, what you just said, making sure that those who produce materials that are going to generate a lot of waste, pay for it. Include the price of waste in the price of goods ultimately, what we called in the past, externalise the negative. I would like your views on this, how we can create a self-funding mechanism where the mainstream funds the future?

Andrew Brown, Junior Environmental Policy Analyst at the OECD

I would be happy to answer that, and I tried to touch on it a bit, what I would call, the extended producer responsibility. At the OECD our definition of this is taking the post-use stage and making the producer either financially or physically in some cases, responsible for this. We have quite a wide definition of which policies fall into this overall approach, but you could think of deposit refund systems, takeback requirements on the producers, financial obligations at the point of production and we would call this an advanced disposal fee. These are used quite extensively throughout the OECD, and I think just about all our members have something in the form of a packaging EPR at the moment. We are also taking a look at how this can be applied to additional product sectors, so plastics beyond packaging. We are also considering construction, food production and waste and seeing if this is something that can be applied to more than just the traditional packaging application. We are also looking at what the possibilities are to address more of the environmental impacts as they occur throughout the lifecycle and producing this within the producer's realm of responsibility. This is definitely something we are looking at so thank you for the question.

Lucia Sinapi-Thomas

Bruno, you raised your hand, did you have anything addition to say?

Bruno Langlois

Yes, I think Andrew summarised this very well. The EPR, the extended responsibility for the producer is one way of collecting money and if it is done cleverly, for instance, you add more tax when you have a material that is difficult to produce, produces a lot of CO₂ and is very difficult to recycle, then you are generating extra revenue and it forces people to be more intelligent in designing products.



Lucia Sinapi-Thomas

We thank you all for your time and your attention, and we can definitely continue this discussion over meals in the coming days.