

Mr Chairman,

On behalf of the Delegations from Finland, Norway and Sweden I should like to present the so called Nordic proposal, to be found on page 11 in UNEP doc./WG78/11, for an annex concerning measures to control, limit and reduce the use and emissions of fully halogenated chlorofluorocarbons (CFC:s) for the protection of the ozone layer.

Before talking about the proposal itself, let me say a few words in respect of the background for our work.

In April 1980 UNEP Governing Council recommended that the use of chlorofluorocarbons 11 and 12 should be significantly reduced and that CFC production capacity should not be increased. At its next meeting in May 1981 the Governing Council decided to initiate work aiming at a global frame-work convention. In that decision, by which our ad hoc working group was established, the Governing Council stresses the desirability of a convention that would cover not only monitoring and scientific research but also the development of the best available and economically feasible technologies to limit and gradually reduce emissions of ozone-depleting substances, as well as the development of appropriate strategies and policies.

That is why we really are under the obligation to develop appropriate strategies to reduce the emissions of ozone depleting substances - as opposed to just coordinate research efforts.

It is true that there are some scientific uncertainties involved in this issue. The CCOL report on our table shows us the whole complexity of it. All scientists, however, generally agree that, according to calculation there will be a depletion of the ozone layer, due to CFCs although the calculated percentage may differ from time to time. In addition - and that should be stressed - most calculations so far have been based on present levels of emissions of CFC:s. However, evidence shows that the use and emissions of CFC:s could increase considerably.

It should be noted that several governments already have taken measures to reduce the use of CFC:s, primarily in spray cans. The way of implementing these measures has varied - some are mandatory, others are achieved on a voluntary basis in cooperation with the industries - some define exactly what uses to allow or not to allow, others deal with these questions on a case by case basis. However, the benefits achieved by these measures could easily be nullified by increased emissions in other countries.

The experience from the countries which have already taken action in this field also shows that the reduced use of CFC:s in aerosol cans is already well on its way

to be outweighed by a growth in non-aerosol uses such as the use in foam plastics, for cooling and as solvents. It is therefore necessary to ensure that reductions in aerosol CFC uses are not counteracted by transfer of CFC:s to non-aerosol uses. The experience, however, shows that it is much more difficult to find substitute or suitable control measures in those sectors than for the use in spray cans.

This leads me to stress another important point. It will take considerable time - first to investigate and decide upon the best practicable and economically feasible technologies to avoid unnecessary emissions and secondly to implement the measures. The economical impact of such measures on industry and society, is also dependent of the time allowed for such adjustment.

Considering also that emissions of CFC:s, specially from foam plastics and refrigeration occur decades after the equipment was actually installed, it is high time that we at least start to consider the problems and possibilities.

As to the content of our proposed annex to control the emissions of CFC:s I should like to say the following.

It contains some basic elements;

The first article deals with the use of CFC:s in aerosol cans. All experience shows that significant reduction of CFC emissions can be achieved at reasonable costs and

without undesirable consequences. In those countries that have implemented measures on CFC:s in aerosol cans reduction of emissions has been in order of 30-95 %. As yet, Mr Chairman, while taking these measures it has been possible to allow the use of CFC:s for objectives where their use is particularly desirable.

Consequently we have included the concept of "essential uses" and deliberately ^a abstained from defining it.

On the other hand we suggest that each Contracting Party shall inform the Secretariat of what uses it considers essential. This combination will give flexibility in the implementation and facilitate an exchange of experience.

It is of course up to each country to decide the methods for achieving these goals.

Article 2 deals with the non-aerosol uses. As I stated before it is high time that we start discussing these uses together, although some countries might find it premature to make concrete changes in their legislation

Article 3. As to article 3 I limit myself to saying that the provisions of this article should be read in conjunction with the potential annex number two on information exchange.

In finishing, Mr Chairman, let me say that we have of course had informal contacts with several delegations.

We have found that many of them are indeed interested in our proposal, although here and there they would prefer another wording. It goes without saying that we do not consider our proposal to be kind of a cathedral in which not a single stone could be moved or changed. The proposal is a basis for discussion and we hope that this discussion will be fruitful.