

**United Nations
Environment
Programme**



Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/29/3
26 November 2002

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE UNDER THE
NON-COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE FOR THE
MONTREAL PROTOCOL

Twenty-ninth meeting
Rome, 23-24 November 2002

REPORT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE UNDER THE NON-COMPLIANCE
PROCEDURE FOR THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL ON THE WORK OF
ITS TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The twenty-ninth meeting of the Implementation Committee under the Non-compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol was held at the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in Rome, Italy, on 23 and 24 November 2002.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

A. Opening of the meeting

2. The President of the Committee, Mr. Mahfuzul Haque (Bangladesh), opened the meeting at 10 a.m. on 23 November 2002.

B. Attendance

3. The meeting was attended by representatives of Australia, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Ghana, Jamaica, Senegal, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

4. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol and the implementing agencies of the Fund – the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO),

the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank. The full list of participants is contained in Annex II to the present report.

5. At the invitation of the Committee, representatives of Albania, Belize, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Paraguay, Russian Federation attended in order to present information on their respective countries' progress towards compliance with the Montreal Protocol. The representative of Tajikistan had been invited to attend but was not present.

6. Also at the invitation of the Committee, the meeting was attended by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol.

C. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

7. The Committee adopted the following agenda, based on the provisional agenda circulated as document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/29/1:

1. Opening of the meeting;
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work;
3. Report of the Secretariat on data and compliance issues;
4. Statements by the:
 - (a) Fund Secretariat;
 - (b) Implementing Agencies (UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, the World Bank), on the activities carried out in Article 5 Parties and Parties with economies in transition to facilitate the implementation and compliance with the Montreal Protocol;
2. Information on compliance by Parties present at the invitation of the Implementation Committee;
3. Review of the status of compliance with specific decisions of the Parties by Bangladesh, Chad, Comoros, Honduras, Mongolia, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Samoa (decision XIII/16), Russian Federation (decision XIII/17), Armenia (decision XIII/18) Kazakhstan (decision XIII/19), Tajikistan (decision XIII/20), Belize (decision XIII/22), Cameroon (decision XIII/23), Ethiopia (decision XIII/24), Peru (decision XIII/25);
4. Consideration of the report of the Secretariat on Parties that have established licensing systems (Article 4B, paragraph 4 of the Montreal Protocol);
5. Other matters;
6. Adoption of the report of the meeting;
7. Closure of the meeting.

III. REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON DATA AND COMPLIANCE ISSUES

8. The Ozone Secretariat presented the report of the Secretariat on data and compliance issues, as contained in documents UNEP/OzL.Pro/14/3 and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/29/2. The Secretariat

observed that some of the data contained in the documents was out of date as a result of data submitted by Parties after they had gone to print, a problem which constantly recurred.

9. On data, Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol required Parties to report yearly data within nine months. Over the last three years about 50 per cent of Parties had reported within the deadline, an improvement on the previous rate of between 25 and 40 per cent. Over time, almost all Parties did manage to report data; rates now stood at 99 per cent for 1998 data, 96 per cent for 1999, and 91 per cent for 2000.

10. Compliance review started with the data report, but the Secretariat reminded the Committee that under previous decisions of the Committee, other information, including dates of ratification of the Protocol and its amendments, and levels of assistance received from the Multilateral Fund or Global Environment Facility also had to be presented to the Committee. This process was becoming more and more complicated, and the Secretariat would make greater efforts to promote synergy with the Multilateral Fund Secretariat and its implementing agencies. The Committee agreed to defer discussion of compliance issues to item 6 of its agenda.

IV. STATEMENTS ON ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT IN ARTICLE 5 PARTIES AND PARTIES WITH ECONOMIES IN TRANSITION TO FACILITATE THE IMPLEMENTATION AND COMPLIANCE WITH THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

(a) Multilateral Fund Secretariat

11. The Chief Officer of the Multilateral Fund Secretariat explained that the thirty-eighth meeting of the Executive Committee, the last of nine meetings of the Executive Committee held during the triennium period 2000 to 2002. He introduced the work of the Executive Committee, which to date had approved more than \$1,500 million worth of funding of projects and other activities in over 125 Article 5 countries with grants ranging from \$50,000 to multimillion dollar grants to countries such as China. The approvals during 2002 would phase out some 42,000 tonnes of ODP-weighted consumption and 24,000 tonnes of ODP-weighted production. He noted that 2002 marked a significant departure from the usual course of the Multilateral Fund. The Executive Committee had been able to virtually finalize discussions on the implementation of the framework of strategic planning of the Multilateral Fund. There had been agreement at the beginning of the triennium of the need to empower Article 5 countries to take control of their phase-out programmes. This had led to the adoption of the framework for strategic planning which culminated in the adoption at the thirty-eighth meeting of a three-year phase-out plan for the Multilateral Fund. He noted that all Article 5 countries must comply with 50 per cent phase-out of CFCs by the beginning of 2005 and 85 per cent by the beginning of 2007. 2002 was marked by a sharp increase in the approval of national and sectoral phase-out plans. All large volume consuming countries of ODS had received enough approvals from the Executive Committee to ensure that they would meet the phase-out. There were fifteen such countries that did not need further assistance from the Multilateral Fund in order to meet these compliance targets. The majority of Article 5 countries which were low volume consuming countries had received assistance for the implementation of Refrigerant Management Plans which would ensure their compliance with the Protocol 2005 and 2007 targets. The implementation of the Refrigerant Management Plans posed a challenge for the Multilateral Fund as experience had shown that the end of phase-out was the most difficult period in countries.

12. Responding to a question from a member of the Committee about Uganda's request for a change in its baseline data for methyl bromide, the Chief Officer of the Fund Secretariat explained that such a change should not affect the agreement between the Executive Committee and the government of Uganda to phase out the entire controlled consumption of methyl bromide in Uganda through the implementation of a project approved by the Executive Committee.

(b) United Nations Development Programme

13. The representative of the United Nations Development Programme drew the Committee's attention to the large number of low-volume-consuming countries assisted by UNDP. In general the last year had been very successful, with a steady move away from project funding towards national and sectoral phase-out agreements. Most of the countries listed as raising compliance issues in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/29/2 were not those assisted by UNDP. Of those that were, UNDP would work with Nigeria to provide baseline methyl bromide data and to implement the CFC phase-out plan which had just been approved by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund. Problems were still being experienced with data reporting by Pakistan, partly caused by the appointment of successive ozone officers. Bangladesh was still in non-compliance, but the completion of a major foam project would return it to compliance. Nepal was also in non-compliance and projects there were not progressing well, perhaps because of political problems; UNDP would continue its efforts with UNEP to bring Nepal back into compliance. Funding for Armenia's country programme had been approved in principle by the GEF Council, but the approval was conditional to the resolution of inconsistencies between data reported to the Ozone Secretariat and that included in the Country Programme; given that Armenia had now applied for reclassification as an Article 5 Party, it was possible that the same proposals would be submitted to the Multilateral Fund.

(c) United Nations Environment Programme

14. The representative of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) drew attention to the report submitted to the Committee by the Energy and OzonAction Unit of the UNEP Division of Technology, Industry and Economics related to compliance status containing general and country specific issues with particular emphasis on Article 5, Article 7 and Article 4B of the Montreal Protocol. He detailed the work of the UNEP OzonAction Programme throughout the world, in particular, the new Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP) of UNEP, emphasizing the overall trends in CFC, halon and methyl bromide consumption in Article 5 countries. He noted that although the overall consumption trends for CFCs and halons were good, trends in methyl bromide consumption were of concern. He presented a regional comparison of consumption of CFCs, halons and methyl bromide and noted that compliance should be irrespective of country size and consumption.

15. Out of 76 countries where UNEP was the implementing agency, nine had come back into compliance since 2000 and 29 countries had sustained methyl bromide consumption at zero from 1999 to 2001. He stressed the need to continue to assist these countries in terms of capacity building and non-investment projects. There had been progress in data reporting in 2001. Some 62 per cent of the countries were in compliance, with 30 per cent non-reporting by both Article 5 and non-Article 5 countries, and non-compliance in 8 per cent.

16. He emphasized that policy setting was a beginning and it was necessary to examine how to enhance policy enforcement assistance to countries. The specific needs of low volume consuming countries needed to be addressed and there was an urgent need to establish an information network on illegal trade in ODS to enhance regional cooperation, with biannual meetings among representatives of implementing agencies, the Ozone Secretariat and the Multilateral Fund Secretariat.

17. He suggested that the Implementation Committee should serve as an early warning institution and said that informal non-compliance sessions during the network meetings were critical with attendance by implementing agencies, the Ozone Secretariat and the Multilateral Fund Secretariat. He noted that there was a need to develop a mechanism to give a platform to a number of Article 5 countries in Europe and countries with economies in transition which had been left out of the process.

18. Responding to questions from members of the Implementation Committee, he agreed that a number of low-volume-consuming countries, such as Nepal, Fiji and Maldives, found it very difficult to import small quantities of ozone-depleting substances, both because exporters were unwilling to ship very small quantities and because it was generally cheaper to buy in bulk. These countries had found themselves importing well over their consumption allowance in a single year, which put them in non-compliance with

the Protocol, but then banning imports in subsequent years until the stockpile was used up. For example, Nepal had introduced a licensing system in February 2001. Their baseline was around 25 tonnes but around 100 tonnes had been imported, and after consultation, Nepal had decided to ban imports

informally for the next five years. They had assured UNEP that they would try to maintain their use below or at the baseline. UNEP stressed, however, that the Committee should address the concerns of A5 countries.

19. A representative of the Secretariat observed, however, that the Implementation Committee had a clear mandate in relation to assessing compliance of parties under the Montreal Protocol. In the cases of Nepal and the Maldives, deviations from the baseline consumption were very high and this required attention.

20. Responding to a further question about Cameroon, the representative of UNEP commented that UNEP's African regional coordinator, assisted by the Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat, had gone to considerable lengths to establish communications with the Government of Cameroon. The problem seemed to be due to repeated changes in the personnel responsible for ozone protection, and an inability or unwillingness on the part of the Government to resolve the situation. The representatives of the Multilateral Fund Secretariat and of UNIDO confirmed, however, that a number of large projects had recently been completed, which should help in returning Cameroon to compliance.

21. A representative of the Secretariat drew attention to the time, energy and resources that the Secretariat spent collecting data reports. He asked whether implementing agencies, especially those with Institutional Strengthening projects, could assist in terms of encouraging countries to report their data in a timely manner. He gave the example of countries which had had projects running for between five and eight years but had failed to submit any data.

(d) United Nations Industrial Development Organization

22. The representative of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation observed that UNIDO was closely attuned to the new compliance strategies aiming at national sectoral phase-out plans, and continued to work closely with other implementing agencies. Methyl bromide phase-out was progressing in many countries, and in fact had already been completed in two. Of the Parties assisted by UNIDO, particular problems were being experienced in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Both countries had anomalously low baseline figures, because of the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the international embargo on Libyan Arab Jamahiriya during the baseline reporting period. As their economies had expanded following the end of these difficult periods, it was inevitable that consumption had risen, putting them in a situation of non-compliance. The Committee was requested, therefore, to look at these issues taking into account the unique problems of the countries in the compliance period.

23. Responding to questions from members of the Committee, the representative of UNIDO added that after the war, Bosnia-Herzegovina had tried to organise a consultative process with the stakeholders to ensure regular feedback on consumption figures. UNIDO had regular meetings with the ozone officer and had explained the implications of not reporting data and not determining baseline figures. They had advised Bosnia-Herzegovina to be present in the subject meeting. Moreover, a letter had been sent by the government of Bosnia-Herzegovina on 11 November 2002 to the Secretariat but it did not contain the required figures. Responding to a further question about information on Uganda's request for a change in its baseline data, he stated that Uganda had not informed UNIDO on this new development.

(e) The World Bank

24. The representative of the World Bank informed the meeting that the Russian Federation had submitted data which showed that there had been no production of Annex A and B substances in their country. He informed the meeting of the approval of a project for China for 85 per cent phase-out of

carbon tetrachloride (CTC) by 2005. The Government of Pakistan had provided data for 2001 which showed that they were in compliance with the CFC freeze and should meet 50 per cent production for 2001. The World Bank was working with Pakistan on its country update. Pakistan appeared to be in compliance on Annex 1 Group II but this was complicated due to variance in data over the last three years and the lack of Multilateral Fund projects on halons. He also gave updates on the partial phase-out of ODS in the manufacturing sector in the Philippines by 2005 to a complete phase-out by 2009 as well as an update on the situation in Argentina. He told the meeting that the World Bank had conducted extensive discussions with the Government of the Bahamas to ask it to submit data in a timely fashion. That data were currently with their national ozone committee and would be forwarded to the Ozone Secretariat. The Bahamas were implementing a new digital system to monitor and track ODS in and out of the country and were increasing dialogue with the customs authorities of the United States of America to monitor ODS bound for the US from the Bahamas. He noted that all the countries with institutional strengthening (IS) projects managed by the World Bank had reported and were in compliance.

25. Responding to questions from members of the Committee about the eligibility of non-Article 5 countries with economies in transition to funding for phase-out of HCFCs, the representative of the World Bank stated that the GEF had recently approved a work plan for 50 million dollars for HCFC activities, though precisely what this covered had yet to be defined.

V. INFORMATION ON COMPLIANCE BY PARTIES PRESENT AT THE INVITATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

(a) Russian Federation

26. The representative of the Russian Federation confirmed that production of Annex and B ODS for end use had closed on 20 December 2000, and exports and imports had ceased on 1 March 2000. The decision of the Government in May 1999 had banned the establishment of any new production facilities. The Special Phase-Out Initiative had been successfully implemented with full support from the international community; seven production facilities had been closed and the equipment dismantled or converted. These activities contributed to a reduction in production not only in the Russian Federation but throughout the former Soviet Union, and also to a reduction in illegal trade. A GEF project to phase out residual consumption would be completed in 2003. The Ozone Commission had prepared a plan for national phase-out for the period 2002–05, and it was due to be submitted to the Government for approval in December 2002. The Russian Federation was experiencing acute problems with the phase-out of CFC consumption for use in MDIs, and he called for the help of the international community in achieving this.

(b) Belize

27. The representative of Belize presented a request for baseline change. He explained that the Executive Committee had approved the preparation of a country programme and a refrigerant management plan at its twenty-fifth meeting in July 1998. In 1998, an international consultant had been hired to carry out data collection. It had been necessary to collect and analyze historical import and consumption, with consumption taken to be equal to imports. All ODS data were taken from the central statistics office with a few visits to importers. It became clear early in the exercise that the data gathered would only yield best estimates but this was, nevertheless, the data used to establish the baseline consumption level of 16.3 tonnes. All ODS, including CFCs, were classified as halogenated derivatives of hydrocarbons under a single code by the customs department. It had, therefore, been impossible to break-down information for imports for 1995, 1996 and 1997. The central statistics office was used mainly for trade data with raw data sourced from customs records. Under the reporting requirements of the Montreal Protocol, the national ozone unit, established in January 2001, was required to collect, analyze and report consumption to the Secretariat. In reviewing earlier data, the national ozone unit found large discrepancies between the data originally made available to the consultant and the actual quantities of CFCs imported. There were also discrepancies in 1999 and 2001 data. Although it had been

claimed that methyl bromide and halons had been imported, neither of them had actually been imported to Belize. Technicians, the end users, were also interviewed and their information compared to customs data.

28. By the time the national ozone unit was established in January 2001 there had been three significant events that had improved data collection. The customs department had completed the installation of an information management system in 1998; chapter 38 of the Laws of Belize was amended to incorporate the revised customs tariff and trade classification to disaggregate specific halogenated derivatives of hydrocarbons, and importers had gained a greater understanding of the Montreal Protocol and therefore provided the National Ozone Unit with more reliable data. He noted that the revised import data for the period 1995 to 2001 showed the true baseline for the period to be 27.5 metric tonnes. He also noted that the Government of Belize was requesting a revision of the baseline to 25 metric tonnes. He added that activities to strengthen the Belize ozone programme were required such as training of customs officers, an aggressive mobile air conditioner retrofit promotion campaign, strengthening of the training programme for refrigeration technicians and an aggressive monitoring and evaluation programme as well as public education and awareness-raising campaigns on the ozone programme in Belize.

29. The representative of Australia asked the representative of Belize for clarification of the baseline revision in ODP tonnes.

(c) Albania

30. The representative explained that Albania was a relative newcomer to the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol. During 2001 and 2002, Albania had cooperated with UNEP in a national participatory process to assess their national situation, and carry out ODS data collection and analysis. Albania had reported data for 1995 to 2000 as well as for the control period. She explained that due to various problems including limited resources and economic problems that detracted from environmental protection, it seemed unlikely that Albania would be able to comply with 2005 and 2007 targets. The national phase-out plan proposed a complete phase-out by the end of 2008. She noted that a new law had entered into force in October 2002 which banned the import of new or secondhand equipment using ODS; import and use of ODS required a permit; work was progressing on regulatory acts to achieve a CFC freeze during 2003 and Albania was implementing the first phase of an institutional strengthening project with funds that were made available in July 2002. She underlined the importance of the triennium period 2003 to 2005 for Albania in the lead up to complete phase-out in 2008.

(d) Nigeria

31. The representative of Nigeria reaffirmed his country's commitment to its obligations under the Montreal Protocol and noted that data submitted to the Ozone Secretariat showed a progressive improvement in their performance towards coming into compliance. He noted that there were a number of investment projects presently being implemented in Nigeria, several with accelerated completion. The plan for 2002 was to phase out about 333.5 metric tonnes of CFC. In order to strengthen and sustain compliance, Nigeria had elaborated a national CFC phase-out plan setting out compliance-conscious CFC reduction targets presented to the thirty-eighth Meeting of the Executive Committee. The targets would be achieved through investment projects in the foam, refrigeration and aerosol sectors; implementation of a refrigerant management plan; strengthening of ODS quota and import licensing system, and policy and legislative measures. He assured the committee that Nigeria would continue to remain in compliance with its binding obligations to the Montreal Protocol.

(e) Ethiopia

32. The representative of Ethiopia explained that CFC consumption in his country was mainly in the refrigeration sector. The Ethiopian country programme included a refrigerant management plan, a conversion project and recycling project. Unfortunately, the start of the recycling project had been

planned prior to 1998 but delayed until early 2002 due to withdrawal of the assisting agency for political reasons. The recycling project aimed to phase out 70 tonnes of CFCs over five years. He said that the national ozone unit was working to increase public awareness, draft new ODS legislation and implement training programmes, amongst others. The current trend showed that the use of CFCs was declining and he hoped that the country would be able to comply with its obligations under the Montreal Protocol with the assistance of the Multilateral Fund and implementing agencies.

(f) Paraguay

33. The representative of Paraguay presented a request for a change in baseline data. This arose from a difference in the data held by the Ozone Secretariat and that which had been recorded by the National Ozone Unit in Paraguay. He believed that the ozone staff at the time had forwarded only partial reports, and that the figures provided to the Multilateral Fund Secretariat were correct. On that basis, the baseline figure for CFCs should be revised upwards from 157.4 to 210.6 ODP-tonnes. This would make no difference to the status of compliance of Paraguay, as current consumption was well below even the original baseline figure.

34. In response to questions from members of the Committee about submission of data, the representative of Nigeria noted that its 2001 data had been submitted to the Secretariat while Ethiopia noted that its data for the control period had already been submitted. The Secretariat confirmed that it had received a copy of the Ethiopian action plan.

VI. REVIEW OF THE STATUS OF COMPLIANCE WITH SPECIFIC DECISIONS OF THE PARTIES BY BANGLADESH, CHAD, COMOROS, HONDURAS, MONGOLIA, NIGER, NIGERIA, OMAN, PAPUA NEW GUINEA, PARAGUAY, SAMOA (decision XIII/16), RUSSIAN FEDERATION (decision XIII/17), ARMENIA (decision XIII/18), KAZAKHSTAN (decision XIII/19), TAJIKISTAN (decision XIII/20), BELIZE (decision XIII/22), CAMEROON (decision XIII/23), ETHIOPIA (decision XIII/24), PERU (decision XIII/25);

35. The Ozone Secretariat presented the report of the Secretariat on the review of the situations of potential non-compliance arising out of the data report, as well as the status of compliance with decisions of the Parties, and recommendations of the Implementation Committee, on non-compliance issues, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/29/2. Parties were grouped according to the categorizations agreed at the 28th Meeting of the Committee.

36. The Secretariat apologized for sending out the report late, but observed that this was a constant problem. Parties were often slow to respond to requests from the Secretariat in following up recommendations of the Implementation Committee and decisions of the Meeting of the Parties, and the Secretariat always preferred to give information to the Committee rather than simply reporting that a Party had not responded to its request. As a result, the Secretariat often had to leave production of the report later than it would like.

37. The Implementation Committee discussed the points raised by the Secretariat in its report, including in closed session attended only by the members of the Committee.

Non-compliance with the requirement to report base year data (Article 7 paragraphs 1 and 2)

38. Twenty-eight Article 5 Parties had not reported data for one or more of the base years (1986, 1989 or 1991) for one or more groups of controlled substances, as required by Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol. The Secretariat observed that in the case of countries that had ratified the Protocol only recently, this data may not in fact exist, or at least be difficult to obtain. Furthermore, since the Protocol was later adjusted to set later baseline years for the determination of compliance by Article 5 Parties, the original base year data in practice was of no value, and Parties sometime found it difficult to understand why it should be reported. Nevertheless, under Article 7 of the Protocol, a failure to report the original base year data placed the Party in non-compliance.

39. The Secretariat further observed that Parties faced a similar position with respect to Article 9 paragraph 3 of the Protocol, under which they were supposed to report every two years on their activities on research, development, public awareness and exchange of information. Although this had been useful in the early years of the Protocol, it was of little value now, and the Implementation Committee had reached an informal understanding that the requirements of the Article were fulfilled by the regular reports from the Assessment Panels and WMO.

40. The Committee decided, however, that the question of baseline data was a more serious matter, requiring a decision of the Meeting of the Parties. The Secretariat suggested that the best way to proceed was for the Secretariat to work with the Parties to produce the best possible estimates of the base year data, as allowed under Article 7 of the Protocol. The Committee agreed to refer the matter to the Legal Drafting Group to prepare a draft decision for the Meeting of the Parties on the provision of base year data under Article 7.

Non-compliance with the requirement to report annual data (Article 7 paragraph 3)

41. Thirteen Parties temporarily classified as Article 5 had never reported any data to the Secretariat: Cambodia, Cape Verde, Djibouti, Liberia, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Suriname and Vanuatu. The Committee noted that many of these Parties had ratified the Protocol only recently, and that some of them had experienced periods of civil unrest. However, almost all of them had received assistance with data collection and institutional strengthening through the Multilateral Fund and its implementing agencies.

42. The Committee believed it was important that Parties should be reminded clearly of their obligation to report data, and therefore agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision, as contained in Annex I to the present report, urging these Parties to work together with UNEP under the Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP) and with other Implementing Agencies of the Multilateral Fund to report data as quickly as possible to the Secretariat, and to request the Implementation Committee to review the situation of these Parties with respect to data reporting at its next meeting.

Issues related to reporting of baseline data under Article 5, paragraphs 3 and 8 ter (d)

43. Several Article 5 Parties had failed to report data for one or more of the years required to establish their baselines: for Annex A: Angola and Haiti; and for Annex E: Cape Verde, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Federated States of Micronesia, Haiti, Democratic Republic of Korea, Liberia, Maldives, Nigeria, Palau, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Somalia, and Vanuatu. The Secretariat was therefore unable to determine these Parties' status with regard to compliance. Almost all of them had received assistance with data collection and institutional strengthening through the Multilateral Fund and its implementing agencies.

44. The Committee decided to adopt a similar approach to that adopted with respect to the group that had never reported any data, and therefore agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision, as contained in Annex I to the present report, urging these Parties to work closely with the agencies concerned to report data as quickly as possible to the Secretariat, and to request the Implementation Committee to review the situation of these Parties with respect to data reporting at its next meeting.

Non-compliance with the requirement to report annual data under Article 7, paragraph 3

45. In 2000 and 2001, only half of the Parties had reported their data to the Secretariat by the required date of 30 September, which made the Secretariat's job of analysing the data for the Implementation Committee and the Meeting of the Parties very difficult.

46. The Committee agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision, as contained in Annex I to the present report, using its standard wording on encouraging Parties to report data as soon as possible.

47. The Secretariat observed that the mid-year control periods, from July to June, for which Article 5 Parties had to report data under Article 2A paragraph 2 of the Protocol, tended to cause some confusion amongst Parties. It seemed likely that the current control period, which extended to eighteen months, from 1 July 2001 to 31 December 2002, would cause even greater confusion. The Committee agreed to add a paragraph to the draft decision on data reporting reminding Article 5 Parties of the eighteen-month control period.

Issues of non-compliance by Article 5 Parties

48. Several Article 5 Parties had reported consumption of Annex A Group I substances for 2000, 2001 and/or the control period 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001 which put them potentially or definitely in a situation of non-compliance. The Committee decided to repeat the language used in previous decisions of Meetings of the Parties dealing with non-compliance for all those Parties in this category that had not already been identified in individual decisions of the 13th Meeting of the Parties. Those countries which had been listed in earlier decision would be treated separately (see further below in paragraphs XX–YY). After a discussion, the Committee further decided to treat all Parties in this category in the same manner regardless of the scale of their excess consumption.

49. The Committee therefore agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing draft decisions on Albania, Bahamas, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Namibia, Nepal, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, as contained in Annex I to the present report, containing the Party's data identifying it as in a state of non-compliance, requesting that the Party submit a plan of action to the Committee with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance, and describing the possible consequences.

Requests for baseline changes

50. Seven Parties had requested changes in their consumption data for baseline years: Belize, Bulgaria, Paraguay, Qatar, Sri Lanka, Uganda and Yemen. The Committee recalled its decisions in previous meetings to request Parties asking for changes in baseline data for full supporting information, including the methodology used in calculating the proposed revised figure, and an explanation of why the earlier figure was incorrect. Decision XIII/15 of the 13th Meeting of the Parties had advised Parties that requested changes in reported baseline data to present their requests before the Implementation Committee, which would in turn work with the Ozone Secretariat and the Executive Committee to confirm the justification for the changes and present them to the Meeting of the Parties for approval.

51. The Committee noted the submissions and presentations made by some of the Parties to the Committee. The Committee further noted that in some cases the requested change would bring the Party into compliance, whereas in other cases it would not, but decided that all requests for changes should be treated on the same basis, regardless of their impact, and also regardless of the scale of the requested change.
52. In the case of Belize, the information provided did not differentiate between the different species of CFCs, so the Committee decided to request a full breakdown from Belize before the final baseline figure could be confirmed.
53. In the case of Bulgaria, the figure contained in the UNEP Methyl Bromide Alternatives Report, annexed to document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/29/2, indicated consumption after deduction of the volumes used for quarantine and pre-shipment uses of 86.3 tonnes, giving an adjusted figure of 51.78 ODP-tonnes, rather than the 54 ODP-tonnes that Bulgaria had initially requested.
54. The representative of Sri Lanka observed that his country's request was not so much for a revision as for a correction of one year's figure which appeared to have been recorded wrongly. This appeared to be the case also for Paraguay.
55. On this basis, the Committee agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision, as contained in Annex I to the present report, recommending changes in baseline data for Belize, Bulgaria, Paraguay and Sri Lanka.
56. In the case of Qatar, the Committee agreed that as no information had been provided, the Committee could not accept the request. The Committee further agreed to ask Qatar to provide full supporting information, including the methodology used in calculating the proposed revised figure, and an explanation of why the earlier figure was incorrect, and to invite Qatar to the next meeting of the Committee to present its request and to answer questions.
57. In the case of Uganda, the Committee acknowledged that some of the necessary information had been provided, but agreed that it was not adequate for the Committee to agree to its request. The Committee further agreed to ask Uganda to provide an explanation of why it believed its earlier baseline figure was incorrect, and to invite Uganda to the next meeting of the Committee to present its request and to answer questions.
58. In the case of Yemen, the Committee acknowledged with appreciation that much of the necessary information had been provided, but agreed that it was still not adequate for the Committee to agree to its request. The Committee further agreed to ask Yemen to provide supplementary information on the following issues: on the validity of its assumption that all substances consumed during 1995–97 were imported, or whether it was possible that some of the consumption may have been from stockpiles; on whether there had been any manufacture of products containing ozone-depleting substances during 1995–97; and on whether there had been any consumption of halons by the emergency services during 1995–97.

Non-compliance by non-Article 5 Parties with the control measures under Articles 2A to 2H

59. Armenia, Belarus, Latvia, Russian Federation and Ukraine had all reported consumption of ozone-depleting substances in 2000 in excess of the control limits which could not be explained by allowed exemptions such as those for essential uses or export to Article 5 Parties. The Secretariat observed that in some cases the deviation was very small, and was often due to consumption for laboratory and analytical uses, which was allowed under a global exemption but was often reported wrongly by Parties. Nevertheless, the Secretariat could not assume that the deviation was for allowed exemptions, and always had to request information from the Parties concerned, which was not always provided quickly.

60. The Committee recognised that in many cases the deviations might be explicable but nevertheless felt that it had to treat these Parties on the same basis as all others that had reported excess consumption or production for any given control period. Armenia and the Russian Federation would be the subject of separate decisions pursuant to decisions of the 13th Meeting of the Parties, and the Committee agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision, as contained in Annex I to the present report, declaring Belarus, Latvia and Ukraine in non-compliance with the control measures in 2000, requesting them to provide explanations for their non-compliance as a matter of urgency, and requesting the Implementation Committee to review the situation at its next meeting, and report to the Fifteenth Meeting of the Parties.

Status of non-compliance with previous decisions of the Parties

61. In order to facilitate its future discussions on Parties in non-compliance, the Committee agreed to request the Secretariat to draw up a checklist of the items of information it would ask Parties to provide.

Bangladesh

62. Bangladesh had been identified in decision XIII/16 of the 13th Meeting of the Parties as being in non-compliance with its obligations. It had since provided information to the Secretariat which showed that it was definitely in a state of non-compliance for the control period 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001. However, the Committee recognised that the completion of a major foam project in January 2002 would reduce CFC consumption and bring Bangladesh back into compliance.

63. The Committee therefore agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision, as contained in Annex I to the present report, recognising Bangladesh's state of non-compliance for the July 2000 to June 2001 control period, accepting that it had already undertaken measures designed to bring it back into compliance, and resolving to monitor the situation closely.

Nigeria

64. The Committee recognised that Nigeria was in a similar situation to Bangladesh, in that it had been identified in decision XIII/16 of the 13th Meeting of the Parties as being in non-compliance, and had reported data for 2000 and 2001 showing that it was still in non-compliance. It had recently submitted a plan of action showing how it intended to move back into compliance, but the Committee decided that specific benchmarks still needed to be agreed, and requested the President of the Committee to agree them with Nigeria.

65. The Committee agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision as contained in Annex I to the present report, recognising Nigeria's state of non-compliance for the July 2000 to June 2001 control period, noting that it had submitted a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a return to compliance by 2003, and resolving to monitor the situation closely.

Russian Federation

66. The Committee noted that although the Russian Federation was in non-compliance with the phase-out benchmarks it had agreed for 1999 and 2000, the data it had submitted for 2001 confirmed the complete phase-out of production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances in Annexes A and B, as noted by the Thirteenth Meeting of the Parties in Decision XIII/17.

67. The Committee agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision, as contained in Annex I to the present report, commending the efforts made by the Russian Federation to comply with the control measures of the Montreal Protocol, and welcoming its return to compliance.

Armenia

68. Armenia had been identified in decision XIII/18 of the 13th Meeting of the Parties as being in non-compliance with its obligations, but it had also submitted a request for reclassification as an Article 5 Party. The Committee agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision, as contained in Annex I to the present report, recognising that Armenia was in non-compliance with its obligations in 2000, acknowledging its request for reclassification as an Article 5 Party, and asking the Implementation Committee to review the issue once that matter was resolved.

Tajikistan

69. Tajikistan had been identified in decision XIII/20 of the 13th Meeting of the Parties as being in non-compliance with its obligations, and had agreed an action plan with time-specific benchmarks designed to return it to compliance. The Secretariat reported that there were minor inconsistencies between the report subsequently received from Tajikistan and that action plan; a representative had been invited to attend the Implementation Committee meeting, but had been unable to be present due to travel difficulties.

70. The Committee agreed to request the Secretariat to attempt to clarify the inconsistencies, and to invite Tajikistan to the next meeting of the Implementation Committee if they could not be satisfactorily clarified.

Cameroon

71. Cameroon had been identified in decision XIII/23 of the 13th Meeting of the Parties as being in non-compliance with its obligations, and had been requested to submit an action plan with time-specific benchmarks designed to return it to compliance. The Committee noted that it had not yet done so, and recalled the comments by UNEP that it had experienced difficulties in establishing good channels of communication with the Government of Cameroon, and that there had been frequent changes in the ozone officers in the country.

72. The Committee agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision, as contained in Annex I to the present report, recognising that Cameroon was in non-compliance with its obligations, noting with regret that it had not fulfilled the requirements of decision XIII/23, requesting it to provide a plan of action to the Secretariat as soon as possible, and in time for it to be considered by the Implementation Committee at its next meeting in July 2003, further requesting progress reports from UNEP and UNIDO, stressing to the Government of Cameroon the accompanying need for it to establish and maintain an effective governmental policy and institutional framework for the purposes of implementing and monitoring the national phase-out strategy, and resolving to monitor the situation closely.

Belize

73. Belize had been identified in decision XIII/22 of the 13th Meeting of the Parties as being in non-compliance with its obligations, and had reported data for the control period 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001 showing that it was still in non-compliance. It had recently submitted a plan of action showing how it intended to move back into compliance, but the Committee decided that specific benchmarks still needed to be agreed, and requested the President of the Committee to agree them with Belize.

74. The Committee agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision as contained in Annex I to the present report, recognising Belize's state of non-compliance for the July 2000 to June 2001 control period, noting that it had submitted a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a return to compliance, and resolving to monitor the

situation closely. It further agreed to insert a cross-reference to the request of Belize to change its baseline data.

Ethiopia

75. Ethiopia had been identified in decision XIII/24 of the 13th Meeting of the Parties as being in non-compliance with its obligations, and had reported data for the control period 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001 showing that it was still in non-compliance. It had recently submitted a plan of action showing how it intended to move back into compliance, but the Committee decided that specific benchmarks, and in particular an end date for phase-out of CFCs, still needed to be agreed, and requested the President of the Committee to agree them with Ethiopia.

76. The Committee agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision as contained in Annex I to the present report, recognising Ethiopia's state of non-compliance for the July 2000 to June 2001 control period, noting that it had submitted a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a return to compliance, and resolving to monitor the situation closely.

Parties now in compliance

77. The Committee noted with appreciation that the following Parties, whose compliance with the Montreal Protocol was a subject of decisions of the Parties on non-compliance in 2001, had returned to compliance and no further action was required: Chad, Honduras, Mongolia, Niger, Oman and Samoa (Decision XIII/16), Argentina (Decision XIII/21) and Peru (Decision XIII/25).

VII. CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON PARTIES THAT HAVE ESTABLISHED LICENSING SYSTEMS (ARTICLE 4B, PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL);

78. The Secretariat introduced its report on the Parties that had established licensing systems under Article 4B, paragraph 4 of the Montreal Protocol, contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/INF/2. The Secretariat observed that although not all of the Parties that had ratified the Montreal Amendment had yet provide information on whether they had established import and export licensing systems, many Parties which had not yet ratified the Amendment had established such systems.

79. The Committee agreed to forward to the 14th Meeting of the Parties a conference room paper, containing a draft decision, as contained in Annex I to the present report, noting with appreciation those Parties that had established licensing systems, and calling on all Parties both to ratify the Montreal Amendment and to establish licensing systems.

VIII. OTHER MATTERS

80. No other matters were raised for discussion.

IX. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

81. The Committee agreed to follow its customary procedure in approving its report.

X. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING.

82. The President declared the meeting closed at 2.30 p.m. on Sunday, 24 November 2002.

Annex I

DRAFT DECISIONS

RECOMMENDED DECISIONS ON COMPLIANCE ISSUES
BY THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

Decision XIV/... Data and information provided by the Parties in accordance with Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol

1. To note that the implementation of the Protocol by those Parties that have reported data is satisfactory.
2. To note with regret that 49 Parties out of the 180 that should have reported data for 2001 have not reported to date, and that in general, reporting rates have not improved in recent years;
3. To note further that lack of timely data reporting by Parties impedes effective monitoring and assessment of Parties' compliance with their obligations under the Montreal Protocol;
4. To strongly urge Parties to report consumption and production data as soon as the figures are available, rather than waiting until the final deadline of 30 September every year;
5. To remind Parties operating under Article 5(1) that for the purposes of reporting data, under the provisions of Article 2A paragraph 2 and Article 5 paragraph 8 *bis* (a) the current control period extends from 1 July 2001 to 31 December 2002.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with data reporting requirements under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol by Parties temporarily classified as operating under Article 5 of the Protocol

1. To note that the following Parties, temporarily classified as operating under Article 5, have not reported any consumption or production data to the Secretariat: Cambodia, Cape Verde, Djibouti, Liberia, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Suriname and Vanuatu.
2. To note that this situation places these Parties in non-compliance with their data reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol;
3. To acknowledge that many of these Parties have only recently ratified the Montreal Protocol but also to note that twelve of them have received assistance with data collection from the Multilateral Fund through the Implementing Agencies;
4. To urge these Parties to work together with UNEP under the Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP) and with other Implementing Agencies of the Multilateral Fund to report data as quickly as possible to the Secretariat, and to request the Implementation Committee to review the situation of these Parties with respect to data reporting at its next meeting.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with data reporting requirement for the purpose of establishing baselines under Article 5 paragraphs 3 and 8 ter (d)

1. To note that the following Parties have not reported data for one or more of the years which are required for the establishment of baselines for Annex A and E to the Protocol, as provided for by Article 5, paragraphs 3 and 8 ter (d):

- (a) For Annex A: Angola, Haiti;
 - (b) For Annex E: Cape Verde, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Federated States of Micronesia, Haiti, Democratic Republic of Korea, Liberia, Maldives, Nigeria, Palau, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Vanuatu;
2. To note that this places these Parties in non-compliance with their data reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol;
 3. To stress that compliance by these Parties with the Montreal Protocol cannot be determined without knowledge of this data;
 4. To note that fifteen out of sixteen of these Parties are receiving assistance with data collection from the Multilateral Fund through the Implementing Agencies;
 5. To urge these Parties to work closely with the Agencies concerned to report the required data to the Secretariat as a matter of urgency, and to request the Implementation Committee to review the situation of these Parties with respect to data reporting at its next meeting.

Decision XIV/... Potential non-compliance with the freeze on CFC consumption by Parties operating under Article 5 for the control period July 2000 to June 2001

1. To note that, pursuant to decision X/29 of the Tenth Meeting of the Parties, the Implementation Committee requested the Secretariat to write to those Parties operating under Article 5 that had reported data on CFC consumption for either the year 2000 and/or 2001 that was above their individual baselines;
2. To note that Guatemala, Malta, Pakistan and Papua New Guinea have failed to report data for the control period from 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001, and have reported annual data for either 2000 or 2001 which is above their baseline. In the absence of further clarification, these Parties are presumed to be in non-compliance with the control measures under the Protocol;
3. To urge these Parties to report data for the control period from 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001 as a matter of urgency;
4. To closely monitor the progress of these Parties with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that these Parties are working towards and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, they should continue to be treated in the same manner as Parties in good standing. In this regard, these Parties should continue to receive international assistance to enable them to meet their commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution these Parties, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that any Party fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that importing Parties are not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Albania

1. To note that Albania ratified the Montreal Protocol on 8 October 1999. The country is classified as a Party operating under Article 5 (1) of the Protocol but has not had its country programme approved by the Executive Committee. However, the Executive Committee has approved \$215,060 from the Multilateral Fund to facilitate compliance in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol;
2. Albania's baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 41 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 62 and 69 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances in 2000 and 2001 respectively, and consumption of 58 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances for the consumption freeze control period of 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001. As a consequence, for the July 2000 to June 2001 control period, Albania was in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol;
3. To request that Albania submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. Albania may wish to consider including in this plan of action the establishment of import quotas to freeze imports at baseline levels and support the phase-out schedule, a ban on imports of ODS equipment, and policy and regulatory instruments that will ensure progress in achieving the phase-out;
4. To closely monitor the progress of Albania with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Albania 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 this regard, Albania should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Albania, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Albania is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Bahamas

1. To note that Bahamas ratified the Montreal Protocol, the London Amendment and the Copenhagen Amendment on 4 May 1993. The country is classified as a Party operating under Article 5 (1) of the Protocol and had its country programme approved by the Executive Committee in 1996. Since approval of the country programme, the Executive Committee has approved \$658,487 from the Multilateral Fund to enable compliance in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol;
2. Bahamas' baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 41 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 66 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances in 2000 and consumption of 87 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances for the consumption freeze control period of 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001. As a consequence, for the July 2000 to June 2001 control period, Bahamas was in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol;
3. To request that Bahamas submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. Bahamas may wish to consider including in this plan of action the establishment of import quotas to freeze imports at baseline levels and support the phase-out schedule, a ban on imports of ODS equipment, and policy and regulatory instruments that will ensure progress in achieving the phase-out;

4. To closely monitor the progress of Bahamas with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Bahamas 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 this regard, Bahamas should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Bahamas, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Bahamas is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Bolivia

1. To note that Bolivia ratified the Montreal Protocol, the London Amendment and the Copenhagen Amendment on 3 October 1994, and the Montreal Amendment on 12 April 1999. The country is classified as a Party operating under Article 5 (1) of the Protocol and had its country programme approved by the Executive Committee in 1995. Since approval of the country programme, the Executive Committee has approved \$1,428,767 from the Multilateral Fund to enable compliance in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol;
2. Bolivia's baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 76 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 79 and 77 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances in 2000 and 2001 respectively, and consumption of 78 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances for the consumption freeze control period of 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001. As a consequence, for the July 2000 to June 2001 control period, Bolivia was in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol;
3. To request that Bolivia submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. Bolivia may wish to consider including in this plan of action the establishment of import quotas to freeze imports at baseline levels and support the phase-out schedule, a ban on imports of ODS equipment, and policy and regulatory instruments that will ensure progress in achieving the phase-out;
4. To closely monitor the progress of Bolivia with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Bolivia is working towards and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, Bolivia should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Bolivia should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Bolivia, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and Bolivia is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Bosnia and Herzegovina

1. To note that Bosnia and Herzegovina ratified the Montreal Protocol on 6 March 1992. The country is classified as a Party operating under Article 5 (1) of the Protocol and had its country programme approved by the Executive Committee in 1999. Since approval of the country programme, the Executive Committee has approved \$1,308,472 from the Multilateral Fund to enable compliance in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol;
2. Bosnia and Herzegovina's baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 24 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 176 and 200 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances in 2000 and 2001 respectively. As a consequence, Bosnia and Herzegovina was in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol;
3. To request that Bosnia and Herzegovina submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. Bosnia and Herzegovina may wish to consider including in this plan of action the establishment of import quotas to freeze imports at baseline levels and support the phase-out schedule, a ban on imports of ODS equipment, and policy and regulatory instruments that will ensure progress in achieving the phase-out;
4. To closely monitor the progress of Bosnia and Herzegovina with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Bosnia and Herzegovina is working towards and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, Bosnia and Herzegovina should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Bosnia and Herzegovina should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Bosnia and Herzegovina, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Bosnia and Herzegovina is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Namibia

1. To note that Namibia ratified the Montreal Protocol on 20 September 1993 and the London Amendment on 6 November 1997. The country is classified as a Party operating under Article 5 (1) of the Protocol and had its country programme approved by the Executive Committee in 1995. Since approval of the country programme, the Executive Committee has approved \$406,147 from the Multilateral Fund to enable compliance in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol;
2. Namibia's baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 22 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 22 and 24 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances in 2000 and 2001 respectively, and consumption of 23 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances for the consumption freeze control period of 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001. As a consequence, for the July 2000 to June 2001 control period, Namibia was in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol;
3. To request that Namibia submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. Namibia may wish to consider including in this plan of action the establishment of import quotas to freeze imports at baseline

levels and support the phase-out schedule, a ban on imports of ODS equipment, and policy and regulatory instruments that will ensure progress in achieving the phase-out;

4. To closely monitor the progress of Namibia with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Namibia is working towards and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, Namibia should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Namibia should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Namibia, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Namibia is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Nepal

1. To note that Nepal ratified the Montreal Protocol and the London Amendment on 6 July 1994. The country is classified as a Party operating under Article 5 (1) of the Protocol and had its country programme approved by the Executive Committee in 1998. Since approval of the country programme, the Executive Committee has approved \$432,137 from the Multilateral Fund to enable compliance in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol;
2. Nepal's baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 27 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 94 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances in 2000, and consumption of 94 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances for the consumption freeze control period of 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001. As a consequence, for the July 2000 to June 2001 control period, Nepal was in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol;
3. To request that Nepal submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. Nepal may wish to consider including in this plan of action the establishment of import quotas to freeze imports at baseline levels and support the phase-out schedule, a ban on imports of ODS equipment, and policy and regulatory instruments that will ensure progress in achieving the phase-out;
4. To closely monitor the progress of Nepal with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Nepal is working towards and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, Nepal should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Nepal should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Nepal, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Nepal is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

1. To note that Saint Vincent and the Grenadines ratified the Montreal Protocol, the London Amendment and the Copenhagen Amendment on 2 December 1996. The country is classified as a Party operating under Article 5 (1) of the Protocol and had its country programme approved by the Executive Committee in 1998. Since approval of the country programme, the Executive Committee has approved \$152,889 from the Multilateral Fund to enable compliance in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol;
2. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines' baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 2 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 6 and 7 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances in 2000 and 2001 respectively, and consumption of 9 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances for the consumption freeze control period of 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001. As a consequence, for the July 2000 to June 2001 control period, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines was in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol;
3. To request that Saint Vincent and the Grenadines submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines may wish to consider including in this plan of action the establishment of import quotas to freeze imports at baseline levels and support the phase-out schedule, a ban on imports of ODS equipment, and policy and regulatory instruments that will ensure progress in achieving the phase-out;
4. To closely monitor the progress of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Saint Vincent and the Grenadines is working towards and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Saint Vincent and the Grenadines is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

1. To note that Libyan Arab Jamahiriya ratified the Montreal Protocol on 11 July 1990 and the London Amendment on 12 July 2001. The country is classified as a Party operating under Article 5 (1) of the Protocol and had its country programme approved by the Executive Committee in 2000. Since approval of the country programme, the Executive Committee has approved \$2,794,053 from the Multilateral Fund to enable compliance in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol;
2. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya's baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 717 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 985 ODP-tonnes in 2000 and 985 ODP-tonnes in 2001, placing Libyan Arab Jamahiriya clearly in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol.

3. To request that Libyan Arab Jamahiriya submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya may wish to consider including in this plan of action the establishment of import quotas to freeze imports at baseline levels and support the phase-out schedule, a ban on imports of ODS equipment, and policy and regulatory instruments that will ensure progress in achieving the phase-out;
4. To closely monitor the progress of Libyan Arab Jamahiriya with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is working towards and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Maldives

1. To note that Maldives ratified the Montreal Protocol on 16 May 1989, the London Amendment on 31 July 1991 and the Copenhagen Amendment and the Montreal Amendment on 27 September 2001. The country is classified as a Party operating under Article 5 (1) of the Protocol and had its country programme approved by the Executive Committee in 1993. Since approval of the country programme, the Executive Committee has approved \$370,516 from the Multilateral Fund to enable compliance in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol;
2. Maldives' baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 5 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 5 ODP-tonnes in 2000 and 14 ODP-tonnes in 2001, placing Maldives clearly in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol.
3. To request that Maldives submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. Maldives may wish to consider including in this plan of action the establishment of import quotas to freeze imports at baseline levels and support the phase-out schedule, a ban on imports of ODS equipment, and policy and regulatory instruments that will ensure progress in achieving the phase-out;
4. To closely monitor the progress of Maldives with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Maldives is working towards and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, Maldives should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Maldives should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Maldives, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Maldives is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Requests for changes in baseline data

1. To note that in accordance with decision XIII/15 of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Parties, Parties that had requested changes in reported baseline data for the base years were asked to present their requests before the Implementation Committee, which would in turn work with the Ozone Secretariat and the Executive Committee to confirm the justification for the changes and present them to the Meeting of the Parties for approval;
2. To note that the following Parties have presented sufficient information to justify their requests for a change in their baseline consumption of the relevant substances:
 - (a) Bulgaria to change baseline consumption data for Annex E substances in 1991 from zero to 51.78 ODP-tonnes,
 - (b) Sri Lanka to change its baseline consumption data for Annex A, Group I substances from 400.4 to 445.6 ODP-tonnes,
 - (c) Belize to change its baseline consumption data for Annex A, Group I substances from 16 to 24.4 ODP-tonnes;
 - (d) Paraguay to change its baseline consumption data for Annex A, Group I substances from 157.4 to 210.6 ODP-tonnes;
3. To accept these requests for changes in the respective baseline data.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with consumption phase-out by Parties not operating under Article 5 in 2000

1. To note that Belarus, Latvia and Ukraine have reported data on consumption of substances in Annexes A or B to the Montreal Protocol in 2000 above control levels as provided in Article 2 of the Protocol;
2. To note further that these Parties are in non-compliance with the control measures under Article 2 of the Montreal Protocol in 2000;
3. To request these Parties to provide the Implementation Committee, through the Secretariat, with explanations for their non-compliance, based on the data reported under Article 7 of the Protocol, as a matter of urgency;
4. To request the Implementation Committee to review the situation with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances in these Parties at its next meeting, and report to the Fifteenth Meeting of the Parties.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Bangladesh

1. To note that, in accordance with decision XIII/16 of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Parties, the Implementation Committee requested the Secretariat to write to Bangladesh since it had reported data on CFC consumption for either the year 1999 and/or 2000 that was above its baseline, and was therefore in a state of potential non-compliance;

2. To further note that Bangladesh's baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 580 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 805 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances in 2000, and consumption of 740 ODP-tonnes of Annex A, Group I substances for the consumption freeze control period of 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001. As a consequence, for the July 2000 to June 2001 control period, Bangladesh was in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol;
3. To note, however, that the information provided to the Implementation Committee by both Bangladesh and UNDP shows that Bangladesh is expected to return to compliance in the control period 1 July 2001 – 31 December 2002.
4. To closely monitor the progress of Bangladesh with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Bangladesh is working towards and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, Bangladesh should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Bangladesh should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Bangladesh, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Bangladesh is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Nigeria

1. To note that, in accordance with decision XIII/16 of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Parties, the Implementation Committee requested the Secretariat to write to Nigeria since it had reported data on CFC consumption for either the year 1999 and/or 2000 that was above its baseline, and was therefore in a state of potential non-compliance;
2. Nigeria's baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 3,650 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 4,095 ODP-tonnes in 2000 and 3,666 ODP-tonnes in 2001, placing Nigeria clearly in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol.
3. To express concern about Nigeria's non-compliance but to note that it has submitted a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. It is with that understanding that the Parties note, after reviewing the plan of action submitted by Nigeria, that Nigeria specifically commits itself:
 - (a)...
 - (b)...
 - (c)...
4. That the measures listed in paragraph 3 above should enable Nigeria to return to compliance by 2003. In this regard, the Parties urge Nigeria to work with relevant implementing agencies to phase out consumption of ozone-depleting substances in Annex A Group I;
5. To closely monitor the progress of Nigeria with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Nigeria is working towards and meeting the specific commitments noted above in paragraph 3, Nigeria should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Nigeria should continue to receive international assistance to enable

it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Nigeria, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Nigeria is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Compliance with the Montreal Protocol by the Russian Federation

1. To note that the Russian Federation was in non-compliance with the phase-out benchmarks for 1999 and 2000 for the production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances in Annex A to the Montreal Protocol;
2. To note with appreciation that the data reported by the Russian Federation for 2001 confirms the complete phase-out of production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances in Annexes A and B, as noted by the Thirteenth Meeting of the Parties in Decision XIII/17;
3. To commend the efforts made by the Russian Federation to comply with the control measures of the Montreal Protocol;
4. To recognise the support and assistance rendered by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol to enable compliance by the Russian Federation.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Armenia

1. To note that Armenia has reported data on consumption of substances in Annex A to the Montreal Protocol in 2000 above control levels as provided in Article 2 of the Protocol, and therefore that Armenia is in non-compliance with the control measures under Article 2 of the Montreal Protocol in 2000;
2. To note that, in accordance with decision XIII/18 of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Parties, Armenia was requested to ratify the London Amendment as a precondition for GEF funding, and that this has not occurred;
3. [To further note that since Armenia has applied for reclassification as a Party operating under Article 5(1), the Implementation Committee should review the situation of Armenia after this matter is resolved.]

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Cameroon

1. To note that, in accordance with decision XIII/23 of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Parties, Cameroon was requested to submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance
2. To further note that Cameroon's baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 257 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 369 ODP-tonnes in 2000 and 364 ODP-tonnes in 2001, placing Cameroon clearly in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol.

3. To note with regret that Cameroon has not fulfilled the requirements of decision XIII/23 and to request that it should provide a plan of action to the Secretariat as soon as possible, and in time for it to be considered by the Implementation Committee at its next meeting in July 2003, in order for the Committee to monitor its progress towards compliance;
4. To further request UNEP to submit to the Implementation Committee a progress report on implementation of its policy and technical assistance project currently under way in Cameroon, and for UNIDO to submit to the Implementation Committee confirmation of the completion of its two foam projects, which might have significantly reduced consumption of ozone-depleting substances in Annex A Group I;
5. To stress to the Government of Cameroon its obligations under the Montreal Protocol to phase out the consumption of ozone-depleting substances, and the accompanying need for it to establish and maintain an effective governmental policy and institutional framework for the purposes of implementing and monitoring the national phase-out strategy;
6. To closely monitor the progress of Cameroon with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Cameroon is working towards and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, Cameroon should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Cameroon should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Cameroon, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Cameroon is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Belize

1. To note that, in accordance with decision XIII/22 of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Parties, Belize was requested to submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance;
2. Belize's baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 24.4 ODP-tonnes [, having been modified in accordance with Decision XIV/...]. It reported consumption of 16 ODP-tonnes in 2000 and 28 ODP-tonnes in 2001, and consumption of 40 ODP-tonnes for the control period 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001, placing Belize clearly in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol.
3. To express concern about Belize's non-compliance but to note that it has submitted a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. It is with that understanding that the Parties note, after reviewing the plan of action submitted by Belize, that Belize specifically commits itself:
 - (a)...
 - (b)...
 - (c)...

4. That the measures listed in paragraph 3 above should enable Belize to return to compliance by []. In this regard, the Parties urge Belize to work with relevant implementing agencies to phase out consumption of ozone-depleting substances in Annex A Group I;
5. To closely monitor the progress of Belize with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Belize is working towards and meeting the specific commitments noted above in paragraph 3, Belize should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Belize should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Belize, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Belize is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Ethiopia

1. To note that, in accordance with decision XIII/24 of the 13th Meeting of the Parties, Ethiopia was requested to submit to the Implementation Committee a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance;
2. Ethiopia's baseline for Annex A, Group I substances is 34 ODP-tonnes. It reported consumption of 39 ODP-tonnes in 2000 and 35 ODP-tonnes for the control period 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001, placing Ethiopia clearly in non-compliance with its obligations under Article 2A of the Montreal Protocol.
3. To express concern about Ethiopia's non-compliance but to note that it has submitted a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure a prompt return to compliance. It is with that understanding that the Parties note, after reviewing the plan of action submitted by Ethiopia, that Ethiopia specifically commits itself:
 - (a)...
 - (b)...
 - (c)...
4. That the measures listed in paragraph 3 above should enable Ethiopia to return to compliance by []. In this regard, the Parties urge Ethiopia to work with relevant implementing agencies to phase out consumption of ozone-depleting substances in Annex A Group I;
5. To closely monitor the progress of Ethiopia with regard to the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. To the degree that Ethiopia is working towards and meeting the specific commitments noted above in paragraph 3, Ethiopia should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In this regard, Ethiopia should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet these commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance. However, through this decision, the Parties caution Ethiopia, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the Parties shall consider measures, consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. These measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of CFCs (that is

the subject of non-compliance) is ceased and that Ethiopia is not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance.

Decision XIV/... Report on the establishment of licensing systems under Article 4B of the Montreal Protocol

1. To note with appreciation that 84 Parties to the Montreal Amendment to the Montreal Protocol have established import and export licensing systems, as required under the terms of the Amendment;
2. To further note with appreciation that 56 Parties to the Montreal Protocol that have not yet ratified the Montreal Amendment have also established import and export licensing systems;
3. To urge all the remaining 25 Parties to the Montreal Amendment to provide information to the Secretariat on the establishment of import and export licensing systems, and for those that have not yet established such systems to do so as a matter of urgency;
4. To encourage all the remaining Parties to the Montreal Protocol that have not yet ratified the Montreal Amendment to ratify it and to establish import and export licensing systems if they have not yet done so;
5. To review periodically the status of the establishment of licensing systems by all parties to the Montreal Protocol, as called for in Article 4B of the Protocol.

Annex II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. Implementation Committee Members

AUSTRALIA

Mr. Milton Catelin
Director
Environment Australia
G.P.O Box 787
2601 Canberra A.C.T
Australia
Tel: (+612) 6274 1481
Fax: (+612) 6274 1172
E-Mail: milton.catelin@ea.gov.au

Ms. Tamara Curll
Assistant Director
Environment Australia
GPO Box 787
2601 Canberra A.C.T
Australia
Tel: (+612) 6274 1701
Fax: (+612) 6274 1172
E-Mail: tamara.curll@ea.gov.au

BOLIVIA

Mr. Alex Suarez Irusta
Coordinator - Ozone Officer
Environment and Natural Resources Vice
Ministry
Sustainable Development and Planning Ministry
Av. Mariscal Santa Cruz Esquina Oruro N° 1092,
Plaza Del Obelisco, Edificio Ex Comibol,
Ministerio de Desarrollo Sostenible Y
Planificación
Bolivia
Tel: (+591 2) 233 18 84/233 0762
Fax: (+591 2) 233 18 84/2331273
E-Mail: ozonobolivia@mdsp.gov.bo /
alekzbo3@mdsp.gov.bo

JAMAICA

Mrs. Veronica Alleyne
Project Manager
National Ozone Unit
National Environment and Planning Agency
10 Caledonia Avenue
Kingston 5
Jamaica
Tel: (+876) 754 7547-50 / 7522
Fax: (+876) 754 7599
E-Mail: valleyne@nepa.gov.jm

BANGLADESH

Dr. Mahfuzul Haque
Deputy Secretary (Environment)
Ministry of Environment and Forest
Bangladesh Secretariat
Dhaka-1000
Bangladesh
Tel: (+8802) 8612 987
Fax: (+8802) 8610166; (8802) 8619210
E-Mail: dsdev@sdnbd.org /
mahfuzul@citechco.net

BULGARIA

Mrs. Lidia Assenova
State Expert
Air Protection Department
Ministry of Environment and Water
67 W. Gladstone St.
Bulgaria
Tel: (+359 2) 980 99 89
Fax: (+359 2) 980 39 26
E-Mail: asenoval@moew.government.bg

GHANA

Mr. Jonathan Allotey
Acting Executive Director
Environmental Protection Agency
P.O. Box MB 326
Accra
Ghana
Tel: (+233 21) 662693 (Direct)
664697 / 8 OR 662465
Fax: (+233 21) 662690 / 667374
E-Mail: jallotey@epaghana.org/
epaed@africaonline.com.gh

SENEGAL

Mr. Ndiaye Cheikh Sylla
Coordinator
Programme Ozone
Ministry of Environment
BP 6657
106, rue Carnot
Dakar
Senegal
Tel: (+221) 822 6211
Fax: (+221) 822 6212
E-Mail: denv@sentoo.sn

SLOVAKIA (SLOVAK REPUBLIC)

Mr. Lubomír Ziak
Head of Air Protection Group
Air Protection Department
Ministry of the Environment
Nam. L. Stura 1
812 35 Bratislava
Slovakia (Slovak Republic)
Tel: (+ 421 2) 5956 2543
Fax: (+421 2) 5956 2662
E-Mail: ziak.lubomir@lifeenv.gov.sk /
ziak.lubomir@enviro.gov.sk

SRI LANKA

Dr. W.L. Sumathipala
Director / Coordinator
Montreal Protocol Unit
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
104 Robert Gunawardena Mawatha
Battaramulla
Sri Lanka
Tel: (+94 1) 871 764
Fax: (+94 1) 887 455
E-Mail: sumathi2@sri.lanka.net

UNITED KINGDOM

Mrs. Maria Nolan
Head
Ozone Layer Policy
Global Atmosphere Division
Department for Environment Food and Rural
Affairs (DEFRA)
3/A3 Ashdown House, 123 Victoria Street
SW1E 6DE, London
United Kingdom
Tel: (+44 207) 944 5215
Fax: (+44 207) 944 5219
E-Mail: maria.nolan@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Mr. Paul Philip Sadgrove
Global Atmosphere Division
Department of the Environment, Food and Rural
Affairs (DEFRA)
3/A3 Ashdown House
123 Victoria Street
London SW1E 6DE
United Kingdom
Tel: (+44 207) 944 5235
Fax: (+44 207) 944 5219
E-Mail: paul.sadgrove@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Executive Committee Chairman

Prof. Oladapo A. Afolabi
Director
Department of Pollution, Control and
Environmental
Health
Federal Ministry of Environment
Plot 444, Aguiyi Ironsi Street Maitana District
P.M.P.B. 265
Garki, Abuja
Nigeria
Tel: (+234 9) 413 6317 / 523 3807
Fax: (+234 9) 413 6317
E-Mail: oladapoafolabi@hotmail.com

**Executive Committee
Vice-Chairman**

Prof. Tadanori Inomata
Ambassador of Japan
Embassy of Japan
Oficentro Ejecutivo La Sabana,
Edificio 7, Piso 3
P.O. Box 501-1000
San Jose, Costa Rica
Tel: (+506) 296 1650
Fax: (+506) 231 3140
E-mail: tinomata@racas
OR embjapon@racsa.co.cr

B. Parties Participating at the invitation of the Committee

ALBANIA

Hon. Mrs. Tatiana Hema
Deputy Minister
Ministry of Environment
Rruga e Durrësit 27
Tirana
Albania
Tel: (+355 4) 270 630 / 225 134
Fax: (+355 4) 270 625 / 270 627

BELIZE

Mr. Martin Alegria
National Ozone Officer
Department of the Environment
National Ozone Unit
Ministry of Natural Resources and the
Environment
10/12 Ambergris Avenue
Belmopan
Belize
Tel: (+501) 822 2542
Fax: (+501) 822 2862
E-Mail: noubelize@btl.net

ETHIOPIA

Mr. Demlew Aweke Berhanu
Deputy General Manager
DGM Office
National Meteorological Services Agency
P.O. BOX 1090
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia
Tel: (+251) 161 5 779
Fax: (+251) 151 7066/(+251) 162 5292
E-Mail:
demlew@hotmail.com/nmsa@telecom.net.et

PARAGUAY

Dr. Victor Morel
Coordinador Unidad Ozono
Secretaria del Ambiente (SEAM) dependiente del
Poder Ejecutivo
Paraguay
Tel: (+595 21) 61 5813
Fax: (+595 21) 61 5813
E-Mail: vmorel@conexion.com.py

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mr. Vassily N. Tselikov
 Executive Director
 ODS Production and Consumption Phase-out
 Projects
 Center for Preparation and Implementation of
 International Projects on Technical Assistance
 13-2 Sr. Pereyrlavskaya Str.
 129 041 Moscow
 Russian Federation
 Tel: (+7 095) 971 0423 / 280 5788
 Fax: (+7 095) 971 0423
 E-mail: vassily@odsgef.dol.ru

TAJIKISTAN

Mr. Abdugarim Kurbanov
 Deputy Minister of Nature Protection
 Coordinator of National Ozone Unit
 Ministry of Nature Protection
 Bohta, Str. 12, Dushanbe City
 734025
 Republic of Tajikistan
 Tel: (+992 372) 216 530
 Fax: (+992 372) 23 21 82

C. Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund and implementing agencies

Dr. Omar El-Arini
 Chief Officer
 Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the
 Montreal Protocol
 1800 McGill College Avenue
 27th floor, Montreal Trust Building
 Montreal, Quebec H3A 3J6
 Canada
 Tel: (+1 514) 282 1122
 Fax: (+1 514) 282 0068
 E-Mail: oelarini@unmfs.org

Mr. Eduardo Ganem
 Project Management Officer
 Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the
 Montreal Protocol
 1800 McGill College Avenue
 27th floor, Montreal Trust Building
 Montreal Quebec H3A 3J6
 Canada
 Tel: (+1 514) 282 1122 Ext. 229
 Fax: (+1 514) 282 0068
 E-Mail: eganem@unmfs.org

Mr. Sheng Shuo Lang
 Deputy Chief Officer
 Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the
 Montreal Protocol
 1800 McGill College Avenue
 27th floor, Montreal Trust Building
 Montreal Quebec H3A 3J6
 Canada
 Tel: (+1 514) 282 1122
 Fax: (+1 514) 282 0068
 E-Mail: slang@unmfs.org

Mr. Andrew Reed
 Economic Affairs Officer
 Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the
 Montreal Protocol
 1800 McGill College Avenue
 27th floor, Montreal Trust Building
 Montreal, Quebec H3A 3J6
 Canada
 Tel: (+1 514) 282 1122 Ext. 224
 Fax: (+1 514) 282 0068
 E-Mail: areed@unmfs.org

Mr. Ansgar Eussner
 Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the
 Montreal Protocol
 1800 McGill College Avenue
 27th floor, Montreal Trust Building
 Montreal Quebec H3A 3J6
 Canada
 Tel: (+514) 282 1122
 Fax: (+514) 282 0068
 E-mail: aeussner@unmfs.org

Mr. Valery Smirnov
 Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the
 Montreal Protocol
 1800 McGill College Avenue
 27th floor, Montreal Trust Building
 Montreal, Quebec H3A 3J6
 Canada
 Tel: (+1 514) 282 1122
 Fax: (+1 514) 282 0068
 E-Mail: mleyva@unmfs.org

WORLD BANK

Mr. Steve Gorman
Unit Chief
Environment Department
Pops/Montreal Protocol Operations Unit
World Bank
1818 H St., NW, Room mc4-10y
20433 Washington, DC
United States of America
Tel: (+1 202) 473 5865
Fax: (+1 202) 522 3258
E-Mail: sgorman@worldbank.org

Mr. Erik Pedersen
Technical Advisor
Montreal Protocol Operation Unit
Environment Department
World Bank
1818 H St., NW, Room MC4-105
20433 Washington, DC
United States of America
Tel: (+1 202) 473 5877
Fax: (+1 202) 522 3258
E-Mail: epedersen@worldbank.org

Ms. Mary-Ellen Foley
Research Analyst
Environment Department
World Bank
1818 H. St., NW
Washington, DC 20433
United States of America
Tel: (+1 202) 458 0445
Fax: (+1 202) 522 3258
E-Mail: Mfoley1@worldbank.org

UNDP

Mrs. Suely Carvalho
Principal Technical Adviser and Chief
Montreal Protocol Unit
UNDP
304 East 45th Street, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10017
United States of America
Tel: (+1 212) 906 6687
Fax: (+1 212) 906 6947
E-Mail: suely.carvalho@undp.org

Mr. Jacques Van-Engel
Programme Coordinator
Montreal Protocol Unit
UNDP
304 East 45th Street, 9th floor
New York, NY 10017
United States of America
Tel: (+1 212) 906 5782
Fax: (+1 212) 906 6947
E-Mail: jacques.van.engel@undp.org

Mr. Alejandro Ramírez-Pabón
Programme Coordinator
Montreal Protocol Unit
UNDP
304 East 45th Street, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10017
United States of America
Tel: (+1 212) 906 5042
Fax: (+1 212) 906 6947
E-Mail: alejandro.ramirez-pabon@undp.org

UNIDO

Ms. Seniz H. Yalcindag
Director
Montreal Protocol Branch
Programme Development & Technical
Cooperation
Division
UNIDO
Vienna International Centre
P.O. Box 300
A-1400 Vienna
Austria
Tel: (+43 1) 26026 3347 / 3654
Fax: (+43 1) 26026 6804
E-Mail: syalcindag@unido.org

Mr. Sidi Menad Siahmed
Chief, Fumigants Unit
Montreal Protocol Branch
Programme Development & Technical
Cooperation
Division
UNIDO
Vienna International Centre
P.O. Box 300
A-1400 Vienna
Austria
Tel: (+43 1) 26026 3782
Fax: (+43 1) 21346 3782
E-Mail: ssi-ahmed@unido.org

UNEP DTIE

Mr. Rajendra M. Shende
 Chief, Energy and OzonAction Unit
 Division of Technology, Industry and Economics
 Energy and OzonAction Unit
 United Nations Environment Programme
 Tour Mirabeau, 39-43 Quai André Citroen
 75739 Paris, Cedex 15,
 France
 Tel: (+33 1) 4437 1459
 Fax: (+33 1) 4437 1474
 E-mail: rmshende@unep.fr

Mr. Leo Heileman
 Senior Programme Officer
 UNEP/Division of Technology, Industry and
 Economics
 Energy and OzonAction Unit
 United Nations Environment Programme
 Tour Mirabeau, 39-43 Quai André Citroen
 75739 Paris, Cedex 15,
 France
 Tel: (+33 1) 4437 1450
 Fax: (+33 1) 4437 1474
 E-mail: leo.neileman@unep.fr

Mr. Atul Bagai
 Regional Officer (Networking)
 South Asia Network, ROAP
 OzonAction Programme
 UNEP Division of Technology, Industry and
 Economics
 UN-ESCAP, UN Building
 Rajdamnern Nok Avenue
 Bangkok 10100
 Thailand
 Tel: (+662) 288 1662
 E-mail: bagai@un.org

OZONE SECRETARIAT

Mr. Marco Gonzalez
 Executive Secretary
 Ozone Secretariat
 P.O. Box 30552
 Nairobi
 Kenya
 Tel: (+254 20) 623 885
 Fax: (+254 20) 623 913 / 623 601
 E-Mail: Marco.Gonzalez@unep.org

Mr. Michael Graber
 Deputy Executive Secretary
 Ozone Secretariat
 P.O. Box 30552
 Nairobi
 Kenya
 Tel: (+254 20) 623 855
 Fax: (+254 20) 623 913 / 623 601
 E-Mail: Michael.Graber@unep.org

Mr. Gilbert M. Bankobeza
 Senior Legal Officer
 Ozone Secretariat
 P.O. Box 30552
 Nairobi
 Kenya
 Tel: (+254 20) 623 854
 Fax: (+254 20) 623 601 / 623 913
 E-Mail: Gilbert.Bankobeza@unep.org

Ms. Ruth Batten
 Administrative/Fund Programme Management
 Officer
 Ozone Secretariat
 P.O. Box 30552
 Nairobi
 Kenya
 Tel: (+254 20) 624 032
 Fax: (+254 20) 623 913 / 623 601
 Email: Ruth.Batten@unep.org

Ms. Anhar Karimjee
 Scientific/Technical Officer
 Ozone Secretariat
 P. O. Box 30552
 Nairobi
 Kenya
 Tel: (+254 20) 623 856
 Fax: (+254 20) 623 913 / 623 601
 Email: Anhar.Karimjee@unep.org

Mr. Gerald Mutisya
 Programme Officer/ Information Systems
 Ozone Secretariat
 P. O. Box 30552
 Nairobi
 Kenya
 Tel: (+254 20) 624 057
 Fax: (+254 20) 623 913 / 623 601
 E-Mail: Gerald.Mutisya@unep.org
