



United Nations
Environment
Programme



Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.I(3)/3
25 September 1989

Original: ENGLISH

OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP OF THE PARTIES
TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

Third session of the first meeting
Geneva, 18-22 September 1989

REPORT OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE OPEN-ENDED
WORKING GROUP OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The third session of the first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol was held at the Palais des Nations in Geneva from 18 to 22 September 1989 to consider the elements for the work plans required by Articles 9 and 10 of the Montreal Protocol in accordance with Decisions 4 and 5(c) of the First Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

A. Opening of the Meeting

2. The meeting was opened by the Executive Director of UNEP. In his opening statement, Dr. Tolba welcomed delegates to the meeting and noted the progress made at the first two sessions of the Working Group held in Nairobi from 21 August to 5 September 1989 (UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.I(1)/3 and UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.I(2)/4). He then reviewed the findings of the session, which inter alia worked on integration of the assessment panel reports into one Synthesis Report. He referred specifically to the effects of ozone depletion and the need to take the action necessary to ensure ozone layer protection, including the complete phase-out of all fully-halogenated CFCs, as well as controlling halons, methyl chloroform and carbon tetrachloride.

3. Based on the new understanding of ozone layer depletion, the Executive Director stressed the importance of obtaining global participation in efforts to halt the production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances. In order to achieve that, he underlined the need to implement concrete work plans containing specific commitments so as to keep abreast of the rapid evolution in science, impacts, economics and technological options.

4. With regard to work plans, he made recommendations including the following: updating of the assessment panel reports on science, effects, economics and technology by 1992; holding a minimum of three regional workshops annually to train at least 50 people in each region; involving industry by participating in country-sponsored technology transfer workshops, demonstration projects and trade fairs; creation of a centralized information network that could contain an annotated bibliography of all ozone-related publications, as well as data and/or abstracts on ongoing technology and substitute-related projects; creation of an information clearing house to disseminate submissions on substitute chemicals and their toxicity; and the initiation of discussions with multilateral aid institutions to see how they can assist in ensuring that funds are channelled towards projects using alternative substances and away from those with an ozone-depleting potential.

5. In closing, the Executive Director emphasized the importance of obtaining the participation of all countries in the effort to eliminate ozone depletion and he expressed the need to discuss related issues with an open mind and a willingness to give and take.

6. The meeting was attended by delegations from the following Contracting Parties: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Egypt, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukrainian SSR, United Kingdom, United States of America and Venezuela.

7. In addition, the following non-contracting countries attended the Working Group session: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, India, Indonesia, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Lebanon, Morocco, Philippines, Sudan, Turkey and Uruguay.

8. The following six organizations also participated in the session: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), Halogenated Solvents Industry Alliance (HSIA), Greenpeace, Association européenne de réfrigération et air conditionnée, and International Chamber of Commerce (ICC).

B. Election of Officers

9. The Executive Director of UNEP reminded delegates that election of the Bureau for this session of the Working Group should necessarily take into consideration the composition of the Bureau for the two preceding sessions. The first session, which had taken place in Nairobi from 21 to 25 August to develop modalities for financial and other mechanisms, had had a Bureau consisting of a Chairman from Finland, two Vice-Chairmen from Japan and Ghana, and a Rapporteur from the European Economic Community (EEC). The second session, which had taken place from 28 August to 5 September in Nairobi to review the reports of the four assessment panels and integrate them into one Synthesis Report and, based on this report, to prepare proposals for adjustments or amendments to the Montreal Protocol, had had a Chairman from

Canada, two Vice-Chairmen from the United States and the USSR, and a Rapporteur from Kenya. He therefore proposed the following Bureau for this session:

Chairman:	Mexico
Vice-Chairman:	Norway
Vice-Chairman:	Netherlands
Rapporteur:	Switzerland

10. The meeting elected the following officers:

Chairman:	Mr. Juan Antonio Mateos	Mexico
Vice-Chairman:	Mr. Per Bakken	Norway
Vice-Chairman:	Mr. Willem Kakebeeke	Netherlands
Rapporteur:	Mr. Daniel Rychner	Switzerland

C. Adoption of the Agenda

11. The meeting adopted the following agenda:

1. Opening of the session (10.00 a.m., 18 September 1989, Palais des Nations).
2. Organization of the session:
 - (a) Election of officers;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda
3. Consideration of the elements for the components of the work plans required by Articles 9 and 10 of the Protocol, which were outlined in Decision 4 of the first meeting of the Parties as follows:
 - (a) Dissemination of reports of the panels for scientific, environmental, technical, and economic assessments, as well as the Synthesis Report, and their follow-up;
 - (b) Regular updating of the panels' reports, taking into account developments in the production of environmentally-sound substitutes or alternative technological solutions to the use of controlled substances;
 - (c) Development of a programme of workshops, demonstration projects, training courses, exchange of experts and provision of consultants on control options, taking into account the special needs of developing countries, for consideration by the Parties at their second meeting;
 - (d) Preparation of a study of retrofit technologies applicable to existing manufacturing facilities that produce controlled substances or products made with or containing such substances, to be presented to the Parties for consideration at their second meeting;

- (e) Facilitation of the production and wide dissemination of material for public information;
 - (f) Exploration of specific ways to exchange and transfer environmentally-sound substitutes and alternative technologies;
 - (g) Initiatives to support activities in programmes of international organizations and financing agencies that could contribute toward implementing the provisions of the Protocol, and defining means by which the Secretariat can initiate concrete contacts with the appropriate international organizations, programmes and financing agencies for this purpose.
4. Other matters.
 5. Adoption of the report.
 6. Closure of the meeting.

III. SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS

12. The Chairman turned to consideration of the dissemination of the reports of the four assessment panels and the Synthesis Report. In this regard, the Executive Director noted that the reports of the panels totalled over 1,800 pages and that, while it would be very desirable to have all of them translated into all official languages, the cost and time involved in this endeavour would be considerable. Moreover, the time involved in translating so many pages could also lead to the reports being outdated. The Executive Director therefore proposed that the Executive Summary of each of the panel reports and the Synthesis Report should be translated into the official languages.

13. Taking into account the cost involved, several delegations suggested that the report should be translated by the appropriate Parties and UNEP could then facilitate dissemination of the translated reports. On this point, several delegations pointed out that translation carried out in developing countries would be cheaper than in the United Nations and could be paid for by UNEP or through funds paid by developed countries into a trust fund developed in accordance with the work of the Nairobi Working Group session.

14. Several delegations noted that, in addition to translating the Synthesis Report and the Executive Summary of the Panel Reports, it was especially important to translate the reports on sector specific technical options since they contained the blueprints that would help countries to determine how to comply with the Protocol.

15. One delegation suggested that a clear channel must be available through which the Technical Options Reports in particular could be made widely available. This delegation also pointed to the difficulties in making the existence of these reports known to those concerned and stated that public information material could be used as a gateway to find the reports. The delegation offered to use information material just being produced in its

country as such a vehicle, if a channel could be identified quickly. The Secretariat suggested that the reports could be published as United Nations Publications with a proper United Nations Library number. Several delegations also stressed the importance of allowing countries and organizations to reproduce the Assessment Reports and distribute them at reasonable reproduction cost.

16. The Chairman then turned to the second substantive item on the Agenda, namely, updating of the panels' reports. The Executive Director noted that the Protocol called for panel reports to be updated AT LEAST every four years. Because of the considerable development in knowledge that had taken place since 1987 and was likely to continue over the next two years, the Executive Director recommended that, in this case in particular, panel reports should be updated in 1992. Several delegations supported this recommendation.

17. One delegation noted that the advances were likely to take place in the areas covered by the panel reports at different rates, therefore areas experiencing the greatest progress, specifically science and technology, could be updated in 1992, leaving the economic and environmental effects to be updated in 1994.

18. On the other hand, several delegations noted that there was likely to be significant new information on the economic aspects as a result of the studies initiated by the Working Group session on financial and other mechanisms. It was also noted that the economic and environmental effects reports would be of great importance to those developing countries contemplating accession to the Protocol and that there must in fact be greater developing country participation and focus in updating the assessment reports, especially the economic panel report.

19. One delegation stated that producing the six technology reports alone was a very difficult and time-consuming endeavour for hundreds of experts and represented an investment in time and money of several million dollars. Recommitment of these experts and money in the near future will not be easy to obtain. He said that several of the Sub-Panel Chairmen would not be able to provide the time necessary to update the report in the 1992 timeframe. One delegation suggested that others could serve as Chairmen, thus giving the assessment reports a new dimension.

20. On this point, the Executive Director emphasized that what he was recommending was an update of the reports. He said that six volumes of material had already been assembled and that updating this material would be much less time-consuming and costly. He suggested that the updates should concentrate on updating, not redrafting, and he stated his belief that the update could be performed in a six-month time period in late 1991 and early 1992.

21. Apart from the substantive value of having updated reports, one delegation emphasized that the assessment process was extremely valuable since it brought together experts with diverse views and, as a result of their discussions, their views on important issues became much closer. It was also noted that the report served to increase awareness of the problem.

22. Some delegations suggested that only some reports may need updating by 1992. In this connection, several delegations proposed making use of a technical advisory panel that would act like a filter, considering new data and studies for inclusion in an updated report. By spring 1991, the panel would recommend whether and which reports need updating in 1992.
23. The Chairman then turned to the third substantive item on the agenda, development of a programme of public awareness workshops, demonstration projects, training courses, exchange of experts and provision of consultants, taking into account the special needs of developing countries. Some delegations noted that an awareness programme already existed for the global warming issue under the framework of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and that this should be taken into account. With regard to the public awareness workshops, several delegations noted that the likely target groups for such activities were politicians, decision-makers, community leaders and the media, as these groups could be expected to act quicker if they had a greater understanding of the problem. In this regard, it was suggested that non-contracting Parties could benefit from both the workshops and the meetings of the Parties and they should continue to be invited to attend both.
24. It was also suggested that these workshops should be general in nature and should discuss *inter alia* the gravity of the problem, the cost of action versus inaction and options for immediate action. Several delegations noted the need to involve both developed and developing countries in the workshops. While it was noted that both developed and developing countries could benefit from increased awareness, several delegations proposed that, because of financial constraints, the workshops should be held in developing countries. It was also suggested that the first three public awareness workshops should be a priority and should take place if possible before the next meeting of the Parties. Finally, it was suggested that elements of the agenda of the London Conference on Ozone could serve as a model for future regional public awareness workshops.
25. With regard to training courses, there was general agreement that they would be particularly successful if they were tailored to the specific needs of the participating countries and that, without a clear understanding of the needs, they might be premature. Therefore, it was suggested that an assessment of the needs of these countries should precede the training courses. Several delegations stressed the need for and usefulness of obtaining industry participation. Some delegations suggested that universities and scientific institutions could be used in the training courses. While concern was expressed that the present state of CFC-free technologies was too new and speculative to be the topic for the training courses, other delegations pointed to the long-standing CFC-free aerosol technology and suggested that several countries could benefit from training courses in this and other technologies. Several delegations expressed the view that training courses should be sector specific.
26. With regard to exchange of experts and provision of consultants, several delegations expressed the desirability of compiling a list of consultants that would be called on by countries needing assistance and utilized by the Secretariat to support its policy discussions. It was suggested that the contributors to the assessment panel reports could serve as the initial

nominees for the list, and it could subsequently be supplemented by UNEP consultants and additional experts recommended by Governments. Several delegations stated that, before the name of a consultant was put on the list, his or her approval must be sought. It was suggested that the Secretariat should collect information on the qualifications and field of expertise of the experts to be included in the list. Finally, some delegations suggested the establishment of a technical review panel to correlate the needs of the countries with the appropriate consultants. Alternatively, it was suggested that the Secretariat could perform this function.

27. The Chairman then turned to consideration of agenda items 3 (d) and (f) dealing with a study on retrofit technologies, and exchange and transfer of technologies respectively. With regard to retrofit technology, there was a general agreement that such studies should be carried out. It was stressed that there were two categories of retrofit technologies: controlled substance production facilities, and manufacturing facilities that use controlled substances. It was noted that there are only 28 producing countries; therefore, transfer of information within this group should not be too difficult.

28. With regard to the manufacturing sector, it was noted that several reports might be needed to cover several industrial sector specific scenarios. It was further suggested that retrofit studies should be broadly based, perhaps taking into account the socio-economic implications and industrial and institutional changes necessary. Several delegations stressed that a great deal of work had been done and many retrofit techniques were described in the technology panel reports. As a first step, it was stated that it was essential to disseminate this information as soon as possible. One delegation volunteered to assemble some information available to it and transmit it to UNEP to serve as a foundation for studies. Another delegation stated that, depending on the detail requested, a retrofit report could not be ready by mid-1990. It was suggested that information on retrofit technology could be included in a 1992 update of the assessment panel report.

29. Several delegations pointed out that, in the transfer of technology, there are two kinds of technology: that which is freely available and that which is limited by proprietary rights. Transfer of technology in the latter case is a sensitive issue and the most difficult. In both cases, and especially as regards the latter, transfer of technology to developing countries should be made on a concessional basis. Other delegations suggested that, with regard to the question of transfer of technology on ozone problems, an exception should be made for the complex issue of proprietary rights so that such technology would be freely available to developing countries, as stated in paragraph 25 of the report of the first session of the first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. Other delegations stated that most countries are not empowered to take intellectual property, including patents, from their owners without compensation.

30. Several delegations suggested that, since the use of CFCs in aerosols was the largest use of the controlled CFCs, UNEP should, as a first priority, hire a consultant to carry out a retrofit study of the aerosol industry.

31. With regard to technology transfer, it was noted that a great deal of work on technology was contained in the reports of the technology panel and that this material should be translated and distributed for use as soon as possible. Some delegations noted that not all countries need all kinds of technology being transferred to them and it was therefore important to take into account specific needs. Other delegations noted that it was the responsibility of each country to decide whether they need all or part of the information. One delegation noted that Article 10, paragraph 2, of the Protocol provides for requests for technical assistance to the Secretariat by Parties should they so desire. It was suggested that this provision might be used to facilitate transfer of technology.

32. One delegation noted the importance of ensuring that all technologies transferred to developing countries should be economically and technically feasible. In this regard, several delegations noted the need to recommend, as soon as possible, the creation of a suitable financial mechanism to allow developing countries to obtain new technologies. Some delegations stated that bilateral assistance should be viewed as an interim measure until such a mechanism could be formally worked out.

33. It was noted that the promotion of local research on basic science and technology should be part of the work plan and that sufficient resources should be allocated as soon as possible.

34. Several delegations commented on the Executive Director's proposal that the Secretariat issue a questionnaire to establish the needs of developing countries regarding technology transfer. Some delegations supported this proposal; however, several delegations expressed concern that such a questionnaire should not replace, detract from or overlap with detailed country studies. One delegation suggested that the results of country studies could be used to develop a better informed questionnaire.

35. Several delegations noted the need to ensure that any recommendations made by this Working Group session take account of and be consistent with the action taken at the last two Working Group sessions. In this regard, there was a request that the Parties be provided with periodic updates on the status of the action being taken to implement the recommendations of the last two meetings.

36. The Chairman then turned to agenda item 3 (e) on production and dissemination of material for public information. In this regard, several delegations referred to the public information campaigns that were taking place in their respective countries. The following points emerged from the discussion: (i) information should be adapted to the needs of the specific target groups, including the media, politicians, technical experts, school-age children, neighbourhood associations, local conservation groups and the general public; in particular, newspaper editors, radio and television managers should be targeted; (ii) educating the press through briefings and allowing the press to provide a free public service in information dissemination were important components in disseminating information to the public; (iii) television documentaries on this issue could be very useful since the television media reach a great number of people all around the world.

37. The following additional points on information dissemination were discussed: (i) using the church to disseminate information should be considered; (ii) the Secretariat could be used to disseminate a common base of material to all countries requesting relevant material and a prototype public relations programme could be created for use by developing countries that so desired; (iii) in many developing countries resources for carrying out a public information campaign were currently inadequate and donor countries could put assistance for such programmes on the agenda for consideration in bilateral aid talks. One delegation asked that the Group recommend for consideration by the Parties the establishment of a fund to enable the Secretariat to initiate similar activities..

38. The Chairman then turned to the final item on the agenda: initiatives to support activities in programmes of international organizations and financing agencies. On this topic, several delegations expressed concern at the Executive Director's suggestion regarding the creation of a Technical Advisory Panel to provide technical assistance to help these organizations in their selection of ozone-related projects. Specifically, concern was expressed that such a panel introduced conditionality into the funding of projects. Other delegations expressed the belief that there was not a need for an independent panel to perform this function and that maybe the function could be performed by the Secretariat itself.

39. The Secretariat noted that it was not the intent of the Executive Director to create a body which would in any way control the decisions of the international institutions. Instead, the Secretariat noted the fact that such organizations might desire technical assistance in their efforts to ensure that no potentially harmful projects were funded, and it clarified that the intent of the suggestion was to provide those organizations with an institution that they could go to for help. Following discussion, it was agreed that the Secretariat should inform such international agencies that it could make available experts to aid in their technical reviews on an "as requested" basis.

IV. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

40. At its last session held on 22 September the Working Group adopted its report together with the recommendations to the second meeting of the Parties and to the Bureau of the Montreal Protocol and to the Secretariat of the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol.

41. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chairman declared the third session closed.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP TO THE SECOND MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

1. Updating the assessment panel reports

The Working Group recommends that those Panel reports genuinely in need of updating should be updated in 1992. With this in mind, the Working Group recommends the creation of a small advisory panel covering the work of each assessment panel. These groups would review the results of new studies and consider the need to include new findings in an updated report. In the first half of 1991, they would be asked to make a recommendation on the need to

produce an updated report in each of the specific areas. The Working Group recommends that delegations propose members for these advisory groups at the Second meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

2. Public information

A. The Working Group recommends that specific types of information be developed to fulfil the information needs of specific target groups including the media, decision makers, technical experts, school age children, neighbourhood associations, local conservation groups, and the general public.

B. The Working Group recommends that the Parties fund the creation of television documentaries on the ozone issue and that such programmes be made available for world-wide distribution.

C. The Working Group considers that the Secretariat should serve as an instrument for the dissemination of a common base of knowledge on the ozone issue to all countries requesting information and it requests countries to submit relevant publications to the Secretariat for dissemination to countries that request such materials. In this regard, the Working Group recommends that Parties be encouraged to translate the public information materials produced by United Nations agencies, international organizations and countries into their own languages and print and distribute them. Reasonable financial support could be provided to the developing countries undertaking such endeavours. The Working Group also recommends that Parties be encouraged to translate into languages other than their own, print and distribute such materials produced by them.

D. The Working Group recommends that the Parties agree to initiate the creation of a prototype public relations programme which could be used by countries.

E. The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat should co-ordinate regional workshops over the next two years to provide relevant information to journalists (print, radio and television).

3. Public awareness workshops

The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat co-ordinate regional workshops in accordance with the terms of reference described in Annex I and the cost described in Annex II to this report at the rate of three per year. The workshop design and hence the costs may need to be adjusted as new or different needs are identified and experience with the seminars has been gained. Interpretation into at least one dominant language of the region in which they are being held should be provided.

4. Dissemination of technical information

The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat of the Protocol be augmented by technical staff supplemented or advised, as necessary, by experts and consultants. The purpose of such technical staff would be to serve as a focal point for the latest reliable information on technologies that reduce

and eliminate the use and emissions of CFCs and halons. It is envisaged that this work will expedite ozone protection activities in developed and developing countries. In particular, the technical staff will engage in collecting, verifying, and distributing technical information. The technical staff shall, as appropriate, rely on advisory committees, UNEP Technical Assessment Committee Members (sector specific), and individual experts, especially the following:

- engineering and economic experts for the purpose of establishing descriptive and quantitative criteria of technical performance, including efficiency, cost, safety and environmental acceptability;
- national experts for the purpose of advising on the utilization of assistance to serve best the interests of developing countries;
- economic development and financing experts for the purpose of linking technical information to financial evaluation.

5. Provision of consultants

The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat compile a list of consultants with a broad geographic distribution in the area of control options. The list of consultants should include detailed descriptions of the individuals' qualifications, affiliations, and areas of specialization in alternatives to controlled substances. It should also include a description of the terms of consulting including fee structures. It is recommended that the Secretariat, through the Panel Chairmen, contact the contributors to the Assessment Panel reports to determine if they would like to be included in such a list. The Secretariat should encourage Parties from both developed and developing countries to supplement this list with recommendations. The Working Group recommends that the Parties consider creation of a small advisory group which could, on request, attempt, with the requesting country, to select consultants from the list who best meet the needs of the requesting country.

6. Technology and retrofit studies

The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat identify and engage on behalf of the Parties suitable consultants to develop a series of sector specific case studies which, taking into account the particular needs of developing countries, would report on the applicability and full technical details of: currently available alternative substances or low cost/no additional cost technologies to reduce CFC and halon emissions in solvents, refrigerants, air conditioning, foams and fire protection with full consideration of recycling and retrofit technologies in the areas noted above.

The first step for such studies must be to compile existing information. The studies should emphasize cost, complexity, suitability for small scale, and availability worldwide. They should also consider technical aspects, economic, staff training and institutional or management changes that might result from proposed alternatives, substitutes or plant conversions.

Since CFC use in aerosols is the world's largest use of the controlled CFCs, the top priority is to initiate a study on retrofitting CFC-based aerosol plants with due consideration for the special problems of small filling plants.

7. Initiatives to support activities in programmes of international organizations and financing agencies

The Working Group finds that it is essential that international organizations and funding agencies take account, to the extent possible, of the requirements of the Montreal Protocol. The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat initiate processes to make recipient countries aware of this positive shift in policy and help them develop the capability to plan projects accordingly. Furthermore, such organizations should agree to look favourably upon and give priority to projects using alternative substances or technologies.

International organizations need the technical expertise to assess the environmental impact of possible alternatives to proposed projects related to the manufacture, production or use of the controlled substances or products made with or containing controlled substances. Such expertise could be provided through the Secretariat on an "as requested" basis from a list of experts compiled in accordance with earlier recommendations of this Working Group. The Secretariat is requested to inform international agencies on the availability of this expertise or assistance.

The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat approach financing and technical assistance agencies, as well as specialized agencies and other bodies of the United Nations system, for help in meeting the needs of the developing countries. Such assistance should include finance for research programmes, feasibility studies and demonstration programmes. Secondly, contribution should be made, to the maximum extent possible, to the totality of funds required to enable the developing countries to adhere to the discipline of the Montreal Protocol within an established timetable.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP TO THE BUREAU OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL AND TO THE SECRETARIAT OF THE VIENNA CONVENTION AND THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL ON INTERIM MEASURES TO BE TAKEN BEFORE THE JUNE 1990 MEETING OF THE CONTRACTING PARTIES

The Working Group recognizes the need for interim measures to be taken before the June 1990 meeting of the Contracting Parties in order to facilitate prompt implementation of Articles 9 and 10 of the Montreal Protocol. For this work to be carried out, additional funds are required. Accordingly, the Working Group recommends that consideration be given by the Parties to the Protocol - the developed countries and those developing countries in a position to do so - to making a special voluntary contribution to the Secretariat of the Protocol to carry out the activities under Articles 9 and 10 of the Protocol that are considered necessary to be carried out before the Second Meeting of the Parties. The Working Group expressed the hope that these contributions be made as soon as possible according to the attached estimates (Annex II). The Working Group expressed concern that, if sufficient

resources were not forthcoming, the Secretariat would be hampered in implementing the recommendations of the Working Group made at the request of the Contracting Parties. These interim measures would include the following:

1. Dissemination of the work of the assessment panels

The Working Group recommends that the following items be translated into official United Nations languages and disseminated as soon as possible:

- A. The Executive Summaries of the Panel Reports
- B. The Synthesis Report
- C. The Technical Options Panel Report and its five sectoral reports

The Working Group recognizes that these documents constitute up to 800 pages of material and that their translation, reproduction and wide dissemination will be quite expensive and time-consuming. Therefore, the Working Group recommends that the Secretariat examine the feasibility of having the documents translated at no or low cost in various countries and the Working Group encourages Parties to offer this support.

The Working Group requests the Secretariat to make an effort to make the reports available as a United Nations document with an appropriate library number so that they can be easily referenced and obtained.

The Working Group understands that the speed at which these very important documents will be translated, reproduced and disseminated will depend on the speed at which funds will be forthcoming from the Parties.

2. Reproduction of Assessment Reports

The Working Group recommends that countries and organizations be encouraged to reproduce the Assessment Reports, including the five technical reports, and distribute them without profit. This will ensure the earliest and widest possible distribution. The Working Group requests that the Secretariat not undertake any contractual obligations that would restrict such distribution.

3. Public awareness workshops

The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat co-ordinate three regional workshops in accordance with the terms of reference described in Annex I to this report. These regional workshops should occur before the June 1990 meeting of the Parties. Translation into at least one dominant language of the region in which they are being held should be provided. Such workshops should continue after June 1990 at the rate of three per year. However, the workshop design and hence the costs may need to be adjusted as new or different needs are identified and experience with the seminars has been gained.

4. Studies on retrofit technology

The Working Group also recommends that, depending on adequate funding, some studies on retrofit technology should be conducted before the June 1990 meeting of the Contracting Parties. The respective cost estimates are included in Annex II to this report.

ANNEX I

UNEP REGIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE PROTECTION OF THE OZONE LAYER

Introduction

The seminar has been designed so that very senior government officials and industry leaders with limited time available can receive an overview of the ozone layer depletion issue in only one day. The seminar has also been designed for government officials who will assume follow-up or implementation responsibilities for the Montreal Protocol. Day 2 to Day 4 would provide participants with an opportunity for a full exchange of views with experts.

Participation

- High-ranking officials (Ministers and senior industry/business managers).
- Government and business working officials who will implement CFC and halon control policy.

Seminar objectives

1. To sensitize government and industry policy-makers to the need for prompt action to protect the ozone layer.
2. To provide policy-makers and governments with specific information on ways and means of meeting the obligations of the Montreal Protocol.
 - status of the atmospheric science
 - environmental effects of UV-b
 - status of the technical solutions
 - economic considerations
 - special problems of developing countries.

Organization

Secretariat for the Montreal Protocol in co-operation with host government or regional organizing committee would assume responsibility for co-ordinating conference logistics; selection, invitation, and payment (if necessary) of speakers; sponsorship of representatives from developing countries; approval of materials for presentation; arrangement for translation, reproduction and distribution of conference materials.

DAY 1: OVERVIEW PARTICULARLY FOR TOP OFFICIALS

Introductory Remarks

- Keynote Address by host country (Prime Minister/Minister)
- Keynote Address by UNEP (Executive Director)
- Overview of Science and Effects of Ozone Depletion
- Overview of Technological Feasibility of a Phase-out

LUNCH

OVERVIEW OF MACRO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

Questions and answers

The Montreal Protocol:

- explanation of key provisions
- control obligations
- special provisions for developing countries
- control of trade

Questions and answers

Co-operation and response strategies of countries in Protecting the ozone layer:

- experience in implementing the protocol
- co-operation between developing and developed countries
- regional co-operation on technical solutions

DINNER

DAY 2: PARTICULARLY FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICIALS

Key Elements of the science:

- atmospheric chemistry
- models and measurements
- regional science and results
- scientific consensus

Key elements of the environmental effects:

- human health
- agricultural impacts
- other concerns

Technical solutions:

Sector specific substitutes and alternatives (as appropriate):

- aerosols
- solvents
- refrigeration
- foams
- halons
- other

Questions and answers

LUNCH

Special problems of developing countries:

- conversion of production
- conversion of manufacturing
- access to technical information
- small-scale uses and infrastructure
- capital funding

Finding solutions for developing countries:

- technology transfer
- training
- financial assistance

DAY 3: INDUSTRY PERSPECTIVES ON SUBSTITUTES AND ALTERNATIVES

Special market conditions:

- customer demands and specifications
- availability of inputs for new technology

Regulatory barriers and uncertainty:

- toxicity
- flammability
- insurance, codes, etc.

Cultivating new market opportunities:

- multinational purchasing and servicing policy

- made without CFCs
- recycling CFCs

Plant tours

LATER DAYS (as needed):

Other topics of possible interest to host country/region:

- Discussion and working groups
- Domestic regulation
- More detailed effects, science, technology, etc.
- Legal issues
- Case study approach/methodology for determining domestic needs
- Training of regional experts for future technical presentations
- Regional meetings and working groups (follow-up and co-ordination)

POSSIBLE PRESENTERS:

UNEP executives and staff
UNDP, World Bank, etc.
UNEP Assessment Chairmen and Committee Members (Alternates)
Host region experts
Consultants
Experts from business

BUDGET:

	<u>in United States dollars</u>
Regional planning committee	5,000
Travel and per diem (per speaker, \$5,000)	35,000
Travel and per diem (per delegation, \$12,000)	120,000
Conference facilities by host country	???
Translation	30,000
Secretariat costs (UNEP)	
Publications, slides, movies, etc.	
TOTAL:	168,000 - 192,000

RESOURCE MATERIALS (Translated, printed, visual, etc.)

Background

- history of the concern
- chronology of international and national regulation
- explanation of the atmospheric science
- estimation and quantification of effects
- assessment of technical options
- costs and benefits of substitutes and alternatives
- importance of developing countries

Questions and answers

Technical training

Science and effects of ozone depletion
Analysing national uses and special needs
Opportunities for special financing
Domestic regulation and business incentives
Occupational health and safety
Waste management and environmental protection
Training for operation and maintenance of new technology
Management and infrastructure development
Understanding and selecting new technology

Special projects

Co-operative research
Regional measurement of ozone depletion
Development of new technology
Adaption of new technology to regional markets

ANNEX II

COST ESTIMATES FOR CARRYING OUT THE ACTIVITIES RECOMMENDED
BY THIS WORKING GROUP SESSION AND WHICH NEED TO BE CARRIED
OUT BEFORE JUNE 1990

1.	Translation, reproduction and dissemination of the Executive Summaries of the Assessment Panel Reports; the Synthesis Report, and the entire Technical Options Panel Report.	\$160,000-175,000
2.	Three regional workshops. Translation and interpretation into at least one language, open-ended financial assistance to developing country participants (up to 20 per meeting).	\$510,000-\$690,000
3.	Production of Studies on retrofits and alternatives	\$200,000
	SUB-TOTAL	\$870,000-\$1.06 m

The following cost estimates are included for information purposes:

Additional costs before the Second Meeting of the Parties

1.	Four sessions of the Working Group meetings:	\$500,000
	(a) adjustments and amendments to the Protocol 13-17 November 1989, Geneva	
	(b) financial and other mechanisms 26 February - 6 March 1989, Geneva	
	(c) two additional negotiating sessions are anticipated but are as yet unscheduled	
2.	Second Meeting of the Bureau	\$ 35,000
3.	Carrying out of up to ten country studies requested by the Working Group session dealing with financial and other mechanisms	\$750,000-1.0 m
	SUB-TOTAL	\$1.285 m-1.535 m
	GRAND TOTAL	\$2.155 m-2.600 m
