



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

**Implementation Committee under the
Non-Compliance Procedure for the
Montreal Protocol
Fifty-second meeting
Paris, 9 and 10 July 2014**

**Report of the Implementation Committee under the
Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol on the
work of its fifty-second meeting**

I. Opening of the meeting

A. Opening statements

1. The fifty-second meeting of the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol was held at the headquarters of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris, on 9 and 10 July 2014.
2. The President of the Committee, Ms. Azra Rogović-Grubić (Bosnia and Herzegovina), opened the meeting at 10 a.m. on 9 July 2014.
3. Ms. Tina Birmpili, Executive Secretary, Ozone Secretariat, welcomed the representatives of the members of the Committee, saying that her resolve to give the Committee the support it needed to function effectively was strengthened by the importance of the Committee's work. Having recently taken up her post, she was pleased to lend her efforts to a treaty regime that had won universal ratification and whose institutions, including not least the Implementation Committee, were widely respected and envied for their effectiveness. Compliance with the obligations imposed by the Montreal Protocol was historically very high, well over 90 per cent overall, and in recent years had reached 99 per cent on certain key matters such as the establishment and operation of systems for licensing imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances. Outlining the agenda for the current meeting, she welcomed the representatives of new members of the Committee – Canada, the Dominican Republic and Ghana – and drew attention to the primer on the operations of the Committee, which provided much useful information on the Committee's functions and practices. Encouraging the representatives to be free with suggestions for improvements, she wished them successful deliberations that would advance the work of the Montreal Protocol.

B. Attendance

4. Representatives of the following Committee members attended the meeting: Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Italy, Morocco and Poland. Prior to the meeting, the representative of Lebanon informed the Secretariat that he would be unable to attend the meeting.
5. A representative of Kazakhstan attended the meeting at the Committee's invitation to provide information on her country's situation.

6. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol and representatives of the implementing agencies of the Multilateral Fund – the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the World Bank.
7. A list of participants is set out in annex II to the present report.

II. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

A. Adoption of the agenda

8. The Committee adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/52/R.1/Rev.1):
 1. Opening of the meeting.
 2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
 3. Presentation by the Secretariat on data and information under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol and on related issues.
 4. Presentation by the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on relevant decisions of the Executive Committee of the Fund and on activities carried out by implementing agencies (the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the World Bank) to facilitate compliance by parties.
 5. Follow-up on previous decisions of the parties and recommendations of the Implementation Committee on non-compliance-related issues:
 - (a) Data-reporting obligations:
 - (i) Eritrea (decision XXV/14);
 - (ii) South Sudan (decision XXV/14);
 - (iii) Yemen (decision XXV/14);
 - (b) Existing plans of action to return to compliance;
 - (i) Ecuador (decision XX/16);
 - (ii) Ukraine (decision XXIV/18);
 - (ii) Uruguay (decision XVII/39);
 - (c) Other recommendations and decisions on compliance: Kazakhstan (decision XXV/12).
 6. Possible non-compliance with hydrochlorofluorocarbon phase-out by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and request for assistance.
 7. Review of information on requests for the revision of baseline data (decisions XIII/15 and XV/19):
 - (a) Libya;
 - (b) Mozambique (recommendation 51/4).
 8. Consideration of other possible non-compliance issues arising out of the data report.
 9. Status of establishment of licensing systems under Article 4B of the Montreal Protocol by Botswana and South Sudan (decision XXV/15).
 10. Consideration of additional information on compliance-related submissions by parties participating in the meeting at the invitation of the Implementation Committee.
 11. Other matters.
 12. Adoption of the recommendations and report of the meeting.
 13. Closure of the meeting.

B. Organization of work

9. The Committee agreed to follow its usual procedures and to meet according to its usual schedule of two 3-hour sessions per day, subject to adjustment as appropriate.

III. Presentation by the Secretariat on data and information under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol and on related issues

10. The representative of the Secretariat gave a presentation summarizing the report of the Secretariat on the data provided by parties in accordance with Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/52/R.2).

11. On the status of ratification, he said that the only amendment to the Protocol that had not been ratified by all parties to the Protocol was the Beijing Amendment, which had not yet been ratified by Kazakhstan or Mauritania.

12. Regarding annual data reporting under paragraph 3 of Article 7, he said that 82 of the 197 parties to the Protocol had thus far reported data for 2013, the reporting deadline for which was 30 September 2014. For the year 2012, only South Sudan had yet to report. Eritrea and Yemen had both provided their data for 2012, as requested in decision XXV/14. For all other years, 1986–2011, all parties had reported all required data.

13. Turning to compliance with control measures for 2013 under the Protocol, only one party not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol (non-Article 5 party), Kazakhstan, had non-compliance issues, which were related to excess consumption of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) and methyl bromide. The Committee and the Meeting of the Parties had discussed the matter at previous meetings and it would be further considered at the current meeting. The reported data had also revealed a few Article 5 parties with possible non-compliance issues. The Secretariat had been in communication with those parties; as the minimum three-month period provided under the non-compliance procedure for consultations between those parties and the Secretariat had not yet elapsed, however, their cases were not presented for consideration at the current meeting and would be taken up at the Committee's fifty-third meeting.

14. With regard to accounting for exemptions for essential uses of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), he said that the two parties concerned – China and the Russian Federation – had both provided their accounting reports for 2013. In addition, all four parties granted exemptions for critical uses of methyl bromide – Australia, Canada, Japan and the United States of America – had submitted the required reports for 2013. On the matter of reporting of exports and destination countries in accordance with decision XVII/16, there had been no reports of exports to non-parties for 2012. Of the 32 parties reporting exports for 2012, 29 had specified destinations for all or some exports; 98 per cent of the exports, by weight, had their destinations specified. Regarding imports, 162 parties (including the European Union on behalf of its member States) had reported, of which 30 had provided complete or partial information on sources; 43 per cent of the imports, by weight, had their source countries specified. There were no reported instances of imports from non-parties.

15. With regard to the reporting of stockpiled excess production or consumption of ozone-depleting substances in accordance with decision XXII/20, five cases had been reported for 2012 for four parties – the European Union, France, Israel and the United States. Of those, the European Union, France and the United States had confirmed that they had in place measures to ensure that the substances were not used for purposes other than those specified in paragraph 1 of decision XVIII/17; Israel, however, had not done so, and its case would be considered under agenda item 8.

16. With regard to the reporting of process-agent uses, the four parties allowed such uses under decision XXIII/7 – China, the European Union, Israel and the United States – had all submitted their reports for 2012 as required by decision X/14. All other parties had previously confirmed that they did not use ozone-depleting substances for process-agent applications and therefore would not need to report on process-agent uses again unless they once again began to use ozone-depleting substances as process agents.

17. In conclusion, he provided supplementary information on the production in 2012 of CFCs, halons, carbon tetrachloride and other phased out substances, pointing out that virtually all the production was for feedstock uses; on feedstock uses of ozone-depleting substances, noting that in the previous three years, on average about 1.1 million metric tonnes had been used annually by about 13 Parties; on the destruction of ozone-depleting substances, pointing out that the annual amount destroyed had been declining over the previous five years while the number of parties reporting destruction had been increasing; and on the calculation of production and consumption, noting that the

information on the subject was provided to raise awareness of how the Secretariat derived calculated levels of consumption and production.

18. In the ensuing discussion, one representative asked about the degree to which parties in their reporting had taken cognizance of decision XXIV/14, which requested parties to affirmatively specify zero quantities – rather than simply leaving cells blank – in their Article 7 data reporting forms. The representative of the Secretariat said that some parties were still submitting forms with blank cells but, as requested by the Committee, the Secretariat always wrote back to those parties for clarification and in most cases received confirmation that blank cells were intended to indicate zero. The number of parties leaving blank cells appeared to be declining as the Secretariat repeatedly reminded parties of the requirements of decision XXIV/14.

19. Finally, one representative asked whether the term “exports for feedstock” used in section II of the Secretariat’s data report had the same meaning for the calculation of production as it did for the calculation of consumption. The representative of the Secretariat said that, in accordance with decision VII/30, in the calculation of both consumption and production a deduction was made for “exports for feedstock” only in the case of parties who produced ozone-depleting substances and then exported them for use as feedstock; no such deduction was made for substances that were imported and subsequently exported for feedstock.

IV. Presentation by the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on relevant decisions of the Executive Committee of the Fund and on activities carried out by implementing agencies (the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the World Bank) to facilitate compliance by parties

20. The representative of the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund reported on decisions of the Fund’s Executive Committee and on activities carried out by bilateral and implementing agencies of the Fund to facilitate compliance by parties with the control measures of the Protocol, summarizing information presented to the Executive Committee and reproduced in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/52/INF/R.4.

21. With regard to the phase-out of methyl bromide, only one party, China, still produced the substance, and its production in 2012 (149.8 ODP-tonnes) was below both the 20 per cent phase-out target and the level allowed under its agreement with the Executive Committee. A total of 25 countries had reported consumption of methyl bromide in 2012, but all were in compliance with the control measures, based on data reported as at 1 July 2014. Investment projects were still under way in 16 countries, and a further four countries (Algeria, Egypt, the Sudan and Tunisia) might submit additional methyl bromide phase-out projects. Critical-use nominations had been submitted by Argentina, China and Mexico, and the Fund Secretariat had provided information on them to the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee.

22. With regard to the phase-out of production of HCFCs, seven Article 5 parties had HCFC production sector baselines: Argentina, China, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, India, Mexico, the Republic of Korea and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). An HCFC production sector phase-out plan for China for up to \$385 million had been approved at the sixty-ninth meeting of the Executive Committee, in April 2013. Argentina, India, Mexico and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had agreements on CFCs with the Executive Committee that precluded additional funding for HCFC production phase-out, although a request for a technical audit of Mexico’s production sector was to be considered at the next meeting of the Executive Committee. The Republic of Korea had not requested any assistance from the Multilateral Fund for phasing out any ozone-depleting substances.

23. With regard to the phase-out of HCFC consumption, all eligible Article 5 parties had received funding for the preparation of HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs), and only six did not yet have approved plans: Botswana, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Libya, Mauritania, South Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic. In the cases of Botswana, Libya and South Sudan, that was due to a lack of operational licensing systems. For the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, the delay had been caused by the need to consult the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1718 (2006) on whether the delivery of equipment needed to implement the party’s plan would violate sanctions against the party imposed by the Council. An administrative audit under way in Mauritania had delayed the preparation and submission of that party’s plan. Civil unrest in the

Syrian Arab Republic had affected the resubmission of its plan, but the party had already received sufficient funding to be able to reach its phase-out target of 10 per cent by 2013.

24. He also provided data on HCFC consumption by chemical, derived from recent (2011–2013) country programme reports. Three substances accounted for 99 per cent of consumption: HCFC-22 (64.18 per cent), HCFC-141b (31.76 per cent) and HCFC-142b (3.89 per cent). Total consumption had risen compared with consumption in the baseline years, presumably because of stockpiling in advance of the implementation of the phase-out schedule. The Fund secretariat had also recorded data on imports of HCFC-141b as a component of polyols, which were not taken into account in the calculation of consumption. The HCFC consumption approved for phase-out under parties' stage I HPMPs amounted to 24.6 per cent of total HCFC consumption.

25. Turning to compliance matters, he reported that of the three parties that had not submitted their 2012 data to the Ozone Secretariat in accordance with Article 7 by the time of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties, one, Yemen, had since reported both its Article 7 data and its country programme data. The two remaining parties, Eritrea and South Sudan, had still not submitted country programme data for 2012 or 2013. Two parties – Ecuador and Uruguay – were operating under plans of action to return them to compliance with the control measures for methyl bromide. Uruguay had completed all funded activities by 2010. In Ecuador UNIDO had completed all its activities; the results had been collected and a final study tour and workshop were planned. A draft agreement for new activities by UNEP had been signed.

26. Two parties were in a possible state of non-compliance with the control measures for HCFC consumption. In Guatemala, equipment had been cleared, a coordinator hired and a training programme designed, and the party was expected to return to compliance in 2014. In Mozambique, UNEP had signed an agreement but UNIDO had experienced delays due to changes in the Government. The party was also requesting a change in its baseline consumption figure, which if granted would affect its status with regard to compliance (see section VII below).

27. Activities in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea faced a number of challenges. The party had not yet submitted the preliminary data required for a technical audit of its HCFC production facilities (a prerequisite for project preparation funding), and difficulties with disbursement were affecting its institutional strengthening project. Since July 1995, however, the Executive Committee had approved a total of \$20.8 million in funding for institutional strengthening, investment and other projects, and the Fund's 2014–2016 business plan included funding for an HPMP for 2015. UNIDO had also informed the Fund secretariat that the Committee established pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1718 had confirmed that the delivery of specified equipment for the implementation of the party's proposed HPMP would not violate existing Security Council sanctions.

28. Two parties were requesting changes in their baseline data for HCFC consumption. UNEP was helping Mozambique to respond to queries that had been raised with regard to its request. Libya, however, had withdrawn its request for funding its HPMP because it had not yet put in place a system for licensing imports and exports of HCFCs; it was, however, currently in the process of drafting the necessary regulations for such a system and would resubmit its HPMP in due course.

29. Two other parties had also yet to establish licensing systems. In Botswana, a new meteorological bill, which included a licensing and quota system, had been approved in April 2014. In South Sudan, however, the political and security situation had prevented the implementation of the necessary regulations, resulting in the suspension of the party's HPMP.

30. In response to a query from a Committee member, the representative of the Ozone Secretariat clarified that, as stated in a comprehensive report by the Secretariat in 2012, Libya did have a system for licensing imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances in general. It was possible, however, that the system did not cover HCFCs, and as the party had only ratified the Montreal Amendment in April 2014 it was not obliged under the Protocol to establish a licensing system for those substances until October 2014. The representative of the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund said that UNIDO and UNEP were working with the party to implement one.

31. Responding to a question about which Article 5 parties had not requested financial assistance from the Multilateral Fund, the representative of the Fund secretariat confirmed that they were the Republic of Korea, Singapore and the United Arab Emirates.

V. Follow-up on previous decisions of the parties and recommendations of the Implementation Committee on non-compliance-related issues

A. Data-reporting obligations: Eritrea, South Sudan and Yemen (decision XXV/14)

32. The representative of the Secretariat recalled that, in decision XXV/14, the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties had urged Eritrea, South Sudan and Yemen to work closely with the implementing agencies of the Multilateral Fund to report their 2012 data to the Secretariat in accordance with Article 7 of the Protocol as a matter of urgency.

1. Eritrea and Yemen

33. By the time of the current meeting, Eritrea and Yemen had reported their 2012 data in full, and that data indicated that both parties were in compliance with the Protocol's control measures for 2012. The Committee therefore noted that Eritrea and Yemen had submitted all outstanding data in accordance with their data-reporting obligations under the Protocol and decision XXV/14 and that the data confirmed that the parties were in compliance with the Protocol's control measures for 2012.

2. South Sudan

34. The representative of the Secretariat reported that South Sudan had not yet reported its 2012 data. A meeting had recently been held between representatives of the Government of South Sudan and UNEP, at which the former had indicated that with assistance from the UNEP Compliance Assistance Programme South Sudan hoped to be able to report its data by September 2014, in time for its consideration by the Committee at its next meeting.

35. The Committee therefore agreed:

Noting with concern that South Sudan had not yet submitted the required data to the Secretariat,

To urge South Sudan to report to the Secretariat its ozone-depleting substance data for 2012 in accordance with Article 7, as a matter of urgency and preferably no later than 15 September 2014, in time for consideration by the Committee at its fifty-third meeting.

Recommendation 52/1

B. Existing plans of action to return to compliance: Ecuador (decision XX/16), Ukraine (decision XXIV/18) and Uruguay (decision XVII/39)

36. Introducing agenda item 5 (b), the representative of the Secretariat presented the cases of Ecuador and Uruguay, which were the subject of decisions XX/16 and XVII/39, respectively, on non-compliance with the methyl bromide consumption phase-out schedule, and Ukraine, which was the subject of decision XXIV/18, on non-compliance with the HCFC consumption phase-out schedule. The decisions included plans of action for returning to compliance, which stipulated 2013 consumption targets of 52.8 ODP-tonnes of methyl bromide for Ecuador, 86.9 ODP-tonnes of HCFCs for Ukraine and zero tonnes of methyl bromide for Uruguay. Ecuador and Uruguay had not yet reported data for 2013, so their compliance status could not be assessed. Ukraine had reported data on HCFC consumption that showed that it had met its commitment under decision XXIV/18, but the party had not reported on its actions to implement a licensing and quota system for imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances; or its actions to introduce a gradual ban on imports of equipment containing or relying on ozone-depleting substances and to monitor its operation once introduced; or its actions to pursue the passage of new legislation to more closely control ozone-depleting substances.

37. The representative of UNDP said that Ukraine had received funding from the Global Environment Facility (GEF), with UNDP as the implementing agency. The security situation in the country, however, was not conducive to successful project implementation, and as a result the party's 2014 consumption target might not be achieved. A mission by international consultants to assist Ukraine with legislation issues was planned for August 2014.

38. One representative questioned why it was necessary for Uruguay to report on its 2013 methyl bromide consumption when, according to the report by the representative of the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund, the party had completed its methyl bromide phase-out programme and had reported zero consumption in 2012. The representative of the Secretariat clarified that the party was required to

report on its 2013 and 2014 methyl bromide consumption by the terms of decision XVII/39, noting that in the absence of such reporting, the party's compliance with its obligation to consume no methyl bromide in those years could not be assessed. The representative of the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund added that while Uruguay's methyl bromide phase-out programme had been completed, and while he had in presenting his report stated that Uruguay's 2012 consumption had been zero, the party's 2012 methyl bromide consumption was in fact recorded as 6 ODP-tonnes, and the Fund had no information regarding its 2013 consumption.

39. Subsequent to the discussion outlined above, the representative of the Secretariat reported that all three parties had, during the current meeting, reported their 2013 data, which showed them to be in compliance with the benchmarks specified in the decisions applicable to them, although Ukraine had not indicated whether it had undertaken the actions called for in decision XXIV/18.

40. The Committee therefore agreed to commend Ecuador and Uruguay on their commitment in meeting the requirements of decisions XX/16 and XVII/39, respectively, as shown by their 2013 methyl bromide consumption data, and to commend Ukraine on its commitment in meeting the requirements of decision XXIV/18, as shown by its 2013 HCFC consumption data. The Committee also agreed to request Ukraine to report on its actions to introduce a gradual ban on imports of equipment containing or relying on ozone-depleting substances, to monitor the operation of the ban once introduced, to implement an HCFC quota system and to pursue the passage of new legislation to more closely control ozone-depleting substances.

C. Other recommendations and decisions on compliance: Kazakhstan (decision XXV/12)

41. Introducing agenda item 5 (c), the representative of the secretariat said that Kazakhstan's compliance issues had been the subject of decision XXV/12. The current situation was described in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/52/R.3, with supporting information found in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/52/INF/R.3. In decision XXV/12, the Meeting of the Parties had requested Kazakhstan to provide an explanation for its excess consumption of HCFCs and methyl bromide in 2011 and to submit a plan of action for its return to compliance. The data submitted subsequently by the party for 2012 and 2013 revealed that it was also in non-compliance with the consumption control measures for HCFCs in 2012 and 2013 and for methyl bromide in 2013.

42. Kazakhstan had submitted a plan of action for returning to compliance with the HCFC control measures by 2016 and the methyl bromide control measures by 2015, along with information on its legislative framework for ozone-depleting substances, historical consumption data (which agreed with the information in the Secretariat's database), phase-out challenges, priority areas and proposed measures. The plan of action foresaw consumption of 0.2 ODP-tonnes of HCFCs in 2020, which was inconsistent with the Protocol's requirement to phase out consumption by that year; in correspondence with the Secretariat, however, the party had said that it would endeavour to achieve zero consumption by that date.

43. Regarding HCFCs, challenges identified in the party's submission included the high cost of alternative technologies, difficulties in identifying HCFCs at the border, and the need to amend the regulatory framework to control imports of HCFCs. On the other hand, the ratification of the Beijing Amendment was in its final stages; a licensing and quota system for imports and exports was in place; and the party was a member of a customs union with Belarus and the Russian Federation and was in compliance with its draft agreement on the movement of HCFCs. For methyl bromide, the party explained that the substance was used for pest control in agricultural products stored in warehouses. Alternatives were available, but programmes were needed to stimulate their use.

44. Following the presentation, the representative of UNIDO reported that GEF had rejected a methyl bromide project for Kazakhstan. An HCFC project was being prepared but could not be submitted for GEF approval until the party had ratified the Beijing Amendment, and UNIDO was providing limited provisional funding for preparation of that project from its own regular budget. GEF was thus currently funding no projects for the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances in Kazakhstan. The representative of the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund indicated that the Fund Secretariat had reviewed the proposed methyl bromide project at the request of the GEF secretariat and explained that in the view of the GEF secretariat the party's methyl bromide consumption had been somewhat erratic and that no clear explanation for that had been forthcoming; the matter, however, was still being discussed.

45. Subsequently, the representative of Kazakhstan attended the meeting to update the Committee on the current situation. She said that the ratification of the Beijing Amendment had been officially approved by the President of Kazakhstan in April 2014 and was currently being processed by the

Ministry of Foreign Affairs for delivery to the Depository for the Protocol. As part of the country's action plan, a review of all equipment and technical procedures had commenced, and the party was actively working with UNIDO and GEF. The legislative framework was being strengthened, systems for licensing and customs verification were being improved, regulatory controls for HCFCs and methyl bromide were being reinforced and education and awareness-raising programmes were being developed. The party aimed to put in place a schedule for the complete phase-out of HCFCs and methyl bromide, and assistance was being provided to companies in the refrigeration sector to phase out the use of ozone-depleting substances other than for maintenance and repair of existing units.

46. The representative of Kazakhstan then responded to questions by representatives. She said that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry for the Protection of the Environment, Water and Forests had been requested to accelerate the administrative process concerning the ratification of the Beijing Amendment, and the instrument of ratification should be submitted to the Depository during July 2014. The administrative structure relating to ozone-depleting substances had recently been reinforced and included various offices with different responsibilities in various ministries. In response to a question about possible supportive measures, including import taxes, a ban on new HCFC installations and incentives for the installation of non-HCFC-based equipment using low-global-warming-potential alternatives, she said that by national law companies could not design or construct new equipment or facilities using ozone-depleting substances, and tax matters would be dealt with in the context of the Eurasian Economic Union, which Kazakhstan had recently joined. In addition, once the ratification of the Beijing Amendment was completed, the provisions of the customs union with Belarus and the Russian Federation regulating the use and trade of ozone-depleting substances would automatically become part of Kazakhstan's legislation without the need for separate implementing legislation. Responding to a question on whether the party might seek critical-use exemptions for methyl bromide, she said that methyl bromide was used for soil treatment for greenhouse crops, which was an expanding industry, and that Kazakhstan did not have specialists trained in the use of the available alternatives. Regarding quarantine and pre-shipment uses of methyl bromide, she said that the party did not have a specific system for distinguishing such uses from other uses and that GEF support for training was needed to enable customs and other officials to do so. She also confirmed, in response to a question, that the party was currently receiving no financial assistance for the phase-out of HCFCs or methyl bromide; in the meantime, it was doing all it could to meet its responsibilities under the Montreal Protocol, although the lack of financial support made it difficult for it to achieve its deadlines.

47. Following the withdrawal of the representative of Kazakhstan, several representatives identified project funding as a paramount need that should be addressed in the draft decision relating to the party. In that context it was suggested that, without prejudice to the operations of GEF, it would be desirable for the implementing agencies and GEF to work with Kazakhstan to resolve the issue.

48. The Committee therefore agreed:

Noting with concern that Kazakhstan had reported consumption of the controlled substances in Annex C, group I, (hydrochlorofluorocarbons) of 90.75 ODP-tonnes for 2011, 21.36 ODP-tonnes for 2012 and 83.32 ODP-tonnes for 2013, levels that represented deviations from the Protocol's requirement that the party limit consumption of those substances to no greater than 9.9 ODP-tonnes in each of those years,

Noting also with concern that Kazakhstan had reported consumption of the controlled substance in Annex E (methyl bromide) of 6.0 ODP-tonnes for 2011 and 19.0 ODP-tonnes for 2013, levels that represented deviations from the Protocol's requirement that the party limit consumption of that substance to no greater than zero ODP-tonnes in each of those years,

Noting further with concern that a methyl bromide project submitted to the Global Environment Facility had been rejected and that the Facility's consideration of an HCFC project proposal was still at an early stage,

Noting with appreciation the party's submission of a plan of action for returning to compliance with the Protocol's control measures for hydrochlorofluorocarbons in 2016 and for methyl bromide in 2015,

To forward to the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Parties for its consideration the draft decision incorporating the party's plan of action set out in section A of annex I to the present report.

Recommendation 52/2

VI. Possible non-compliance with hydrochlorofluorocarbon phase-out by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and request for assistance

49. Introducing the item, the representative of the Secretariat said that in late 2013 the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had informed the Secretariat of its possible non-compliance with the control measures for the consumption and production of HCFCs for 2013, 2014 and 2015. The party had attributed its anticipated non-compliance to delays in the disbursement of funds for the institutional strengthening renewal project approved by the Executive Committee at its sixty-eighth meeting, in December 2012, and the lack of approval for its HPMP, originally submitted for consideration at the same meeting.

50. The party had very recently submitted its 2013 data, which showed that it was in non-compliance in 2013 with the HCFC control measures, with excess consumption of 12.56 ODP-tonnes and excess production of 4.24 ODP-tonnes. The party had expressed concern that in the absence of financial support for the phase-out of HCFCs, and given declining world production, it would soon be unable to import the necessary volumes and would have to increase its domestic production – although the national ozone unit had recommended that the country not increase its production capacity.

51. The Executive Committee had approved \$260,000 for an institutional strengthening renewal project. UNEP, which had conducted a mission to the country in April 2014, had been trying to find ways to disburse the approved funds in ways that satisfied the Executive Committee's concerns about transparency, organizational structures and monitoring procedures. The HCFC management plan had included a request for funding in the amount of \$922,390. As reported during discussion of the report by the Multilateral Fund (see section IV, above), UNIDO had been addressing the issue of compliance with Security Council sanctions.

52. The representative of UNIDO confirmed that his organization had been in contact with the Security Council Committee responsible for overseeing sanctions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In April 2014 the Committee had indicated that the export of the equipment necessary for the party's HPMP did not in itself appear to violate any sanctions in place; the Committee was concerned, however, about the possibility that such equipment could be put to alternative uses that would be inconsistent with the sanctions. UNIDO had responded by providing extensive technical details of the range of equipment that might be purchased, and the Committee had then confirmed that the export of equipment could go ahead provided that it did not include certain specified items. The representative of UNIDO said that the limitations on the equipment to be delivered would not impede the implementation of the HPMP. He also expressed confidence in the ability of those concerned to comply with the restrictions, saying that the countries exporting to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea generally possessed export licensing systems that would provide a second check on the equipment to be exported. He expected the HPMP to be submitted for approval to the Executive Committee at its next meeting.

53. The representative of UNEP reported that a joint mission of UNIDO and UNEP to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was currently under way, with the aim of collecting data for the preparation of the HPMP, and that another mission might be undertaken within the next few weeks. On the institutional strengthening renewal project, UNEP had submitted proposals regarding transparency and monitoring to the Executive Committee in 2012, and a joint mission in April 2014 had included discussions with the local UNDP office on the issue. No funds had been disbursed since 2012, however, because of logistical challenges faced by the UNDP office, uncertainty over the applicability of the Security Council sanctions and the general situation in the country. Nevertheless, proposals for capacity-building for local stakeholders had been well received, and an action plan for the implementation of the various activities to be conducted by UNEP had recently been agreed to with the party. He hoped that a request for funding for the next phase of institutional strengthening could be submitted in 2015.

54. One representative suggested that the HPMP, when approved, could contain a requirement that the party certify that all equipment would be used only for the purposes of the project and that a mechanism should be established to monitor the use of the equipment for the duration of the project and a number of years afterwards; such conditions had been applied to other parties before. He also suggested that the Committee could appropriately request the implementing agencies to disburse funding for institutional strengthening as a matter of urgency. Another representative, however, recalled that the Executive Committee had approved funding for institutional strengthening on the understanding that UNEP would establish appropriate procedures for its disbursement, and she

expressed concern that the Committee might be encroaching on matters that were properly in the remit of the Executive Committee.

55. The representative of the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund confirmed that he was working closely with the implementing agencies and the party to facilitate the submission of the party's HPMP. Given the particular circumstances of the case, slightly different procedures might have to be adopted, but he was hopeful that the Executive Committee would reach agreement at its next meeting, which was due to take place before the next meeting of the Implementation Committee.

56. The Committee therefore agreed to take note of the information presented by the Secretariat and the updates by the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund and relevant implementing agencies and to revisit the matter at its fifty-third meeting in the light of any additional information received. The Committee also agreed, without prejudice to the operations of the Executive Committee, that reconsideration of the HPMP of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by the Executive Committee should be undertaken as a matter of urgency.

VII. Review of information on requests for the revision of baseline data (decisions XIII/15 and XV/19): Libya and Mozambique

57. Introducing agenda item 7, the representative of the Secretariat noted that the number of parties requesting the revision of their baseline data was decreasing steadily over time. Such requests were governed by decision XIII/15, which provided that they should be considered by the Implementation Committee working with the Ozone Secretariat and the Executive Committee prior to their submission to the Meeting of the Parties for approval, and decision XV/19, which, among other things, requested parties seeking the revision of their baselines to provide specified supporting information.

58. At the current meeting, the Committee had before it requests from Libya and Mozambique for the revision of their HCFC baseline data (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/52/R.3/Add.2 and Add.3).

59. Regarding Libya, she said that the party had requested the revision of its baseline consumption data for HCFC-22 and HCFC-141b for 2010, on the basis that the existing figures were based on a transmission error. The proposed revised figures were based on a 2009–2012 survey carried out during preparation of the party's HPMP. The party had provided a summary of the methodology used and copies of relevant documentation. The representative of the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund said that the party's HPMP had been submitted to the Executive Committee at its seventy-second meeting but the matter had been deferred because the party lacked an operational licensing system applicable to HCFCs and because there were some inconsistencies in the data provided.

60. In the subsequent discussion, several representatives expressed support for accepting the proposed baseline change, saying that the previous figures had arisen from an error and that the proposed change was supported with information satisfying the requirements of decision XV/19. In the estimation of the Secretariat, it appeared that the party had satisfied the requirements of decision XV/19.

61. Turning to Mozambique, the representative of the Secretariat said that the issue was complex and had been discussed at several past meetings of the Committee and that considerable correspondence with the party had taken place. The party had requested the revision of its HCFC consumption data for the five years ending in 2009, which was a baseline year. The party had reported that the previous figures had been derived from an incomplete survey using a variety of methods, whereas the proposed figures were based on a survey funded by the Multilateral Fund using a single methodology. In recommendation 51/4 the Committee had requested the party to clarify inconsistencies in the data presented and to provide further documentation, and the party had addressed those matters in its correspondence with the Secretariat. She added that with its existing baseline the party would exceed its HCFC consumption limit for 2013 and would be in non-compliance, whereas acceptance of the proposed revisions would put the party in compliance. As with Libya, the Secretariat was of the view that the party had complied with the provisions of decision XV/19.

62. In the subsequent discussion one representative expressed continuing concerns about the adequacy of the data and documentation provided by Mozambique. There was general agreement, however, that the party had done its best to address the issues raised in the face of considerable difficulties, that it had demonstrated that its original baseline figure had been based on erroneous data and that its proposed new baseline, while perhaps somewhat uncertain, was a conservative one. In addition, the representative of the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund said that the Fund had undertaken a technical analysis of the party's reported data and had concluded that the proposed new baseline better reflected actual consumption in the party than did the existing baseline.

63. The Committee therefore agreed:

Noting with appreciation the information submitted by Libya and Mozambique in support of their requests for the revision of their baseline consumption data for the Annex C, group I, controlled substances (hydrochlorofluorocarbons) for the years 2010 and 2009, respectively,

Recalling decision XV/19, in which the Meeting of the Parties set out the methodology to be used to review requests for the revision of baseline data,

Noting with appreciation the efforts made by the above-mentioned parties to satisfy the information requirements of decision XV/19, in particular their efforts to verify the accuracy of their proposed new baseline data through national surveys of hydrochlorofluorocarbon use carried out with the assistance of the implementing agencies and funding from the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol,

To forward for consideration by the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Parties the draft decision set out in section B of annex I to the present report, which would approve the requests of Libya and Mozambique for the revision of their baseline consumption data for hydrochlorofluorocarbons.

Recommendation 52/3

VIII. Consideration of other possible non-compliance issues arising out of the data report: reporting on stockpiling of ozone-depleting substances by Israel

64. Introducing the issue, the representative of the Secretariat recalled decisions XVIII/17 and XXII/20. By the former decision, the Meeting of the Parties had, among other things, requested the Secretariat to maintain, for information purposes only, a consolidated record of cases in which parties had explained that excess consumption or production of ozone-depleting substances in a given year had been the result of stockpiling of those substances under the circumstances described in subparagraphs (a)–(c) of paragraph 1 of the decision. In decision XXII/20, the Meeting of the Parties had added the provision that no follow-up action from the Implementation Committee would be necessary in respect of any such consumption or production if the reporting party specified that it had in place the measures necessary to prohibit the use of the stockpiled ozone-depleting substances for any purpose other than those described in paragraph 1 of decision XVIII/17.

65. As alluded to in section III of the present report, four parties had reported excess consumption or production of ozone-depleting substances in 2012 under the circumstances described in decision XVIII/17, and three of the four parties had also reported, as required by decision XXII/20, that they had in place measures to prevent the use of those substances for any purpose other than those described in paragraph 1 of decision XVIII/17. However, the fourth party, Israel, had not reported that it had in place the measures required by decision XXII/20. The Secretariat had tried on several occasions to obtain the relevant information from the party but its efforts had not been fruitful and the information remained outstanding.

66. Following the presentation one representative expressed concern that some parties sought exemptions for the production of methyl bromide while holding significant stockpiles of the substance. The situation, he said, was counterproductive, and he asked for clarification on how the secretariat took such information into account while preparing its data report. The representative of the Secretariat explained that exemptions for the production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances were granted by the Meeting of the Parties and that parties availing themselves of such exemptions were obliged to account for the quantities of substances consumed and produced in accordance with them, using an accounting framework approved by the Meeting of the Parties. The role of the Secretariat was to verify whether parties had submitted their accounting frameworks and whether their reported consumption and production were within the exempted amounts granted by the Meeting of the Parties.

67. The Committee therefore agreed:

Recalling decision XVIII/17, pursuant to which the Secretariat is to maintain a consolidated record of cases in which parties have explained that their situations of excess production or consumption are the consequence of scenarios (a), (b) or (c) outlined in paragraph 1 of that decision and to incorporate that record in the documentation of the Implementation Committee, for information purposes only,

Recalling also decision XXII/20, which provides that in any of the scenarios referred to in the previous paragraph no follow-up action from the Implementation Committee is deemed necessary if the party concerned reports that it has the necessary measures in place to prohibit the use of the ozone-depleting substances for any purpose other than those described in the decision,

1. To note with concern that Israel had not by the time of the current meeting provided the information required under decision XXII/20;
2. To request Israel to submit the outstanding information urgently, preferably by 15 September 2014, for consideration by the Committee at its fifty-third meeting.

Recommendation 52/4

IX. Status of establishment of licensing systems under Article 4B of the Montreal Protocol by Botswana and South Sudan (decision XXV/15)

68. The representative of the Secretariat recalled that, by its decision XXV/15, the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties had requested Botswana and South Sudan to establish systems for licensing imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances and to report thereon to the Secretariat by 31 March 2014.

69. With regard to Botswana, he reported that the party had prepared a draft licensing system and had consulted the Secretariat regarding how to finalize it. The party, in the Secretariat's estimation, was working hard to put a system in place as soon as possible and there were indications that it could be completed by September 2014, in time for consideration by the Committee at its next meeting.

70. As for South Sudan, representatives of the party had met with the Secretariat in Nairobi in June 2014. They had explained that the party had been unable to put a licensing system in place in time for the current meeting, owing to continuing political difficulties, but hoped to do so in time for the fifty-third meeting of the Committee and the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Parties.

71. The Committee therefore agreed:

Noting that Botswana and South Sudan, which became parties to the Montreal Amendment in 2013, had not yet established licensing systems to control the import and export of ozone-depleting substances,

Recognizing that licensing systems provide for the monitoring of imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances, prevent illegal trade and enable data collection,

Recognizing also that the successful phase-out of most ozone-depleting substances by parties is largely attributable to the establishment and implementation of licensing systems to control the import and export of ozone-depleting substances,

Recalling decision XXV/15, in which the Meeting of the Parties urged Botswana and South Sudan to establish licensing systems in accordance with Article 4B of the Protocol and to report to the Secretariat by 31 March 2014,

To urge Botswana and South Sudan to establish licensing systems and to submit to the Secretariat, no later than 30 September 2014, information on the status of the establishment of those systems, as called for in decision XXV/15, for consideration by the Implementation Committee at its fifty-third meeting and by the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Parties, in November 2014.

Recommendation 52/5

X. Consideration of additional information on compliance-related submissions by parties participating in the meeting at the invitation of the Implementation Committee

72. The Committee considered information provided by the representative of Kazakhstan, who was present at the invitation of the Committee. The Committee's consideration of the situation of Kazakhstan is described in section V, part C, of the present report.

XI. Other matters

73. The Committee considered no other matters.

XII. Adoption of the recommendations and report of the meeting

74. The Committee approved the recommendations set out in the present report and agreed to entrust the preparation of the meeting report to the President and the Vice-President, who also served as Rapporteur for the meeting, working in consultation with the Secretariat.

XIII. Closure of the meeting

75. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the President declared the meeting closed at 12.50 p.m. on Thursday, 10 July 2014.

Annex I

Draft decisions approved by the Implementation Committee at its fifty-second meeting for consideration by the Meeting of the Parties

The Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Parties decides:

A. Draft decision XXVI/-: Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Kazakhstan

Noting that Kazakhstan ratified the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer on 26 August 1998, the London Amendment on 26 July 2001 and the Copenhagen and Montreal Amendments on 28 June 2011 and is classified as a party not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol,

Noting also that the Global Environment Facility has previously approved funding in the amount of [\$6,024,696] to enable Kazakhstan to achieve compliance with control measures of the Protocol other than those applicable to hydrochlorofluorocarbons and methyl bromide,

Noting with concern that a methyl bromide project submitted to the Global Environment Facility was rejected and that the Facility's consideration of a hydrochlorofluorocarbon project proposal was still at an early stage,

1. That Kazakhstan's annual consumption of the controlled substances in Annex C, group I, (hydrochlorofluorocarbons) of 90.75 ODP-tonnes for 2011, 21.36 ODP-tonnes for 2012 and 83.32 ODP-tonnes in 2013 exceeds the party's maximum allowable consumption of 9.9 ODP-tonnes for those controlled substances for those years and that the party was therefore in non-compliance with the consumption control measures under the Protocol for hydrochlorofluorocarbons;

2. That Kazakhstan's annual consumption of the controlled substance in Annex E (methyl bromide) of 6.0 ODP-tonnes in 2011 and 19.0 ODP-tonnes in 2013 exceeds the party's maximum allowable consumption of zero ODP-tonnes for that controlled substance for those years and that the party was therefore in non-compliance with the consumption control measures under the Protocol for methyl bromide;

3. To note with appreciation the submission by Kazakhstan of a plan of action to ensure its return to compliance with the Protocol's hydrochlorofluorocarbon and methyl bromide control measures under which, without prejudice to the operation of the financial mechanism of the Protocol, Kazakhstan specifically commits itself:

(a) To reducing its consumption of hydrochlorofluorocarbons from 83.32 ODP-tonnes in 2013 to no greater than:

(i) 40 ODP-tonnes in 2014;

(ii) 9.9 ODP-tonnes in 2015;

(iii) 3.95 ODP-tonnes in 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019;

(iv) Zero ODP-tonnes by 1 January 2020, save for consumption restricted to the servicing of refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment between the period 2020 and 2030 as prescribed in the Protocol;

(b) To reducing its consumption of methyl bromide from 19.0 ODP-tonnes in 2013 to no greater than:

(i) 6.0 ODP-tonnes in 2014;

(ii) Zero ODP-tonnes by 1 January 2015, save for critical uses that may be authorized by the parties;

(c) To monitoring its system for licensing imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances;

4. To invite the relevant implementing agencies to work with Kazakhstan to secure the reconsideration of the party's proposed methyl bromide project and consideration of the party's proposed hydrochlorofluorocarbon project by the Global Environment Facility;

5. To urge Kazakhstan to work with the relevant implementing agencies to implement its plan of action to phase out consumption of hydrochlorofluorocarbons and methyl bromide;

6. To monitor closely the progress of Kazakhstan with regard to the implementation of its plan of action and the phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons and methyl bromide. To the degree that the party is working towards and meeting the specific Protocol control measures it should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In that regard, Kazakhstan should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet those commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that may be taken by the Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance;

7. To caution Kazakhstan, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures that may be taken by the Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance, that, in the event that Kazakhstan fails to return to compliance, the Parties will consider measures consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. Those measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of hydrochlorofluorocarbons and methyl bromide that are the subject of non-compliance is ceased so that exporting Parties are not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance;

B. Draft decision XXVI/-: Requests for the revision of baseline data by Libya and Mozambique

Noting that, in accordance with decision XIII/15, by which the Thirteenth Meeting of the Parties decided that parties requesting the revision of reported baseline data should present such requests to the Implementation Committee, which in turn would work with the Secretariat and the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol to confirm the justification for the changes and present them to the Meeting of the Parties for approval,

Noting also that decision XV/19 sets out the methodology for the submission of such requests,

1. That Libya and Mozambique have presented sufficient information, in accordance with decision XV/19, to justify their requests for the revision of their consumption data for hydrochlorofluorocarbons for 2010 and 2009, respectively, which are part of the baseline for parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5;

2. To approve the requests of the parties listed in the preceding paragraph and to revise their baseline hydrochlorofluorocarbon consumption data for the respective years as indicated in the following table:

<i>Party</i>	<i>Previous hydrochlorofluorocarbon data (ODP-tonnes)</i>		<i>New hydrochlorofluorocarbon data (ODP-tonnes)</i>	
	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>
1. Libya	–	131.91	–	139.26
2. Mozambique	4.3	–	8.68	–

Annex II

List of participants

Members of the Committee

Bangladesh

Mr. Md. Shahjahan
 Additional Director General
 Environmental Clearance
 Department of Environment
 Ministry of Environment and Forests
 E-16, Agargaon, Sher-e-Bangla Nagar
 Dhaka 1207
 Bangladesh
 Tel: +880 2 818 1767
 Cell: +880 1 819 258 177
 Fax: +880 2 8181772/8181801
 E-mail: shahjahan5519@yahoo.com

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Ms. Azra Rogović-Grubić
 Senior Advisor for International
 Cooperation
 Bosnia and Herzegovina Ozone Unit
 Manager
 Musala 9 Street,
 71000 Sarajevo
 Bosnia and Herzegovina
 Tel: + 387 33 953 531
 Fax: + 387 33 206 141
 e-mail: azra.rogovic-
 grubic@mvteo.gov.ba,
 rogoviczra@yahoo.com

Canada

Ms. Nancy Seymour
 Head, Ozone Protection Programs
 Chemicals Production Division
 Environment Canada
 351 St. Joseph Blvd., 11th Floor
 Gatineau K1A 0H3
 Quebec
 Canada
 Tel: +1 819 938 4236
 E-mail: nancy.seymour@ec.gc.ca

Cuba

Mr. Enrique Moret Hernandez
 Director
 International Affairs Department
 Ministry of Science, Technology
 and Environment
 18A Nro 4118, E/41 y 47, Playa
 La Havana
 Cuba
 Tel: +537 214 4554
 Fax: +537 214 4257
 E-mail: emoret@citma.cu

Ghana

Mr. Emmanuel Osae-Quansah
 Project Coordinator
 National Ozone Unit
 Environment Protection Agency
 P.O. Box MB.326
 Accra
 Ghana
 Tel: +233 0320 667374
 Email: epaozone@africaonline.com.gh,
 ozone@epa.gov.gh

Dominican Republic

Mr. Elías Gómez Mesa
 Coordinador Programa Nacional de
 Protección de la Capa de Ozono
 Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y
 Recursos Naturales
 Av. Luperón esq. Av. Cayetano
 Germosen, El pedregal
 Código Postal 02487
 Santo Domingo,
 Republica Dominicana
 Tel. 809 567 4300 ext. 6250,
 809 350 7052
 Email: ozono@ambiente.gob.do

Italy

Ms. Elisabeta Scialanca
 Department of Sustainable
 Development, Climate Change and
 International Cooperation
 Ministry for the Environment,
 Land and Sea
 Via Cristoforo Colombo, 44
 00147, Rome
 Italy
 Tel: +39 06 57 22 81 40
 Fax: +39 06 57 22 81 78
 Email:
 scialanca.elisabeta@minambiente.it

Ms. Antonella Angelosante
 Department of Sustainable
 Development, Climate Change and
 International Cooperation
 Ministry for the Environment,
 Land and Sea
 Via Cristoforo Colombo, 44
 00147, Rome
 Italy
 Tel: +39 06 57 22 81 76
 Fax: +39 06 57 22 81 78
 Email:
 angelosante.antonella@minambiente.it

Morocco

Mr. Chakour Abderrahim
 Ingénieur Général
 Ministère de l'Industrie, du Commerce,
 de l'Investissement, et de l'Economie
 Numerique
 Quartier Administratif – Chellah
 Rabat 10 000, Morocco
 Tel: +212 537 669632
 Cell: +212 661521967
 Fax: +212 637669655
 E-mail: abderrahimc@mcinet.gov.ma

Poland

Mr. Janusz Kozakiewicz
 Director's Plenipotentiary
 Ozone Layer and Climate Protection
 Unit
 Industrial Chemistry Research Institute
 8 Rydygiera Street
 Warsaw 01-793
 Poland
 Tel: +48 22 568 2845
 Fax: +48 22 633 9291
 E-mail: kozak@ichp.pl

Ms. Jadwiga Poplawska-Jach
 Ozone Layer and Climate Protection
 Unit
 Industrial Chemistry Research Institute
 8, Rydygiera Street
 Warsaw 01-793
 Poland
 Tel: +48 22 568 2182
 Fax: +48 22 633 9291
 E-mail: jadwiga.poplawska-
 jach@ichp.pl

Invited parties

Kazakhstan

Ms. Valentina Kryukova
 Director
 Climate Change Coordination Centre
 Office 102, Abay Ave., 20, 010000,
 Astana
 Kazakhstan
 Tel: +7 7172 717170/73/69
 Fax: +7 7172 324738
 Email: vkryukova2005@mail.ru,
 valentine@climate.kz

Secretariats and implementing agencies

Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol and Implementing Agencies

Mr. Eduardo Ganem
 Chief Officer
 Multilateral Fund Secretariat
 1000 de la Gauchetière Street West
 Montreal H3B 4W5
 Quebec
 Canada
 Tel: +1 514 282 7860
 Fax: +1 514 282 0068
 E-mail: eganem@unmfs.org

Mr. Andrew Reed
 Deputy Chief Officer for Economics
 and Finance
 Multilateral Fund Secretariat
 1000 de la Gauchetière Street West
 Montreal H3B 4W5
 Quebec
 Canada
 Phone: +1 514 282 7855
 Fax: +1 514 282 0068
 E-mail: areed@unmfs.org

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

Mr. Yuri Sorokin
 Industrial Development Officer
 Montreal Protocol Branch
 United Nations Industrial Development
 Organization (UNIDO)
 Wagramer Strasse 5, P.O. Box 200
 A-1400 Vienna
 Austria
 Tel: +431 26026/3624
 E-mail: Y.Sorokin@unido.org

World Bank

Mr. Thanavat Junchaya
Senior Environmental Engineer
Climate Change Group
World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
United States of America
Tel: +1 202 473 3841
Fax: +1 202 522 3258
E-mail: tjunchaya@worldbank.org

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Mr. Jacques Van Engel
Officer-in-Charge
Montreal Protocol Unit/Chemicals
304 East 45th Street, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10017
United States of America
Tel: +1 212 906 5112
Fax: +1 212 906 6403
Email: jacques.van.engel@undp.org

Mr. Ajiniyaz Reimov
Programme and Research Analyst
Montreal Protocol Unit/Chemicals
New York, NY 10017
United States of America
Tel: +1 212 906 5853
Fax: +1 212 906 6403
Email: ajiniyaz.reimov@undp.org

United Nations Environment Programme, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)

Dr. Shamila Nair-Bedouelle
Head of OzonAction Branch
UNEP Division of Technology,
Industry and Economics
15 rue de Milan
75441 Paris Cedex 09
France
Tel: +33 1 44 37 14 59
Fax: +33 1 44 37 14 74
Email: shamila.nair-bedouelle@unep.org

Mr. Atul Bagai
Senior Regional Coordinator
UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
UN Building
Rajdamnern Nok Avenue
Bangkok, 10200
Thailand
Mobile +668 4700 2257
Fax +662 288 3041
Email: atul.bagai@unep.org

Ozone Secretariat

Ms. Tina Birmpili
Executive Secretary
Ozone Secretariat
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
P.O. Box 30552 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 762 3855/7623611
E-mail: Tina.Birmpili@unep.org

Ms. Megumi Seki
Acting Deputy Executive Secretary
Senior Scientific Affairs Officer
Ozone Secretariat
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
P.O. Box 30552 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 3452/7624213
E-mail: meg.seki@unep.org

Mr. Gilbert Bankobeza
Chief, Legal Affairs and Compliance
Ozone Secretariat
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
P.O. Box 30552 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 762 3854/7623848
E-mail: gilbert.bankobeza@unep.org

Ms. Sophia Mylona
Compliance and Monitoring Officer
Ozone Secretariat
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
P.O. Box 30552 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 763430
E-mail: sophia.mylona@unep.org

Mr. Gerald Mutisya
Programme Officer
Ozone Secretariat
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
P.O. Box 30552 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 762 4057/7623851
E-mail: gerald.mutisya@unep.org