UNITED

For reasons of econ

EP

United Nations

For reasons of economy, this document is printe
meetings and not to request additional copies.

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/WG.1/13/2
31 May 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP OF THE PARTIES TO
THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Thirteenth meeting
Geneva, 26-29 August 1996

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

Note by the Secretariat

1. The present note presents for discussion the issues related to items 3, 5, 8 and 10 of the provisional agenda for the thirteenth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group (UNEP/OzL.Pro/WG.1/13/1) and proposes possible recommendations by the Working Group for submission to the Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol to be held in Costa Rica in November 1996. The report of the Executive Committee under item 4 of the provisional agenda will be circulated by the Fund Secretariat, while the reports of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel under items 6, 7 and 9 will be communicated to Parties after the meeting of the Panel in June 1996.

I. ITEM 3 OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA: REPLENISHMENT OF THE MULTILATERAL FUND AND THREE-YEAR ROLLING BUSINESS PLAN FOR THE PERIOD 1997-1999: (a) REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (DECISION VII/23); (b) REPORT OF THE TECHNOLOGY AND ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT PANEL (DECISION VII/24)

2. The report of the Executive Committee on the three-year rolling business plan for the period 1997-1999 has been sent to all Parties by the Fund Secretariat as document UNEP/OzL.Pro/WG.1/13/3, while the report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on replenishment of the Fund has been circulated by the Secretariat. In considering a recommendation to the Eighth Meeting of the Parties, the Working Group may wish to take into account the following issues regarding the contributions to the Multilateral Fund.

3. The Seventh Meeting of the Parties decided in its decision VII/37, paragraph 4:

> "(a) To approve the adoption of the new United Nations scale of assessments, which came into effect through the General Assembly resolution 49/19 B of 3 March 1995 for Members of the United Nations and through administrative circular ST/ADM/SER.B/451 of 4 January 1995 for non-Members of the United Nations, as the basis for calculating individual Parties' levels of contributions to the Montreal Protocol and the Multilateral Fund trust funds in 1996 and beyond;
>
> "(b) To authorize the Treasurer to recalculate the future individual Parties' levels of contributions to the Montreal Protocol and the Multilateral Fund trust funds, using the scale of assessments as updated and adopted within the United Nations system."

4. Following this decision, the Treasurer of the Multilateral Fund sent letters to all the contributors to the trust funds, requesting for contributions according to the new United Nations scale and also apportioning among the non-Article 5 Parties as so classified on the date of issue of the letters the total level of funding (US$ 151.67 million) for the Multilateral Fund for 1996 as agreed by the Fifth Meeting of the Parties, held in Bangkok in 1993.

5. France and the United Kingdom objected to the amount apportioned to them by way of contributions to the Multilateral Fund. They argued that, since the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the years 1994, 1995 and 1996 had been decided upon by the Fifth Meeting of the Parties, they considered that their commitments were fixed once and for all for these years in the tables annexed to the report of the Fifth Meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.5/12). They also felt that the draft decision on the application of new United Nations scale submitted to the Seventh Meeting of the Parties by the Secretariat had been imprecisely worded and had no annex with figures indicating individual Parties' levels of contributions. They requested that the matter be placed before the Eighth Meeting of the Parties and that the difference between the amounts determined according to the new scale of assessments and the amount fixed at the Fifth Meeting in 1993 should not appear as outstanding contributions in the status reports circulated to the Parties. In accordance with this request, the Treasurer has shown this difference as a disputed amount in the tables showing the status of contributions and the issues raised will be placed before the Eighth Meeting of the Parties through the Working Group. France and the United Kingdom have paid their contributions for 1996 at the levels fixed for them by the Fifth Meeting of the Parties.

6. France and the United Kingdom did not raise objections to the application of the new United Nations scale to the Montreal Protocol Trust Fund. In addition, this Trust Fund is contributed to by all Parties, non-Article 5 or otherwise, whose United Nations rate of assessment is more than 0.1 per cent.

7. A table showing the differences between the 1996 contributions to the

Multilateral Fund decided upon by the Fifth Meeting of the Parties and the revised amounts for 1996 issued by the Treasurer is shown in annex I to the present note. The difference between the original contribution for each Party is accounted for by the use of revised United Nations scale, as well as the redistribution among the remaining Parties of the contributions of Kuwait, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia and Singapore, who were classified as non-Article 5 at the time of the Fifth Meeting in 1993 but have now been reclassified as operating under Article 5, and the inclusion of new non-Article 5 Parties - Brunei Darussalam, Latvia, Lithuania and Turkmenistan - as contributors to the Fund.

8. Paragraph 6 of Article 10 of the Protocol provides that "the Multilateral Fund shall be financed by contributions from Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in convertible currency or, in certain circumstances, in kind and/or in national currency, on the basis of the United Nations scale of assessments". The Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, to be held in November 1996, will finalize the replenishment for 1997, 1998 and 1999 and will also apportion the annual amounts among the individual non-Article 5 Parties by applying the United Nations scale of assessments prevailing at the time of the meeting. Two issues arise in this connection:

(a) If the United Nations scale of assessments is revised by the General Assembly during the period 1997-1999, should the contributions from the non-Article 5 Parties be adjusted in line with the revised scale, to be applied from the year following the year in which the revised scale takes effect for contributions to the United Nations regular budget?

(b) If a Party is reclassified to be operating or not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in any year, should the contributions be revised for the subsequent year and the annual total replenishment distributed among the non-Article 5 Parties as so classified at the beginning of that year?

9. A negative answer to these questions would imply that the contributions fixed for each country by the Eighth Meeting of the Parties would remain unchanged for three years and the contribution allocated to any non-Article 5 Party subsequently reclassified as operating under Article 5, paragraph 1, would not be collectible to the Multilateral Fund.

10. The Working Group may wish to make a recommendation to the Eighth Meeting on:

(a) Whether the new United Nations scale, as revised from time to time, can continue to be applied to the contributions to the Montreal Protocol Trust Fund, as approved by decision VII/37;

(b) The course of action to be followed by the Treasurer for the contributions to the Multilateral Fund for 1996 in view of points raised by France and the United Kingdom;

(c) Whether the Treasurer can recalculate the future individual Parties' level of contributions to the Multilateral Fund using the scale of assessments as adopted and updated by the General Assembly, and as approved by decision VII/37; and/or

(d) Whether the contributions can be worked out by the Treasurer afresh every year and allocated among the non-Article 5 Parties as classified at the beginning of that year; or

(e) Whether the contributions to the Multilateral Fund fixed for each Party by the Eighth Meeting of the Parties are not to be changed at all and any loss due to reclassification of some developing country contributors as operating under Article 5, paragraph 1, is to be ignored.

II. ITEM 5 OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE TECHNOLOGY AND ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT PANEL ON ESSENTIAL-USE NOMINATIONS AND METERED-DOSE INHALERS (MDIs) (DECISIONS VII/28 AND VII/34, PARAGRAPHS 5 (a) AND (b))

11. The reports of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) on the issues referred to it by the Seventh Meeting of the Parties were circulated to all the Governments in English (the language in which they were prepared) in March and June 1996. The issues falling under item 5 of the provisional agenda are covered in part II (Essential use nominations) of the TEAP report of March 1996.

12. Seven Parties nominated for essential-use production exemptions for metered-dose inhalers (MDIs), nasal inhalers, dermatological aerosols, sterilization of surgical sutures, aerosols for nasal polyposis/sinusitis for decision in 1996 for the years 1997, 1998 and 1999. The TEAP report explains the status of introduction of alternatives like dry-powder inhalers, new oral therapy and the progress of approval of HFC-134a and HFC-227 for the reformulation of MDIs. The recommendations and comments made by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel for 1997, 1998 and 1999 are as follows:

(a) Canada

Year:		**1998**
Tonnages:	CFC-11	128
	CFC-12	320
	CFC-114	65
Specific usage:	MDIs for asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)	
Recommendation:	Recommended for exemption	
Comments:	The Aerosols Products Technical Options Committee (TOC) notes that projected tonnages for 1997-1998 are reducing. The tonnages are lower than allocations agreed last year due to the withdrawal of the application for MDI nasal sprays.	

(b) European Union

Year:		**1998**
Tonnages:	CFC-11	1778
	CFC-12	3307
	CFC-113	16
	CFC-114	509
Specific usage:	MDIs for asthma/COPD	
Recommendation:	Recommended for exemption	
Comments:	The Aerosols Products Technical Options Committee notes the projected reduction in CFC tonnages applied for exemption in 1997/1998.	

(c) Japan

Year:		**1998**	**1999**
Tonnages:	CFC-11	53	37
	CFC-12	105	75
	CFC-113	0.5	0.5
	CFC-114	23	24
Specific usage:	MDIs for asthma/COPD		
Recommendation:	Recommended for exemption		
Comments:	The quantities of ODS propellants requested show a significant reduction on the 1995-1997 consumption and an anticipated further reduction by 1999. In part this reflects the withdrawal of the application for nasal sprays.		

(d) Poland

MDIs

Year		**1997**
Tonnages:	CFC-11	102
	CFC-12	152.6
	CFC-114	23
Specific usage:	MDIs for asthma/COPD	
Recommendation:	Recommended for exemption	
Comments:	None.	

Nasal inhalers

Year:		**1997**
Tonnages:	CFC-11	1.6
	CFC-12	2.6
Specific usage:	Nasal inhalers	
Recommendation:	Insufficient data to recommend	
Comments:	Suitable non-CFCs alternatives are available. The Aerosols Products Technical Options Committee has consistently been unable to recommend CFC use for nasal aerosols for use in rhinitis. Within this year's application from Poland there is a mention of need for these products for post surgical use. To be	

consistent with the decision regarding the application of the United States of America, further information is requested from Poland. If their request is for an identical drug (dexamethasone) for an identical purpose (nasal polyposis), then allocation of 1.6 metric tonnes of CFC-11 and 2.6 metric tonnes of CFC-12 is recommended for 1997 only.

Dermatological aerosols

Year:		**1997**
Tonnages:	CFC-11	70
	CFC-12	30
Specific usage:	Dermatological aerosol	
Recommendation:	Unable to recommend	
Comments:	This use has been phased out elsewhere.	

Sterilization

Year:		**1997**
Tonnages:	CFC-12	20
Specific usage:	Sterilization of surgical sutures	
Recommendation:	Unable to recommend	
Comments:	Sterilization of sutures has been phased out elsewhere and there is no justification to continue use in this single application.	

(e) South Africa

Year:		**1998**
Tonnages:	CFC-11	62
	CFC-12	156
	CFC-114	5
Specific usage:	MDIs for asthma/COPD	
Recommendation:	Recommended for exemption	
Comments:	The Aerosols Products Technical Options Committee notes the small increase in requested tonnages justified by improving health care.	

(f) Switzerland

Year:		**1997**	**1998**
Tonnages:	CFC-11	2	2
	CFC-12	4	4
	CFC-114	2	2
Specific usage:	MDIs for asthma/COPD		
Recommendation:	Recommended for exemption		
Comments:	There is a need for the nominator to show good-faith efforts to find alternatives to CFCs.		

(g) United States of America

MDIs

Year:		**1997***	**1998**
Tonnages:	CFC-11	149.3	1204.3
	CFC-12	413.7	2814.7
	CFC-114	123	369

Specific usage: MDIs for asthma/COPD
Recommendation: Recommended for exemption
Comments: The Aerosols Products Technical Options Committee strongly notes the large increase in requested volumes. The Technology and Economic Assessment Panel attributes this in part due to a real increase in MDI usage, but believes that most of the increase is due to double-counting of demand due to new manufacturers coming into the market, and optimistic estimates of market share. (These factors may also apply to other nominations.)

Nasal polyps/sinusitis

Year:		**1997**
Tonnages:	CFC-12	2.1
	CFC-114	8.5

Specific usage: Nasal dexamethasone (Dexacort™)
Recommendation: Recommended by TEAP. However, the Aerosols Products Technical Options Committee was able to recommend this nomination only through a majority and not unanimously.
Comments: In 1995, TEAP was unable to recommend 1997 production of CFC for nasal polyps/sinusitis nasal dexamethasone-Dexacort™). However, in 1996, TEAP and a majority of the Aerosol Products TOC recommend essential use for 1997 for this application. A two-year research programme will be completed in 1997 to assess this drug relative to other available therapy.

A majority of the Aerosols Products Technical Options Committee members recommended nomination for one year only (1997). Nomination for a 1996 decision had been recommended by the TOC after exhortation that this product was essential and that it had a unique indication (nasal polyposis). Further trials were recommended. It is imperative that adequate clinical studies are undertaken, and the TOC notes that a slow start has been made for studies in sinusitis alone and none in polyposis. Not only will there be a need to demonstrate efficacy but also clear evidence that

* These 1997 figures relate to a supplement to the already approved 1997 tonnage.

this product (which is exempt in the United States alone) is essential. The company needs to show good faith efforts in the reformulation away from CFCs.

13. The summary of the nominations for essential-use production exemptions recommended by TEAP appears in annex II to this note.

14. The Seventh Meeting of the Parties requested TEAP to review annually, the quantity of controlled substances authorized and also to review, biennially, whether the applications for which essential use was granted still meet the essential-use criteria and submit a report to the meeting of the Parties in that year (decision VII/28, paras. 2 (a) and (b)). The review for the exemptions given for 1996 can be carried out only in 1997.

15. The Panel also considered the question of laboratory and analytical essential uses and recommended that the Parties extend the global laboratory and analytical uses exemption for 1998. Such an extension would allow the Panel to prepare a report based on the 1996 use by April 1997 for a decision by the Parties in September 1997. Parties and users of laboratory and analytical chemicals will require at least one year (1998) after the 1997 decision to implement any changes in essential uses.

16. The Halons Technical Options Committee (HTOC) reviewed the nomination submitted by the Russian Federation to it for 1996, as an updated use plan for halon-2402. However, this updated use plan was not submitted to the Secretariat as a 1996 essential-use nomination by the Russian Federation. The Russian Federation noted that production of halon-1211 ceased in 1991, production of halon-1301 on 1 January 1995, and the production of halon 2402 has been reduced to less than 10 per cent of the 1986 levels. The halon 2402 will be phased out gradually by the year 2003. The HTOC is of the opinion that this plan is realistic.

17. The 1995 United States nominations for shuttle/rockets were expressed in both metric and ODP tonnes. The quantities of methyl chloroform granted by the decision of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties were less than the nominated amounts, as a result of errors in reporting quantities as ODP-weighted units. TEAP recommends the following upward adjustments in the approved amounts: 2.61 metric tonnes in 1996, 3.33 metric tonnes in 1997, 3.10 metric tonnes in 1998, 2.61 metric tonnes in 1999, 1.53 metric tonnes in 2000 and 1.53 metric tonnes in 2001.

18. In addition, an accounting error was made in 1995, by combining asthma/COPD and nasal polyps/sinusitis uses, which resulted in an unintended approval. TEAP recommended the following adjustments: subtract 6.20 metric tonnes of CFC-12 in 1997 and 24.7 tonnes of CFC-114 in 1997 from the amounts granted by the decision of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties (see annex III below).

19. New Zealand has withdrawn an essential-use nomination for MDIs after the favourable decision by the Seventh Meeting of the Parties. TEAP recommended that the quantities exempted for CFC-11 and CFC-12 in 1996 and 1997 should be reduced to zero (see annex III below).

20. By decision VII/34, paragraph 5 (b)(i), of the Seventh Meeting of the

Parties, the Panel was requested to recommend an accounting framework for reporting essential uses, including MDIs. The Reporting Accounting Framework summary sheet (annex IV below) starts with the total quantities of ODS exempted by the decisions of the Parties. (It should be noted that, in some cases, the authorized 1996 production is the summation of quantities granted in 1994, plus quantities granted in 1995, plus or minus quantities necessary to correct errors and adjustments). Separate columns track ODS inventory carry-over.

21. TEAP believes that the information requested to be collected by the Parties should include the following:

(a) ODS amount exempted listed by year of the nomination and decision;

(b) Amount produced and imported for essential uses;

(c) Amount destroyed; and

(d) Initial and final inventory of bulk CFCs for use in manufacturing MDIs.

22. This information should allow the Parties to re-evaluate exemptions already granted in the light of historical use and changes in production patterns due to rationalization. The data will also allow Parties to monitor the quantities authorized but not utilized and quantities of bulk CFC available at the beginning and end of each year.

23. TEAP also recommended that it may be desirable to allow:

(a) Transfer of essential-use authorizations among Parties to enable consolidation of MDI production facilities using CFCs;

(b) Production of CFC for medical applications on a periodic "campaign basis" to satisfy estimated future needs, rather than producing small quantities each year. Excess quantities could be held "in bond" by national Governments pending use as authorized by the Parties, provided this was found acceptable with respect to the maintenance of adequate product purity of CFCs, stockpiling having previously been described as unacceptable for MDI purposes;

(c) An emergency procedure to enable the Secretariat, in consultation with TEAP, to authorize production of small quantities of ODS for essential uses if ODS is needed under special circumstances prior to the next scheduled meeting of Parties.

24. TEAP further recommended that the Eighth Meeting of the Parties:

(a) Urge Parties to check for errors in summation of individual allocations that form their submission and ask Parties to double-check their applications prior to submission;

(b) Urge Parties to audit nominations submissions against TEAP reports and to carefully compare their records of national nomination against conference papers prior to decision;

(c) Correct the errors introduced by TEAP and its TOCs in the United States nomination and adjust for the withdrawal of the New Zealand MDI nomination for production years 1996 and 1997;

(d) Allow Parties nominating essential uses the advantage of a later submission deadline of 31 January of each year and allow TEAP and its TOCs the advantage of reporting on essential-use nominations on 30 April of each year. This will avoid the complications of completing work and communicating during a holiday season.

25. The Working Group may wish to consider and take appropriate action on the recommendations of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel.

III. ITEM 8 OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA: LIST OF PRODUCTS CONTAINING, OR MADE WITH BUT NOT CONTAINING, CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES IN GROUP II OF ANNEX C OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL (ARTICLE 4, PARAGRAPHS 3 TER AND 4 TER)

26. Paragraph 3 ter of Article 4 of the Protocol provides for Parties, within three years of the date of its entry into force, following the procedures in Article 10 of the Vienna Convention, to elaborate in an Annex, a list of products containing controlled substances in Group II of Annex C. Paragraph 4 ter of the same Article provides for Parties, within five years of the date of its entry into force, to determine the feasibility of banning or restricting, from States not party to the Protocol, the import of products produced with, but not containing, controlled substances in Group II of Annex C. The recommendations of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) on these issues will be part of the report of the TEAP to be circulated in June 1996.

27. The Working Group may wish to consider and take appropriate action on the Panel's recommendations.

IV. ITEM 10 OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA: ISSUES REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

A. Report of the Secretariat on illegal imports and exports of controlled substances (decision VII/33)

28. By its decision VII/33, the Seventh Meeting of the Parties requested the Secretariat to examine information available to it and to request further information from Parties regarding dumping, illegal imports and exports, and uncontrolled production of Annex A and B substances and products containing them that could undermine the effectiveness of the Protocol, and report to the Eighth meeting of the Parties, taking into account the non-compliance procedure under the Montreal Protocol.

29. In February 1996, the Secretariat addressed a letter to all Parties and selected NGOs requesting information regarding this matter. The following Parties reported either that there was no information available on illegal trade or that no such trade was taking place: Austria, Cuba, Czech Republic,

Ethiopia, Iceland, Israel, Jordan, Malaysia, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Saint Lucia, Tunisia, Turkey and Zambia.

30. Australia reported that there was one successful prosecution of a company which illegally imported CFCs without a licence and was fined 168,000 Australian dollars, which went into stratospheric ozone research. It also reported that a small number of other minor inadvertent breaches, the result of ignorance rather than organized attempts to trade illegally, have also been reported although not prosecuted.

31. The European Community reported that rumours of illegal imports, particularly of CFCs, have been heard but not substantiated. As a result of these persistent rumours, the European Commission and the member States have identified three ways through which illegal trade in ozone-depleting substances could take place within the Community and detailed the steps taken/to be taken to stop such trade. These are:

(a) Inward processing. Imports coming to the European Community for processing and re-export and not subject to any quotas may find their way into the European Community market. In order to monitor these imports, the Commission introduced import licences through Council regulation 3093/94 from 1 January 1995 to allow the Commission and the member States to monitor such imports;

(b) Shipments in transit. Shipments of controlled substances coming into the European Community are normally cleared at the final destination, not at the point of entry. A new system is to be introduced to closely monitor the shipments in transit until the final destination;

(c) Incorrect labelling. Since most entry points do not possess sophisticated chemical analysis equipment needed to distinguish between various chemical substances, this is a potential method by which illegal imports may be made.

32. The member States of the European Community will be considering whether additional controls on exports are appropriate.

33. In a separate reply to the Secretariat's letter, France stated that it is following the regulations of the European Community.

34. The Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy (ARAP), in cooperation with the United States Government, has reported that an estimate of between 10,000 and 20,000 metric tonnes of CFCs illegally entered the United States market each year in 1994 and 1995. Steps taken to prevent this illegal trade include:

(a) Forming a Government investigative group composed of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the United States Customs Service, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), the Commerce Department, and the Justice Department;

(b) Rigorous Government investigations that have led to the indictment and/or conviction of approximately 12 individuals for smuggling or diverting

CFCs into the United States with judges imposing monetary penalties of up to $3.5 million and imprisonment for terms up to five years in jail. Over 500 tonnes of illegally imported CFCs have been impounded by customs authorities. In addition to criminal penalties, there are also civil penalties of $25,000 per kilogramme wrongfully imported in violation of EPA regulations. The Government has powers to confiscate any illegally imported refrigerant;

(c) New CFC refrigerants may not be imported after 1 January 1996;

(d) EPA has adopted a petition process requiring imports of used CFCs to be approved prior to their shipment into the United States. EPA is soon to finalize a rule requiring notice or permission for shipments of CFCs to pass through the United States on their way to another country;

(e) Much publicity has been generated on the issue of illegal trade in ozone depleting substances by the Government and the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy through the media, conferences, speeches, and documents. The publicity clarified what activity is legal or illegal and informed CFC users that illegally imported material can be of questionable quality and may be confiscated;

(f) Customs agents have held training sessions and have been provided with the tools, such as pressure gauges, to identify and be aware of illegal CFCs at the borders.

35. The response of ARAP recommends that:

(a) A petition system similar to the EPA's petition system should be instituted internationally. The system requires that the Government approve the shipment of any used, recycled, or reclaimed CFCs into the United States before they leave the exporting port. The importer must sufficiently demonstrate to EPA that the CFCs have, indeed, been previously used. Documentation includes identification of the actual equipment from which the CFCs were removed. EPA's scrutiny has been rigorous;

(b) All Parties have the obligation to report all imports and exports. In addition, all Parties are required to notify the Secretariat in regard to their capabilities for recycling and reclamation. This information is needed in order to determine whether a country has the capability to claim that such exports are recycled or reclaimed. It is recommended that sanctions be imposed on those countries which do not make these reports. Such sanctions could include disallowing trade in CFCs for those countries, rejection of imports of CFCs from them and denial or withholding of financial assistance from the Multilateral Fund until they comply with these requirements;

(c) Funds from the Multilateral Fund should be made available to developing countries with particular problems to enable them increase their border patrols, enforcement of the law, and tracking of production and exports. Funds should also be made available for the purchase of pressure gauges for use at major entry ports which identify the contents of containers which may be falsely labelled. In addition, funds from the Multilateral Fund should be used for expanding recycling and reclamation within countries without such an infrastructure. Such technology may create incentives to keep and reuse the refrigerants within the country. Recycling and

reclamation also diminishes the opportunity to vent refrigerants;

(d) Developed countries should be requested to patrol their borders, enforce the laws, and institute more severe criminal penalties for illegal import and export of CFCs. Developed countries should be encouraged to buy the tools and conduct the training necessary to curtail illegal trade. Each Party should be required to submit a report regarding activity to curtail illegal trade. Sanctions restricting trade in CFCs should be imposed on Parties which do not submit such timely reports. Reports should be made public by the Secretariat;

(e) The Secretariat should avail to the Parties all of the accumulated information and statistics on illegal trade. This information could be provided as a result of the investigations which have been conducted;

(f) The Parties should decide to institute a registration number for each CFC production facility in the world. The registration number would be applied to every container of virgin CFCs leaving the facility. The facility registration numbers would be publicized. Containers without a registration number would not be allowed to be exported or imported under the requirement of the Protocol. The registration number system would allow tracking and identification of virgin substances to occur more easily;

(g) Parties not in compliance with production controls and trade restrictions should not be allowed to export CFCs or import CFCs from any Party to the Protocol.

Observations by the Secretariat

36. The Parties have prescribed, in addition to the reporting under Article 7, that data regarding exports and imports be reported to the Secretariat:

(a) Decision IV/24, paragraph 2, prescribes reporting for import and export of used and recycled controlled substances.

(b) Decision VI/19, paragraph 4, prescribes reporting on reclamation facilities and their capacities.

(c) Decision V/25, and later decision VI/14 A, prescribe reports from 1 January 1995 by Parties supplying controlled substances to the Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5.

37. If the Parties report all the above-mentioned information every year in time, it will be possible to cross-check the imports with the exports and the export of recycled substances with the recycling capacity and identify any illegal trade.

Recommendations by the Secretariat

38. The Secretariat recommends:

(a) The steps already taken by the European Community, the United States of America and other countries appear to be effective in curbing the illegal trade. The Working Group may wish to consider whether all the

Parties may be urged to take similar steps;

(b) The recommendations by the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy and the United States of America appear to be appropriate to promote the strict implementation of the various provisions of the Protocol and to restrict the illegal trade. The Working Group may wish to consider recommending acceptance of these recommendations by the Eighth Meeting of the Parties;

(c) The Working Group may wish to consider whether, on a specific request by the Meeting of the Parties in appropriate cases, the TEAP may be authorized to inspect and report on any specific recycling facilities;

(d) The detection of illegal trade becomes easier if each Party is required to report the destination of its exports and the origins of its imports. Decision VII/9, paragraph 4, requires each exporting Party to report the details and destinations of its exports. The Working Group may consider whether such reporting may be prescribed for each importing Party also.

B. Report by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on the status of implementation of the Protocol in the countries with economies in transition (decision VII/34, paragraph 5(d))

39. The TEAP report on the status of implementation of the Protocol in the countries with economies in transition is under preparation by the Panel and will be presented to the meeting of the Working Group. The Working Group may wish to consider and take action as appropriate on the report.

C. Report of the President of the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol

40. The Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol held its first meeting this year in Geneva on 18 and 19 March 1996 to consider, among other things, issues referred to it by the Seventh Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. The report of this meeting was communicated to all Parties in all official languages in April 1996 under the symbol UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/13/3. The Implementation Committee will meet again in Geneva on 23 August 1996, after which the President of the Committee will present a report to the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting.

D. Issues relating to ratification of the Protocol by non-Parties

41. At the thirteenth meeting of the Implementation Committee, held in Geneva on 18-19 March 1996, it was recommended that the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties should consider the issue of ratification of the ozone treaties by the countries with economies in transition in the context of economic conditions being experienced by those countries and their overall consumption of ozone-depleting substances. This recommendation followed the report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel Ad Hoc Working Group on CEIT Aspects on its activities in the period from December 1995 to March 1996 that was presented to the Implementation Committee at its meeting in March 1996. Some of the countries with economies in transition had pointed out two reasons for failure to ratify the ozone treaties: their inability to meet the existing phase-out schedule of ozone-depleting substances applicable to Parties operating under Article 2 of the Protocol; and their inability to make contributions to the Multilateral Fund because of the financial difficulties which they are facing.

42. At present, seven non-developing countries with economies in transition — Armenia, Azerbaijan, Estonia, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Moldova and Tajikistan — are yet to ratify the Protocol. Tajikistan recently ratified the Vienna Convention only. The Secretariat has recently received letters from Azerbaijan, Estonia and the Republic of Moldova stating that they are in the process of ratification of the Protocol. The GEF secretariat is considering proposals to convene regional meetings to persuade these non-Parties to ratify the Protocol quickly.

43. The Open-ended Working Group may wish to consider ways of solving the two problems raised by these countries with economies in transition.

E. Proposed revised format for the reporting of data under Article 7 of the Protocol

44. Following the adoption of further adjustments (the Vienna Adjustments) to the control measures to phase out ozone-depleting substances and other decisions, changes to the layout of some existing data formats are proposed. These changes affect the columns for quarantine and pre-shipment, increased production, import and export.

45. The Working Group may wish to consider and approve the proposed changes in the formats in annex V below.

Annex I

TRUST FUND FOR THE MULTILATERAL FUND UNDER THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL ON SUBSTANCES THAT DEPLETE THE OZONE LAYER: SCALE OF 1996 CONTRIBUTIONS BY THE PARTIES BASED ON THE CURRENT UNITED NATIONS SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS WITH NO PARTY PAYING MORE THAN 25 PER CENT (IN UNITED STATES DOLLARS) IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DECISION OF THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

PARTY	CONTRIBUTIONS AGREED BY THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES IN 1993		NEW UNITED NATIONS SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR 1996	ADJUSTED TO EXCLUDE NON-CONTRIBUTORS IN 1996	ADJUSTED PERCENTAGES WITH 25% CEILING CONSIDERED	ADJUSTED CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTIES FOR 1996	DIFFERENCE COMPARED TO ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS AGREED FOR 1996
	PERCENTAGE	AMOUNT (US$)	PERCENTAGE	PERCENTAGE	PERCENTAGE	AMOUNT (US$)	AMOUNT (US$)
Australia	1.73670	2,633,990	1.4800	1.4800	1.69952	2,577,608	(56,382)
Austria	0.86260	1,308,273	0.8650	0.8650	0.99330	1,506,507	198,234
Belarus	0.55206	837,295	0.2925	0.2925	0.33589	509,426	(327,869)
Belgium	1.21914	1,849,026	1.0075	1.0075	1.15694	1,754,689	(94,337)
BRUNEI DARUSSALAM		0	0.0200	0.0200	0.02297	34,833	34,833
Bulgaria	0.14952	226,767	0.0825	0.0825	0.09474	143,684	(83,083)
Canada	3.57691	5,424,973	3.1025	3.1025	3.56268	5,403,397	(21,576)
Cyprus	0.02300	34,887	0.0300	0.0300	0.03445	52,249	17,362
Czech Republic	0.48305	732,633	0.2600	0.2600	0.29856	425,823	(279,810)

Denmark	0.74758	1,133,837	0.7175	0.7175	0.82392	1,249,617	115,780
Finland	0.65557	994,288	0.6175	0.6175	0.70909	1,075,455	81,167
France	6.90078	10,466,186	6.4075	6.4075	7.35789	11,159,474	693,288
Germany	10.27066	15,577,174	9.0425	9.0425	10.38373	15,748,660	171,486
Greece	0.40255	610,528	0.3800	0.3800	0.43636	661,818	51,290
Hungary	0.20702	313,986	0.1400	0.1400	0.16077	243,828	(70,158)
Iceland	0.03450	52,331	0.0300	0.0300	0.03445	52,249	(82)
Ireland	0.20702	313,986	0.2100	0.2100	0.24115	365,742	51,756
Israel	0.26453	401,204	0.2675	0.2675	0.30718	465,885	64,681
Italy	4.93406	7,483,323	5.1975	5.1975	5.96842	9,052,105	1,568,782
Japan	14.31912	21,717,336	15.4350	15.4350	17.72440	26,882,010	5,164,674
Kuwait A5	0.28753	436,091	0.1900	0.0000	0.00000	0	(436,091)
LATVIA		0	0.0825	0.0825	0.09474	143,684	143,684
Liechtenstein	0.01150	17,444	0.0100	0.0100	0.01148	17,416	(28)
LITHUANIA		0	0.085	0.085	0.09761	148,038	148,038
Luxembourg	0.06901	104,662	0.0700	0.0700	0.08038	121,914	17,252
Monaco	0.01150	17,444	0.0100	0.0100	0.01148	17,416	(28)
Netherlands	1.72520	2,616,547	1.5875	1.5875	1.82297	2,764,833	148,286

/...

New Zealand	0.27603	418,647	0.2400	0.2400	0.27560	417,990	(657)
Norway	0.63257	959,400	0.5600	0.5600	0.64306	975,311	15,911
Poland	0.54056	819,851	0.3375	0.3375	0.38756	587,799	(232,052)
Portugal	0.23003	348,873	0.2750	0.2750	0.31579	478,947	130,074
Republic of Korea A5	0.79359	1,203,611	0.8175	0.0000	0.00000	0	(1,203,611)
Russian Federation	7.71737	11,704,685	4.4500	4.4500	5.11005	7,750,239	(3,954,446)
Saudi Arabia A5	1.10413	1,674,590	0.7200	0.0000	0.00000	0	(1,674,590)
Singapore A5	0.13802	209,324	0.1400	0.0000	0.00000	0	(209,324)
Slovakia	0.14952	226,767	0.0825	0.0825	0.09474	143,684	(83,083)
South Africa	0.47155	715,189	0.3225	0.3225	0.37033	561,675	(153,514)
Spain	2.27726	3,453,841	2.3625	2.3625	2.71292	4,114,593	660,752
Sweden	1.27664	1,936,244	1.2275	1.2275	1.40957	2,137,847	201,603
Switzerland	1.27664	1,936,244	1.2100	1.2100	1.38947	2,107,368	171,124
TURKMENISTAN		0	0.0325	0.0325	0.03732	56,603	56,603
Ukraine	2.15074	3,261,961	1.1400	1.1400	1.30909	1,985,455	(1,276,506)
United Arab Emirates	0.24153	366,317	0.1900	0.1900	0.21818	330,909	(35,408)
United Kingdom	5.77365	8,756,709	5.3150	5.3150	6.10335	9,256,746	500,037
United States of America	25.00000	37,916,667	25.0000	25.00000	25.0000	37,916,667	0

Uzbekistan	0.29903	453,535	0.1375	0.1375	0.15789	239,474	(214,061)
TOTALS	100.0000	151,666,666	92.18000	90.31250	100.00000	151,666,667	1

Annex II

RECOMMENDED NOMINATIONS FOR ESSENTIAL USE EXEMPTIONS
(in metric tonnes)

Party	CFC-11			CFC-12			CFC-113			CFC-114		
	1997	1998	1999	1997	1998	1999	1997	1998	1999	1997	1998	1999
1. Canada	--	128.0	--	--	320.0	--	--	--	--	--	65.0	--
2. European Union	--	1,778.0	--	--	3,307.0	--	--	16.0	--	--	509.0	--
3. Japan	--	53.0	37.0	--	105.0	75.0	--	0.5	0.5	--	23.0	24.0
4. Poland	102.0	--	--	152.6	--	--	--	--	--	23.0	--	--
5. South Africa	--	62.0	--	--	156.0	--	--	--	--	--	5.0	--
6. Switzerland	2.0	2.0	--	4.0	4.0	--	--	--	--	2.0	2.0	--
7. United States	149.3	1,204.3	--	415.8	2,814.7	--	--	--	--	131.5	369.0	--
TOTAL	253.3	3,227.3	37.0	572.4	6,706.7	75.0	--	16.5	0.5	156.5	973.0	24.0

Annex III

RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS TO QUANTITIES APPROVED EARLIER FOR ESSENTIAL USES
(in metric tonnes)

Country	Use	Chemical	Production year	Nominated amount	Approved amount	Recommended adjustment	Total approved and recommended
United States	MDI	CFC-12	1997	431	437.2	-6.20	431
United States	MDI	CFC-114	1997	19	43.7	-24.7	19
United States	Shuttle/rockets	MCF	1996	2.9	.29	2.61	2.9
United States	Shuttle/rockets	MCF	1997	3.7	.37	3.33	3.7
United States	Shuttle/rockets	MCF	1998	60.1	57.00	3.10	60.10
United States	Shuttle/rockets	MCF	1999	59.6	56.99	2.61	59.60
United States	Shuttle/rockets	MCF	2000	58.4	56.87	1.53	58.4
United States	Shuttle/rockets	MCF	2001	58.4	56.87	1.53	58.4
New Zealand	MDI	CFC-11	1996	9.00	9.00	-9.00	0.00
New Zealand	MDI	CFC-12	1996	23.50	23.50	-23.50	0.00
New Zealand	MDI	CFC-11	1997	8.00	8.00	-8.00	0.00
New Zealand	MDI	CFC-12	1997	22.00	22.00	-22.00	0.00

Annex IV

TEAP PROPOSED REPORTING ACCOUNTING FRAMEWORK

A	B	C	D	E	F (D + E)	G (C - F)	H[1]	I (H + F)	J	K	L[2] (I - J - K)
Year of authorized essential use	**Ozone-depleting substance**	**Amount exempted listed by year of decision**	**Amount acquired by production**	**Amount acquired by import**	**Total acquired for essential use**	**Authorized but not acquired**	**On hand start of year[1]**	**Available for use in current year**	**Used for MDI manufacture**	**Destroyed**	**On hand end of year[2]**
1996	CFC-11	1994:									
		1995:									
		1996:									
		Total:									
1996	CFC-12	1994:									
		1995:									
		1996:									
		Total:									
1996	CFC-113	1994:									
		1995:									
		1996:									
		Total:									
1996	CFC-114	1994:									
		1995:									
		1996:									
		Total:									
1996	MCF	1994:									
		1995:									
		1996:									
		Total:									

All quantities expressed in tonnes.

[1] National Governments may not be able to estimate quantities on hand as at 1 January 1996 but can track the subsequent inventory of ODS produced for essential uses (Column L).

[2] Carried forward as “on hand start of the year” for next year.

Annex V

FORMATS FOR REPORTING DATA UNDER THE AMENDED MONTREAL PROTOCOL
(Revised in 1996)

INTRODUCTION SHEET

1. The data formats are for the use of the Parties in reporting data on the production, import and export of each individual substance listed in the annexes of the Montreal Protocol as amended in London and Copenhagen, and as required by Article 7 and relevant decisions of the Parties.

2. There are ten forms for reporting the required data:

(a) **Data for the base years for controlling production and consumption:** (No change in the formats approved in 1993).

(i) For reporting 1986 data, as required by Article 7, paragraph 1:

Form 1: Annex A substances;

(ii) For reporting data necessary to calculate base-year consumption under Article 2 F:

Form 2: Annex A, Group I substances;

(iii) For reporting 1989 data, as required by Article 7, paragraph 2:

Form 3: Annex B substances
Form 4: Annex C substances;

(iv) For reporting 1991 data, as required by Article 7, paragraph 2:

Form 5: Annex E substance;

(b) **Reporting of data for the year in which the Protocol enters into force for the Party in question and for each year thereafter, in accordance with Article 7, paragraphs 3 and 3 bis, and decision IV/24 and VII/9 and 30:** (The forms below replace the forms 6-10 approved in 1993)

New Form 6: Annexes A and B substances
New Form 7: Annex C substances
New Form 8: Annex E substance

New Form 9: Data on exports of controlled substances

New Form 10: Data on imports of controlled substances

3. Parties are requested to report the data in metric tonnes, without multiplying by the relevant ODPs (ozone-depleting potentials). The data on each substance should also include isomers.

4. The data reported in accordance with the formats will be used to determine the calculated levels of consumption upon which the control measures are based. It is therefore crucial that data be provided separately for each individual substance listed in the formats.

5. It should be noted that paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 7 both provide that the Parties should submit the best possible estimates where actual data are not available.

6. The quantities of controlled substances used for refilling the refrigeration and fire-extinguishing systems of ships in ports should be regarded as forming part of consumption of the country with jurisdiction over the port and should therefore not be included in its export figures.

7. With regard to the data on "amounts destroyed", the Parties, approved, at their Fourth Meeting, destruction processes and regulatory standards for the destruction facilities. The amounts destroyed should be calculated on the basis of the destruction efficiency of the facility employed (see decision IV/11).

8. Amounts used as feedstock, e.g. amounts of carbon tetrachloride used as feedstock in the production of CFC-11 and 12, should be reported, as a total, whether from production within the country or imports.

Ref: Data Form 1

Reporting of data under Article 7, paragraph 1

1986 DATA ON PRODUCTION, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF CFCs AND HALONS
CONTROLLED BY THE AMENDED MONTREAL PROTOCOL
(in metric tonnes)

Country: _____ Annex A substances

SUBSTANCES	PRODUCTION	IMPORTS	EXPORTS
GROUP I $CFC1_3$ (CFC-11)			
CF_2C1_2 (CFC-12)			
$C_2F_3C1_3$ (CFC-113)			
$C_2F_4C1_2$ (CFC-114)			
C_2F_5C1 (CFC-115)			
TOTAL FOR GROUP I			
GROUP II CF_2BrC1 (HALON 1211)			
CF_3Br (HALON 1301)			
$C_2F_4Br_2$ (HALON 2402)			
TOTAL FOR GROUP II			

Notes:

1. Please report the data by weight and not multiplied by ODP.

2. Isomers should be included under each substance.

Ref: Data Form 2

Reporting of data necessary to calculate base year consumption under Article 2 F

1989 DATA ON PRODUCTION, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF CFCs CONTROLLED BY THE AMENDED MONTREAL PROTOCOL
(in metric tonnes)

Country: _____ Annex A substances

SUBSTANCES	PRODUCTION	IMPORTS	EXPORTS
GROUP I $CFCl_3$ (CFC-11)			
CF_2Cl_2 (CFC-12)			
$C_2F_3Cl_3$ (CFC-113)			
$C_2F_4Cl_2$ (CFC-114)			
C_2F_5Cl (CFC-115)			
TOTAL FOR GROUP I			

Notes:

1. Please report the data by weight and not multiplied by ODP.

2. Isomers should be included under each substance.

Ref: Data form 3

Reporting of data under Article 7, paragraph 2

1989 DATA ON PRODUCTION, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF SUBSTANCES CONTROLLED BY THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
(in metric tonnes)

Country: _____ Annex B substances

SUBSTANCES	PRODUCTION	IMPORTS	EXPORTS
GROUP I CF_3Cl (CFC-13)			
C_2FCl_5 (CFC-111)			
$C_2F_2Cl_4$ (CFC-112)			
C_3FCl_7 (CFC-211)			
$C_3F_2Cl_6$ (CFC-212)			
$C_3F_3Cl_5$ (CFC-213)			
$C_3F_4Cl_4$ (CFC-214)			
$C_3F_5Cl_3$ (CFC-215)			
$C_3F_6Cl_2$ (CFC-216)			
C_3F_7Cl (CFC-217)			
TOTAL FOR GROUP I			
GROUP II CCl_4 (carbon tetrachloride)			
GROUP III $C_2H_3Cl_3$* (methyl chloroform, i.e. 1,1,1-trichloroethane)			

* This formula does not refer to 1,1,2-trichloroethane.

Notes: 1. Please report the data by weight and not multiplied by ODP.

2. Isomers should be included under each substance.

Ref: Data Form 4

Reporting of data under Article 7, paragraph 2

1989 DATA ON PRODUCTION, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF SUBSTANCES
CONTROLLED BY THE AMENDED MONTREAL PROTOCOL
(in metric tonnes)

Country: _____ Annex C substances

SUBSTANCES		PRODUCTION	IMPORTS	EXPORTS
GROUP I				
$CHFCl_2$	(HCFC-21)*			
CHF_2Cl	(HCFC-22)*			
CH_2FCl	(HCFC-31)			
C_2HFCl_4	(HCFC-121)			
$C_2HF_2Cl_3$	(HCFC-122)			
$C_2HF_3Cl_2$	(HCFC-123)			
$CHCl_2CF_3$	(HCFC-123)*			
C_2HF_4Cl	(HCFC-124)			
$CHFClCF_3$	(HCFC-124)*			
$C_2H_2FCl_3$	(HCFC-131)			
$C_2H_2F_2Cl_2$	(HCFC-132)			
$C_2H_2F_3Cl$	(HCFC-133)			

SUBSTANCES		PRODUCTION	IMPORTS	EXPORTS
$C_2H_3FCl_2$	(HCFC-141)			
CH_3CFCl_2	(HCFC-141b)*			
$C_2H_3F_2Cl$	(HCFC-142)			
CH_3CF_2Cl	(HCFC-142b)*			
C_2H_4FCl	(HCFC-151)			
C_3HFCl_6	(HCFC-221)			
$C_3HF_2Cl_5$	(HCFC-222)			
$C_3HF_3Cl_4$	(HCFC-223)			
$C_3HF_4Cl_3$	(HCFC-224)			
$C_3HF_5Cl_2$	(HCFC-225)			
$CF_3CF_2CHCl_2$	(HCFC-225ca)*			
CF_2ClCF_2CHClF	(HCFC-225cb)*			
C_3HF_6Cl	(HCFC-226)			
$C_3H_2FCl_5$	(HCFC-231)			
$C_3H_2F_2Cl_4$	(HCFC-232)			
$C_3H_2F_3Cl_3$	(HCFC-233)			
$C_3H_2F_4Cl_2$	(HCFC-234)			
$C_3H_2F_5Cl$	(HCFC-235)			
$C_3H_3FCl_4$	(HCFC-241)			
$C_3H_3F_2Cl_3$	(HCFC-242)			

SUBSTANCES		PRODUCTION	IMPORTS	EXPORTS
$C_3H_3F_3Cl_2$	(HCFC-243)			
$C_3H_3F_4Cl$	(HCFC-244)			
$C_3H_4FCl_3$	(HCFC-251)			
$C_3H_4F_2Cl_2$	(HCFC-252)			
$C_3H_4F_3Cl$	(HCFC-253)			
$C_3H_5FCl_2$	(HCFC-261)			
$C_3H_5F_2Cl$	(HCFC-262)			
C_3H_6FCl	(HCFC-271)			
GROUP II $CHFBr_2$				
CHF_2Br	(HBFC-22B1)			
CH_2FBr				
C_2HFBr_4				
$C_2HF_2Br_3$				
$C_2HF_3Br_2$				
C_2HF_4Br				
$C_2H_2FBr_3$				
$C_2H_2F_2Br_2$				
$C_2H_2F_3Br$				
$C_2H_3FBr_2$				

SUBSTANCES	PRODUCTION	IMPORTS	EXPORTS
$C_2H_3F_2Br$			
C_2H_4FBr			
C_3HFBr_6			
$C_3HF_2Br_5$			
$C_3HF_3Br_4$			
$C_3HF_4Br_3$			
$C_3HF_5Br_2$			
C_3HF_6Br			
$C_3H_2FBr_5$			
$C_3H_2F_2Br_4$			
$C_3H_2F_3Br_3$			
$C_3H_2F_4Br_2$			
$C_3H_2F_5Br$			
$C_3H_3FBr_4$			
$C_3H_3F_2Br_3$			
$C_3H_3F_3Br_2$			
$C_3H_3F_4Br$			
$C_3H_4FBr_3$			
$C_3H_4F_2Br_2$			
$C_3H_4F_3Br$			

SUBSTANCES	PRODUCTION	IMPORTS	EXPORTS
$C_3H_5FBr_2$			
$C_3H_5F_2Br$			
C_3H_6FBr			

Notes: 1. Please report the data by weight and not multiplied by ODP.

2. Isomers should be included under each substance.

* Identifies the most commercially viable substances with ODP values listed against them to be used for the purposes of the Protocol.

Ref: Data Form 5

Reporting of data under Article 7, paragraph 2

1991 DATA ON PRODUCTION, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF SUBSTANCES CONTROLLED BY THE AMENDED MONTREAL PROTOCOL
(in metric tonnes)

Country: _____ Annex E substance

SUBSTANCE	PRODUCTION	IMPORTS	EXPORTS	AMOUNTS USED FOR QUARANTINE AND PRE-SHIPMENT APPLICATION	AMOUNTS FOR CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL USES
CH_3Br METHYL BROMIDE					

Ref: New Data Form 6

DATA ON PRODUCTION, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF SUBSTANCES CONTROLLED
BY THE AMENDED MONTREAL PROTOCOL
(in metric tonnes)

Annexes A and B substances

Country: _____ Period: January - December 199--

ANNEX/GROUP	SUBSTANCES	TOTAL PRODUCTION*	IMPORT	USED WITHIN THE COUNTRY FOR FEEDSTOCK**	EXPORT	DESTROYED	INCREASED PRODUCTION FOR SUPPLY TO ARTICLE 5 COUNTRIES***
A-Group I	$CFCl_3$ (CFC-11)						
	CFC_2Cl_2 (CFC-12)						
	$C_2F_3Cl_3$ (CFC-113)						
	$C_2F_4Cl_2$ (CFC-114)						
	C_2F_5Cl (CFC-115)						
	TOTAL						
A-Group II	CF_2BrCl (HALON 1211)						
	CF_3Br (HALON 1301)						
	$C_2F_4Br_2$ (HALON 2402)						
	TOTAL						
B-Group I	CF_3C1 (CFC-13)						

/...

ANNEX/GROUP	SUBSTANCES	TOTAL PRODUCTION*	IMPORT	USED WITHIN THE COUNTRY FOR FEEDSTOCK**	EXPORT	DESTROYED	INCREASED PRODUCTION FOR SUPPLY TO ARTICLE 5 COUNTRIES***
	C_2FC1_5 (CFC-111)						
	$C_2F_2C1_4$ (CFC-112)						
	C_3FC1_7 (CFC-211)						
	$C_3F_2C1_6$ (CFC-212)						
	$C_2F_3C1_5$ (CFC-213)						
	$C_2F_3C1_5$ (CFC-213)						
	$C_3F_4C1_4$ (CFC-214)						
	$C_3F_5C1_3$ (CFC-215)						
	$C_3F_6C1_2$ (CFC-216)						
	C_3F_7C1 (CFC-217)						
	TOTAL						
B-Group II	CCl_4 (Carbon tetrachloride)						
B-Group III	$C_2H_3Cl_3$ (Methyl chloroform, i.e., 1,1,1-trichloroethane)						

* Total production should be given without any deductions. The Secretariat would make the necessary deductions in accordance with the definition in Article 1.

** Please see Article 1, paragraph 5, of the Protocol and decision VII/30 of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties. Please give the total quantity used within your country as feedstock, whether from local production or imports.

*** Up to 15 per cent of calculated production in order to satisfy their basic domestic needs.

Ref: New Data Form 7

DATA ON PRODUCTION, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF SUBSTANCES CONTROLLED BY THE AMENDED MONTREAL PROTOCOL
(in metric tonnes)

Country: _____ Period: January - December 199-

Annex C substances

ANNEX/GROUP	SUBSTANCE		TOTAL PRODUCTION***	IMPORT	USED WITHIN THE COUNTRY FOR FEEDSTOCK**	EXPORT
C-Group I	$CHFCl_2$	(HCFC-21)*				
	CHF_2Cl	(HCFC-22)*				
	CH_2FCl	(HCFC-31)				
	C_2HFCl_4	(HCFC-121)				
	$C_2HF_2Cl_3$	(HCFC-122)				
	$C_2HF_3Cl_2$	(HCFC-123)				
	$CHCl_2CF_3$	(HCFC-123)*				
	C_2HF_4Cl	(HCFC-124)				
	$CHFClCF_3$	(HCFC-124)*				
	$C_2H_2FCl_3$	(HCFC-131)				
	$C_2H_2F_2Cl_2$	(HCFC-132)				
	$C_2H_2F_3Cl$	(HCFC-133)				

ANNEX/GROUP	SUBSTANCE		TOTAL PRODUCTION***	IMPORT	USED WITHIN THE COUNTRY FOR FEEDSTOCK**	EXPORT
	$C_2H_3FCl_2$	(HCFC-141)				
	CH_3CFCl_2	(HCFC-141b)*				
C-Group I	$C_2H_3F_2Cl$	(HCFC-142)				
	CH_3CF_2Cl	(HCFC-142b)*				
	C_2H_4FCl	(HCFC-151)				
	C_3HFCl_6	(HCFC-221)				
	$C_3HF_2Cl_5$	(HCFC-222)				
	$C_3HF_3Cl_4$	(HCFC-223)				
	$C_3HF_4Cl_3$	(HCFC-224)				
	$C_3HF_5Cl_2$	(HCFC-225)				
	$CF_3CF_2CHCl_2$	(HCFC-225ca)*				
	CF_2ClCF_2CHClF	(HCFC-225cb)*				
	C_3HF_6Cl	(HCFC-226)				
	$C_3H_2FCl_5$	(HCFC-231)				
	$C_3H_2F_2Cl_4$	(HCFC-232)				
	$C_3H_2F_3Cl_3$	(HCFC-233)				
	$C_3H_2F_4Cl_2$	(HCFC-234)				
	$C_3H_2F_5Cl$	(HCFC-235)				

ANNEX/GROUP	SUBSTANCE	TOTAL PRODUCTION***	IMPORT	USED WITHIN THE COUNTRY FOR FEEDSTOCK**	EXPORT
	$C_3H_3FCl_4$ (HCFC-241)				
	$C_3H_3F_2Cl_3$ (HCFC-242)				
	$C_3H_3F_3Cl_2$ (HCFC-243)				
	$C_3H_3F_4Cl$ (HCFC-244)				
	$C_3H_4FCl_3$ (HCFC-251)				
	$C_3H_4F_2Cl_2$ (HCFC-252)				
C-Group I	$C_3H_4F_3Cl$ (HCFC-253)				
	$C_3H_5FCl_2$ (HCFC-261)				
	$C_3H_5F_2Cl$ (HCFC-262)				
	C_3H_6FCl (HCFC-271)				
TOTAL					
C-Group II	$CHFBr_2$				
	CHF_2Br (HBFC-22B1)				
	CH_2FBr				
	C_2HFBr_4				
	$C_2HF_2Br_3$				
	$C_2HF_3Br_2$				
	C_2HF_4Br				

ANNEX/GROUP	SUBSTANCE	TOTAL PRODUCTION***	IMPORT	USED WITHIN THE COUNTRY FOR FEEDSTOCK**	EXPORT
	$C_2H_2FBr_3$				
	$C_2H_2F_2Br_2$				
	$C_2H_2F_3Br$				
	$C_2H_3FBr_2$				
	$C_2H_3F_2Br$				
	C_2H_4FBr				
	C_3HFBr_6				
	$C_3HF_2Br_5$				
	$C_3HF_3Br_4$				
C-Group II	$C_3HF_4Br_3$				
	$C_3HF_5Br_2$				
	C_3HF_6Br				
	$C_3H_2FBr_5$				
	$C_3H_2F_2Br_4$				
	$C_3H_2F_3Br_3$				
	$C_3H_2F_4Br_2$				
	$C_3H_2F_5Br$				
	$C_3H_3FBr_4$				

ANNEX/GROUP	SUBSTANCE	TOTAL PRODUCTION***	IMPORT	USED WITHIN THE COUNTRY FOR FEEDSTOCK**	EXPORT
	$C_3H_3F_2Br_3$				
	$C_3H_3F_3Br_2$				
	$C_3H_3F_4Br$				
	$C_3H_4FBr_3$				
	$C_3H_4F_2Br_2$				
	$C_3H_4F_3Br$				
	$C_3H_5FBr_2$				
	$C_3H_5F_2Br$				
	C_3H_6FBr				

* Identifies the most commercially viable substances with ODP values listed against them to be used for the purposes of the Protocol.

** Please see Article 1, paragraph 5, of the Protocol and decision VII/30 of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties. Please give the total quantity used within your country as feedstock, whether from local production or imports.

*** Total production should be given without any deductions. The Secretariat would make the necessary deductions in accordance with the definition in Article 1.

Ref: New Data Form 8

DATA ON PRODUCTION, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF SUBSTANCES CONTROLLED BY THE AMENDED MONTREAL PROTOCOL
(in metric tonnes)

Country: _____ Period: January - December 199--

Annex E substance

ANNEX/GROUP	SUBSTANCE	TOTAL PRODUCTION*	IMPORT	USED WITHIN THE COUNTRY FOR FEEDSTOCK**	EXPORT	INCREASED PRODUCTION FOR SUPPLY TO ARTICLE 5 COUNTRIES***	QUARANTINE & PRE-SHIPMENT
E-Group I	CH_3Br METHYL BROMIDE						
	TOTAL						

* Total production should be given, without any deductions. The Secretariat would make the necessary deductions in accordance with the definition in Article 1.

** Please see Article 1, paragraph 5, of the Protocol and decision VII/30 of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties. Please give the total quantity used within your country as feed stock whether from local production or imports.

*** Up to 10 per cent of calculated production in order to satisfy their basic domestic needs.

Ref: New Data form 9

DATA ON EXPORTS OF SUBSTANCES CONTROLLED BY THE AMENDED MONTREAL PROTOCOL
(in metric tonnes)

Annexes A, B, C and E substances

Country: _____ Period: January - December 199--

ANNEX	GROUP	SUBSTANCE	COUNTRY OF DESTINATION OF EXPORTS*	QUANTITIES		
				NEW	RECOVERED**	RECLAIMED**

/...

ANNEX	GROUP	SUBSTANCE	COUNTRY OF DESTINATION OF EXPORTS*	QUANTITIES		
				NEW	RECOVERED**	RECLAIMED**
TOTAL						

* Decision VII/9, paragraph 4, of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties. Use additional copies of this form to enter names of all countries where substances exported.

** Decision IV/24, paragraph 3, defines what is "recovered" and "reclaimed" substances.

Recovery: The collection and storage of controlled substances from machinery, equipment, containment vessels, etc., during servicing or prior to disposal;

Reclamation: The reprocessing and upgrading of a recovered controlled substance through such mechanisms as filtering, drying, distillation and chemical treatment in order to restore the substance to a specified standard of performance. It often involves processing "off-site" at a central facility.

Ref: New Data form 10

DATA ON IMPORTS OF SUBSTANCES CONTROLLED BY THE AMENDED MONTREAL PROTOCOL
(in metric tonnes)

Annexes A, B, C and E substances

Country: _____ Period: January - December 199--

ANNEX	GROUP	SUBSTANCE	COUNTRY OF DESTINATION OF EXPORTS*	QUANTITIES		
				NEW	RECOVERED**	RECLAIMED**

/...

TOTAL						

* Decision VII/9, paragraph 4, of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties. Use additional copies of this form to enter names of all countries where substances exported.

** Decision IV/24, paragraph 3, defines what is "recovered" and "reclaimed" substances.

Recovery: The collection and storage of controlled substances from machinery, equipment, containment vessels, etc., during servicing or prior to disposal;

Reclamation: The reprocessing and upgrading of a recovered controlled substance through such mechanisms as filtering, drying, distillation and chemical treatment in order to restore the substance to a specified standard of performance. It often involves processing "off-site" at a central facility.
