



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/10/4  
30 August 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE UNDER THE  
NON-COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE FOR  
THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Tenth meeting  
Geneva, 25 August 1995

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

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The tenth meeting of the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol was held at the Geneva International Conference Centre on 25 August 1995.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

A. Opening of the meeting

2. The meeting was opened at 10 a.m. on Friday, 25 August 1995, by Mr. Hugo Schally (Austria), President of the Committee for 1994.

B. Attendance

3. The meeting was attended by Committee members from Austria, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chile, Jordan, Netherlands, Peru, the Russian Federation and the United Republic of Tanzania. The meeting was also attended by a representative of Slovenia. Representatives of the Implementing Agencies for the Financial Mechanism under the Montreal Protocol and of the Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund were also present. The meeting was also attended by the Chair and Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on CEIT Issues. The full list of participants is annexed to the present report.

C. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

4. The Committee adopted the following agenda, which had been circulated as document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/10/2:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Election of the President and the Vice-President, the latter to serve also as Rapporteur.
3. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.

4. Consideration of the report of the Secretariat:
  - (a) Data reporting under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol;
  - (b) Application of trade measures under Article 4 to non-Parties to the London Amendment to the Protocol (decision VI/4);
  - (c) Corrected data on ozone-depleting substances (ODS) submitted by Kuwait and Slovenia;
  - (d) Statement by the Russian Federation on behalf of certain Parties regarding non-fulfilment of their obligations under the Montreal Protocol;
  - (e) Non-compliance by Parties;
  - (f) Parties operating under Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol whose country programmes have been finalized but which have not yet reported data to the Secretariat;
  - (g) Romania's request for transfer of production rights of substances contained in Annex I of the Protocol to Greece.
5. Statement by Bulgaria on its programme for the phase-out of ODS under the Montreal Protocol.
6. Other matters.
7. Adoption of the report.
8. Closure of the meeting.

D. Election of the President and the Vice-President,  
the latter to serve also as Rapporteur

5. Pursuant to paragraph 5 of the non-compliance procedure, Mr. Hugo Schally (Austria) was elected by the Committee to continue to serve as its President until the Seventh Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol and Mr. Antonio Garcia-Revilla (Peru) was elected Vice-President.

III. CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT

A. Data reporting under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol

6. The representative of the Secretariat introduced the report of the Secretariat on the reporting of data by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/10/3). He said that, although additional data submissions had been received since the report had been prepared, the overall picture was still disappointing. It was gratifying that many countries had reported data, following the discussion of the matter at the eighth and ninth meetings of the Committee, but it was also worrying that some countries still had failed to do so.

7. Continuing his presentation, the representative of the Secretariat said that the data reported showed that the implementation of the Protocol was on course for 1993, with large reductions in the production of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and halons. There had been an increase in the production of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) in 1993, but those substances had not been controlled under the Protocol at that time. The data received by the Secretariat thus indicated that all non-Article 5 Parties had complied with the control measures, with two exceptions (Japan and Liechtenstein). Slovakia, which had earlier been deemed to have not complied with the reduction schedule of other fully halogenated CFCs in 1993, had not yet ratified the London Amendment at that time and therefore was in full compliance with its obligations. At the same time, there had been a combined increase in the production of CFCs, halons and HCFCs in the eight Article 5 countries that had reported production data for 1993 (see paragraph 13 of the report of the Secretariat).

8. With regard to the status of developing countries as operating under Article 5 of the Protocol (paragraph 28 of the report of the Secretariat), the representative of the Secretariat said that, according to the data it had submitted, Lebanon had exceeded the per capita consumption ceiling prescribed in Article 5 in order for it to operate under that Article. Lebanon had, however, disputed the population figures used in making that calculation. The Secretariat had raised the matter with the United Nations Statistical Division, which had replied that the population figures used were indeed the official ones. That reply had been forwarded to the Government of Lebanon, and, for the moment, Lebanon could not be considered as a Party operating under Article 5. Other developing countries currently classified as not operating under Article 5 were Cyprus, Kuwait, Slovenia and the United Arab Emirates.

9. Finally, the Secretariat informed the Committee that, since the report had been prepared, Gambia had reported its data for 1992, Canada and Peru had reported their data for 1993, and the following countries had reported data for 1994: Algeria, Austria, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, France, Gambia, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Netherlands, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and Ukraine. In addition, the Russian Federation should be added to the list of non-Article 5 Parties that had not reported data for 1993 (paragraph 9 of the report of the Secretariat).

10. The President pointed out that Parties still had until 30 September 1995 to report their data for 1994. The main concern was the non-reporting of baseline and 1992 and 1993 data.

11. The Secretariat recalled that, at the eighth meeting of the Committee, in July 1994, it had been pointed out that a number of countries were not reporting data, and the Implementing Agencies had been requested to provide assistance in obtaining data from those countries where they were implementing country programmes. Specifically, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) had been requested to provide assistance on data-reporting in respect of Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Ghana, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Nigeria, the Philippines, Trinidad and Tobago, and Venezuela; the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) had been requested in respect of Algeria, Burkina Faso, Fiji, Guatemala, Mauritius, Panama, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic and Zambia; and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) had been requested in respect of Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Botswana, Guinea, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Seychelles, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Zimbabwe. Of those countries, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Botswana, Cuba, Ghana, Indonesia, Niger, the Philippines, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela had since reported data for 1992; Barbados, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mauritius, Niger, the Philippines, the Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela and Zimbabwe had reported for 1993; and Algeria, Burkina Faso and the Syrian Arab Republic had reported for 1994.

12. The Secretariat said that, in most cases where no data had been reported, it had heard nothing from the countries concerned. However, the Implementing Agencies were in closer contact with the countries and might be able to provide some clarification.

13. In response to the statement by the Secretariat, the representative of UNDP said that UNDP had received replies from about one half of the 19 Governments it had contacted on the question of data-reporting. Some countries had submitted data in the past, and UNDP would endeavour to find out

/...

why they were no longer doing so. In other cases, the data should be forthcoming once the country programme had been completed or the national ozone unit had been put in place.

14. The representative of UNEP said that, of the 45 Article 5 Parties that had not reported data for 1993, UNEP as an Implementing Agency was assisting 29 countries in their country programmes and institutional-strengthening activities. Other Implementing Agencies were also implementing various investment projects and assisting many of those countries. Of the 29 countries, 16 still had their country programmes and ODS survey activities ongoing, and their reporting under Article 7 was expected to be done immediately afterwards. Additionally, four of those countries had their country programme approved a month previously, and they had their data available for reporting. Of the remaining nine countries, the reasons for not reporting data could be placed into three categories: change of Government (Guatemala); administrative delays although the data was available (Senegal, Seychelles, Sudan, Swaziland and Uganda); and non-response from the Government to various reminders, although the country programme had been approved and institutional-strengthening projects were under way (Fiji, Panama and Zambia).

15. Continuing his statement, the representative of UNEP said that UNEP planned to intensify the follow-up with the countries through its institutional-strengthening and networking activities for baseline and annual data-reporting. Networking activities provided a good forum for ODS officers to discuss the problems related to data collection. He also said that the situation with reporting was improving rapidly as more institutional-strengthening projects went on stream and networking activities became more effective. As an example, he said that of the 28 Parties that had already reported data for 1994, 18 were Article 5 Parties, and the majority were members of UNEP's networks.

16. The representative of UNIDO said that his organization was not involved in institutional strengthening in any of the countries delinquent in their reporting of data. UNIDO would, however, collaborate with UNEP to urge countries to report data.

17. One member of the Committee suggested that measures were required to involve the non-reporting Parties to a greater extent in the work of the organs established under the Montreal Protocol, so that they would gain a better understanding of the need for data-reporting. Noting that the data used for the preparation of the country programme was often insufficient to continue reporting once the programme was completed, he suggested that there was a need to support the efforts of the national ozone officers through, for example, manuals and guides, since the initial collection of data was done by consultants.

18. Another member of the Committee suggested that the Secretariat should address different letters to different ministries in the countries concerned in order to make those countries take the subject more seriously.

19. The Committee:

(a) Expressed concern at the problems encountered in receiving data from a number of countries on an ongoing basis, while recognizing that the rate of reporting in relation to the overall level of consumption was, in fact, very good;

(b) Decided that the Parties should be made aware of the problem and recommended that some action should be taken to improve the reporting

/...

discipline of the Parties concerned. Such action might take the form of a decision on the eligibility for funding of Parties that had reported their baseline data but from whom no further data reports had been received;

(c) Agreed that there was a need to support the efforts of national ozone officers since the initial data collection was done by consultants;

(d) Suggested that, in view of the difficulties involved in directly approaching government authorities other than the designated focal point, correspondence from the Secretariat urging Governments to submit data should be copied to the appropriate Implementing Agencies, who could then support the appeals through their contacts in the countries concerned;

(e) Expressed the view that the widest possible participation in the Montreal Protocol processes would be helpful in increasing awareness of the need to report data.

20. One member of the Committee suggested that, rather than focusing on the formalities of data-reporting, the Committee should concern itself more with reports of dumping of obsolete technologies, the conclusion of joint venture agreements to construct CFC-production facilities in Article 5 countries and the increased production of ozone-depleting substances in certain Article 5 countries. It should request additional information from the countries concerned.

21. In response, the President said that some of the points raised were outside the remit of the Committee but that others could be addressed if specific information was provided in accordance with paragraph 1 of the non-compliance procedure.

22. The representative of UNDP said that, on the question of joint ventures, many such agreements had been signed a number of years previously, and the plants concerned were just coming on stream. The Executive Committee had, however, decided at its seventeenth meeting that it would not consider any project to convert any ODS-capacity installed after 28 July 1995.

B. Application of trade measures under Article 4 to non-Parties to the London Amendment to the Protocol (decision VI/4)

23. The Secretariat stated that, following decision VI/4 of the Sixth Meeting of the Parties, Poland, a non-Party to the London Amendment, had provided the Secretariat with data which, upon analysis, showed that it was in compliance with Articles 2A-2E of the Montreal Protocol. At the same time, Turkey, a non-Party at the time of the adoption of the decision, had since ratified the London Amendment. The Committee took note of the information provided by the Secretariat and decided that, in the light of that information, no action under this item was required on its part.

C. Corrected data on ozone-depleting substances submitted by Kuwait and Slovenia

24. The Secretariat indicated that Kuwait and Slovenia had submitted to the Secretariat corrected data for 1993 showing, contrary to their original submissions, that their per capita levels of consumption of Annex A substances were below the ceiling established in Article 5 of the Protocol. In the light of decision VI/5, by which the Sixth Meeting of the Parties decided that, in such cases, no change of classification would be permitted for the year to which the corrected data pertained and that any such corrections should

/...

be accompanied by an explanatory note to facilitate the work of the Implementation Committee, the Secretariat had advised the Parties concerned that they would not be classified under Article 5 until the matter had been considered by the Implementation Committee. The supporting documentation on the corrected data for both Parties had been circulated to the members of the Committee. The Government of Kuwait had explained that there had been a typographical error in its original submission for consumption of halons and that error had been corrected in its resubmitted data.

25. The Chief Officer of the Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol said that the data submitted by Kuwait showed a high level of exports of CFC-11 and CFC-12. There was, however, no mention of the countries of destination nor was it stated whether or not those exports were in accordance with Article 4 of the Protocol.

26. The Committee decided to instruct the Secretariat to raise the matter of the destination and form of exports of controlled substances from Kuwait with the Government and to seek a response before the Seventh Meeting of the Parties so that the request for reclassification could be considered at that Meeting.

27. The representative of Slovenia said that her country had submitted the corrected data purely for the record and was not seeking reclassification as a Party operating under Article 5 of the Protocol. She further informed the Committee that Slovenia was submitting its project to the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

28. The Secretariat noted that, in the case of Slovenia, there was a discrepancy between the data submitted to it and the data contained in the country programme submitted to the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund in 1994. The Chief Officer of the Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund said that, according to the data contained in the country programme for Slovenia, the per capita level of consumption for Slovenia was 0.43 kg, if the amounts of controlled substances exported in finished products were included in the calculation of consumption. He also recalled that, at its seventeenth meeting, in July 1995, the Executive Committee had to hold up approval of the country programme of another Party until new data were submitted to the Ozone Secretariat. He believed that it was essential to insist that the different sets of data were consistent.

29. The Committee:

(a) Noted the statement by the representative of Slovenia that her country was not seeking reclassification;

(b) Decided to instruct the Secretariat to raise the matter of the destination and form of exports of controlled substances from Slovenia with the Government and to seek a response before the Seventh Meeting of the Parties.

30. The Committee also recommended that the Secretariat should be entitled to question data reported under Article 7 if there was a constant discrepancy with the data in the country programme of the country concerned.

D. Statement by the Russian Federation on behalf of certain Parties regarding non-fulfilment of their obligations under the Montreal Protocol

31. Introducing agenda item 4 (d), the President drew attention to paragraphs 9 and 10 of the note by the Secretariat on issues before the

/...

Implementation Committee, which referred to the statement made by the representative of the Russian Federation, speaking also on behalf of Belarus, Bulgaria, Poland and Ukraine, at the eleventh meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. That statement, together with a subsequent letter from Mr. V. Chernomyrdin, Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation, addressed to the Executive Director of UNEP, constituted a submission under paragraph 4 of the non-compliance procedure. It was therefore considered that the non-compliance procedure as adopted by the Fourth Meeting of the Parties should be applied in regard of the Parties which supported the submission by the Russian Federation. The task of the Implementation Committee was to facilitate compliance and to make recommendations for consideration and decision by the Meeting of the Parties.

32. The President said that the case of the Russian Federation presented a particular problem in that the country was a major producer of controlled substances, while the other Parties were primarily consumers. In addition, the whole issue also concerned other countries, both Parties and non-Parties, in terms of their access to controlled substances, which could be important for their economies. It should also be noted that the Russian Federation was the only one of the five Parties that had not reported data. It was therefore also not in compliance with its reporting obligations under Article 7. He suggested, and the Committee agreed, that the discussion of the joint submission should first concentrate on the Russian Federation, with the cases of other four countries being considered at a later stage.

33. Before the Committee took up the substance of the submission, Mr. L. Kuijpers, Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel Ad Hoc Working Group on CEIT Aspects, introduced the draft report of the Working Group on assessment of basic problems confronting the countries with economies in transition in complying with the Montreal Protocol. Mr. Kuijpers stressed that the report concerned all the countries with economies in transition, not just the Russian Federation. The report was still in draft form and had been submitted for review and comment. After outlining the methodology used, the time-schedule for completing the work and the findings to date, Mr. Kuijpers presented possible options for dealing with CEIT issues for the consideration of the Implementation Committee. Mr. Kuijpers said that the progress toward phase-out in the Central European countries was a lesser problem; they were not so dependent on the Russian Federation as were the CIS and Baltic States. Overall, expected delays in complying with the Protocol ranged from about four years, in the case of Belarus, the Russian Federation and Ukraine, to about two years, in the case of Bulgaria and Poland, to a matter of months in the case of other Central European countries.

34. The representative of UNEP said that the UNEP Industry and Environment Programme Activity Centre had been involved in the Regional Meeting on the Montreal Protocol: Implementation in the Countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Baltic States and Mongolia, held in Minsk in August 1994, and had also completed the formulation of country studies in the three Baltic States with financial assistance from the Government of Finland. A country programme workshop had been held in Riga in November 1994 to finalize the country studies and assess the problems in the Baltic region. Since then, Latvia and Lithuania had become party to the Protocol. Thus, those activities had shown that any support activities in the CEIT could catalyse responses for early phase-out.

35. At the invitation of the President, the representative of the Russian Federation gave an account of the main problems facing his country regarding compliance with the phase-out schedule and the reporting requirements under

/...

the Protocol. He drew attention to the message dated 26 May 1995 from the Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation addressed to the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol, as well to Decree No. 566 adopted by the Government of the Russian Federation on 24 May 1995 concerning first-priority measures for the implementation of the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol. Both those texts had been circulated to the members of the Committee. Recounting the difficulties involved in collecting the necessary data in the format approved by the Parties, he said that the information concerned was spread among various agencies and that, in any event, information on imports and exports could only be estimated since until 1995 there had been no strict controls on the borders within the area covered by the former Soviet Union. It was only as a result of the adoption of Decree No. 566 that such controls would be put in place.

36. It was the feeling of the members of the Implementation Committee that they required additional information for the elaboration of a recommendation concerning the case of the Russian Federation. In the absence of additional information, no conclusion could be reached as to whether the Russian Federation had presented a comprehensive strategy for bringing about full compliance with its obligations under the Montreal Protocol.

37. Following a discussion of the issue, the representative of the Russian Federation said that his country would submit to the Secretariat by 10 October 1995 additional information on the first-priority measures, statistical data, and extracts from the State programme. He reiterated that the export and import data for years before 1994 would relate to the boundaries of the former Soviet Union and that his country would appreciate assistance in collating data from various sources. Most of the data were, however, available and would be put together in the format required under the Montreal Protocol. It should also be made clear that the Russian Federation could not take responsibility for collecting data for other countries.

38. The Committee decided:

(a) That the Decree adopted by the Government of the Russian Federation was a first step but did not provide a sufficient basis for a recommendation to the Meeting of the Parties;

(b) That the Russian Federation should supply further information, including data on production and consumption of controlled substances and a schedule for achieving compliance with the control measures under the Protocol. In that connection, it was recalled that the Russian Federation should also submit a list of recycling facilities, in accordance with the decision adopted by the Sixth Meeting of the Parties. The Committee also drew attention to the provision of Article 7 of the Protocol whereby Parties should submit best available estimates where actual data were not available;

(c) That it would consider the information to be provided by the Russian Federation at a meeting immediately prior to the Seventh Meeting of the Parties with a view to making recommendations to the Parties. Such recommendations could include, as part of the whole package of measures to respond to the problem of non-compliance, the adoption of restrictions on trade in new or recycled substances between the Russian Federation and the other non-Article 5 countries;

(d) That every possible assistance should be provided to the Russian Federation in the collection of data and that close coordination and contacts between the Russian Federation and the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on CEIT Aspects should be encouraged;

/...

(e) That, in accordance with paragraph 7 (c) of the non-compliance procedure, the Secretariat should address a communication to the appropriate authority in the Russian Federation summarizing the decisions of the Implementation Committee.

39. On the question of countries with economies in transition not party to the Protocol, the Committee decided:

(a) That such countries are subject to the trade restrictions in Article 4 of the Protocol. It also noted that any trade with those countries constitutes non-compliance by the Party concerned;

(b) That they should be made aware of that fact and be encouraged to ratify the Protocol as soon as possible or, at a minimum, submit data pursuant to Article 4, paragraph 8, of the Protocol to show that they were in compliance and hence have the possibility of importing controlled substances from Parties;

(c) That the Secretariat should contact those countries, through the appropriate channels, in order to make the situation clear.

40. The Committee also decided, in the light of the reclassification of certain countries for the purposes of UNDP development assistance, that the Secretariat, in collaboration with UNDP, should follow developments regarding the classification of Parties within the United Nations context and inform the Committee and the Meeting of the Parties of any changes that came to light. In the meantime, however, the Parties concerned would continue to be considered as Article 2 countries.

41. The Committee further decided that it would be useful to meet with the countries that received their supplies of ODS from the Russian Federation in order to exchange views on their main problems. That meeting could be arranged in conjunction with the meeting of the Committee with the representatives of Belarus, Bulgaria, Poland and Ukraine, the other countries concerned by the statement of the Russian Federation.

E. Parties operating under Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol whose country programmes have been finalized but which have not yet reported data on ODS to the Secretariat

42. The Secretariat said that, of the two countries mentioned in paragraphs 13 of it note on issues before the Committee at its tenth meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/10/2), Algeria had since reported its baseline data.

43. The Committee decided to instruct the Secretariat to write to the Government of Mauritania to inform it of decision VI/5 of the Sixth Meeting of the Parties, in accordance with which a country temporarily classified as operating under Article 5 would lose its Article 5 status if it did not report its base-year data within one year of the approval of its country programme and its institutional strengthening by the Executive Committee, unless otherwise decided by a Meeting of the Parties. The Secretariat should state in its letter that Mauritania still had until the Seventh Meeting of the Parties to submit its data and should, if necessary, seek the assistance of the relevant Implementing Agencies or other organizations to do so.

/...

G. Romania's request for transfer of production rights of substances contained in Annex A of the Protocol to Greece

44. The Secretariat summarized the discussion at the ninth meeting of the Implementation Committee on the request submitted by Romania, an Article 5 Party, for it to transfer a portion of its production rights for Annex A substances to Greece, a Party not operating under Article 5. At the conclusion of that discussion, it had been agreed that the matter would be taken up again at the current meeting. The Secretariat said that it had not been approached by Greece or Romania since the ninth meeting of the Implementation Committee. Formally, however, the matter was still before the Committee. The Secretariat further clarified that no formal permission was required for eligible countries to proceed with industrial rationalization and offered to contact the Romanian authorities to see if the proposal had been implemented. The Committee agreed that the Secretariat should contact the Romanian authorities on the matter and that it should draw attention in its communication to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 5, of the Protocol.

V. STATEMENT BY BULGARIA ON ITS PROGRAMME FOR THE PHASE-OUT OF ODS UNDER THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

45. In considering agenda item 5, the Committee had before it a statement by the Government of Bulgaria, which it had requested should be circulated among members of the GEF Council in March 1995. Since the statement related to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol, it had been brought to the attention

of the Implementation Committee (see UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/10/2, para. 20). The President said that, according to the Government of Bulgaria, the matter raised in the statement had been resolved. The Committee therefore decided that the statement called for no action on its part.

VI. OTHER MATTERS

Data on recycling submitted in accordance with Article 7 of the Protocol and information submitted under Article 9 of the Protocol

46. The representative of UNEP noted that, according to paragraphs 24 and 26 of the report of the Secretariat on the reporting of data by Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/10/3), the Secretariat had received no data under Article 7 of the Protocol on annual imports and exports of recycled halons and HCFCs and no information under Article 9 of the Protocol on research, development, public awareness, and exchange of information. He said that such information was important for the clearing-house operated by the UNEP Industry and Environment Programme Activity Centre. The non-Article 5 countries should therefore be urged to submit such information in order to share their experience with the countries operating under Article 5. The Committee agreed that that was an issue that could be taken up by the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties.

Eleventh and twelfth meetings of the Implementation Committee

47. The Committee decided:

(a) That its eleventh meeting would be held on Thursday, 31 August 1995. The purpose of the meeting would be to consult with the representatives of the other countries concerned by the statement of the Russian Federation, namely, Belarus, Bulgaria, Poland and Ukraine, as well with the representatives of the non-Parties to the Montreal Protocol from countries with economies in transition attending the twelfth meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group. The meeting would be held at the Geneva

/...

International Conference Centre in conjunction with the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group;

(b) That its twelfth meeting would be held on Monday, 27 November 1995, immediately preceding and at the same venue as the Seventh Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

VI. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

48. In accordance with past practice, the Committee entrusted the President and Rapporteur with the finalization and approval of its report.

VII. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

49. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the meeting was closed at 5 p.m. on 25 August 1995.

/...

Annex

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. Members of the Committee

**AUSTRIA**

Mr. Hugo-Maria Schally  
Office of the Legal Adviser  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs  
Ballhauspl. 1  
A-1014 Vienna  
Austria  
Tel.: (+43 1) 531 15 33 00  
Fax: (+43 1) 531 85 212

**BULGARIA**

Mr. Vanguel Tzvetkov  
Ministry of the Environment  
Gladstone Str. 67 W.  
Sofia  
Bulgaria  
Tel.: (+359 2) 87 61 51  
Fax: (+359 2) 81 05 09  
Telex: 22145 MOSBG

**BURKINA FASO**

Mr. Boubié Jérémy Bazye  
Coordonateur  
Bureau de l'Ozone  
Ministère de l'Environnement et du Tourisme  
03 BP 7044  
Ouagadougou 03  
Burkina Faso  
Tel.: (+226) 30 63 97  
Fax: (+226) 31 81 34  
Telex: 5555 SEGE GOUV

**CHILE**

Mr. Sergio Vives  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Morande 411  
Santiago  
Chile  
Tel.: 648 25 01

**JORDAN**

Mr. Hussein Shahin  
MMRAE  
P.O. Box 1799  
Amman  
Jordan  
Tel.: (+962 6) 69 56 26  
Fax: (+962 6) 69 56 27

/...

Mr. Ghazi Faleh Odat  
Assistant Director  
Department of Environment  
Head of Ozone Unit  
P.O. Box 1799  
Amman  
Jordan  
Tel.: (+962 6) 69 56 26  
Fax: (+962 6) 69 56 27

**NETHERLANDS**

Mr. Jan-Karel B. H. Kwisthout  
Ministry of Environment  
P.O. 30945  
2500 9X The Hague  
Netherlands  
Tel.: (+31 70) 339 43 77  
Fax: (+31 70) 339 12 93

**PERU**

Mr. Antonio Garcia Revilla  
Permanent Mission of Peru  
to the United Nations  
Rue de Lausanne 63  
1202 Geneva  
Switzerland  
Tel.: (+41 22) 731 11 30  
Fax: (+41 22) 731 11 68

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

Mr. Mikhail Tolkachev  
Deputy Minister  
Ministry of Protection of the Environment  
and Natural Resources  
4/6, B. Gruzinskaya St.,  
Moscow, 123812  
Russia  
Tel.: (+7 95) 252 32 70  
Fax: (+7 95) 254 82 83  
Telex: 411692 BOREI RU

Mr. Evgueni F. Outkine  
Ministry of the Protection of  
Environment and Natural Resources  
4/6, B. Gruzinskaya St.  
Moscow, 123812  
Russia  
Tel.: (+7 95) 254 48 47  
Fax: (+7 95) 254 82 83  
Telex: 411692 BOREI RU

Mr. Valeriy G. Barabanov  
RSC. Applied Chemistry  
14 Dobrolubov Av.  
197198 St. Petersburg

/...

Russia  
Tel.: (+812) 238 90 53  
Fax: (+812) 238 95 34  
Telex: GIPH AT 321250

**UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA**

Mr. Sanjo M. Mgeta  
Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources  
and Environment  
P.O. Box 72243  
Dar es Salaam  
Tanzania  
Tel.: (+255 51) 250 84 / 35501  
Fax: (+255 51) 250 84 / 23230

B. Parties to the Protocol attending at the invitation  
of the Implementation Committee

**SLOVENIA**

Ms. Janja Leban  
Chamber of Economy of Slovenia  
DIMICEVA 9  
61000 Ljubljana  
Slovenia  
Tel.: (+ 386 61) 30 11 33  
Fax: (+ 386 61) 21 83 80

C. Implementing agencies for the Financial Mechanism  
under the Montreal Protocol and Secretariat of  
the Multilateral Fund

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)**

Mr. Frank Pinto  
Chief, Montreal Protocol Unit, SEED  
Room FF-9116  
One United Nations Plaza  
New York, N.Y. 10017  
U.S.A.  
Tel.: (+1 212) 906 5042  
Fax: (+1 212) 906 6947  
E-mail: franck.pinto@undp.org

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)**

Mr. Rajendra Shende  
Coordinator, OzonAction Programme  
Industry and Environment Programme Activity Centre (IE/PAC)  
39-43, Quai Andre Citroen  
75739 Paris Cedex 15  
France  
Tel: (+33 1) 4437 1459  
Fax: (+33 1) 4437 1474

**UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL AND DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (UNIDO)**

Mr. S.I. Ahmed

/...

Vienna International Centre  
Wagramer Strasse  
P.O. Box 300  
1220 Vienna  
Austria  
Tel.: (+43 1) 211 3137 82  
Fax: (43 1) 237 386

**WORLD BANK**

Mr. Bill H. Rahill  
1818 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20433  
U.S.A.  
Tel.: (+1 202) 473 7889  
Fax: (+1 202) 522 3258

Ms. Jessica Poppele  
1818 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20433  
U.S.A.  
Tel.: (+1 202) 458 2707  
Fax: (+1 202) 522 3258  
E-mail: [jpoppel@worldbank.org](mailto:jpoppel@worldbank.org)

**MULTILATERAL FUND SECRETARIAT**

Dr. Omar E. El-Arini  
Chief Officer  
Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the  
Montreal Protocol  
1800 McGill College Ave.  
Montreal Trust Bldg., 27th Floor  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada  
Tel.: (+1 514) 282 1122  
Fax: (+1 514) 282 0068

Mr. Tony Hetherington  
Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the  
Montreal Protocol  
1800 McGill College Ave.  
Montreal Trust Bldg., 27th Floor  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada  
Tel.: (+1 514) 282 1122  
Fax: (+1 514) 282 0068

D. Assessment Panels

**AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON CEIT ISSUES OF THE TECHNOLOGY AND ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT  
PANEL**

Dr. Lambert Kuijpers  
Technical University WS-404  
P.O. Box 513  
5600 MB Eindhoven  
Netherlands  
Tel.: (+31 40) 47 24 87 / 50 37 97

/...

Fax: (+31 40) 46 66 27

Mr. László Dobó  
Ministry for Environment  
H-1011 Budapest  
Fő u. 44-50  
Hungary  
Tel.: (+361) 201 2325  
Fax: (+361) 201 3056

-----