



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



Distr.  
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/14/4  
26 August 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE UNDER THE  
NON-COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE FOR  
THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Fourteenth meeting  
Geneva, 23 August 1996

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

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The fourteenth meeting of the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol was held at the Geneva International Conference Centre on 23 August 1996.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

A. Opening of the meeting

2. The meeting was opened at 10 a.m. on Friday, 23 August 1996, by Mr. Antonio Garcia Revilla (Peru), President of the Committee.

B. Officers

3. Mr. Antonio Gracia Revilla (Peru) served as President of the Committee and Mr. Denis Langlois (Canada) as Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Committee, in accordance with the decision of the Committee at its thirteenth meeting.

C. Attendance

4. The meeting was attended by Committee members from Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Philippines, Peru, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Zambia. At the invitation of the Committee, representatives of Latvia, Lithuania and the Russian Federation also attended. In addition, the meeting was attended by Chair and Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Non-Compliance Procedures, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP). /...  
Representatives of the Implementing Agencies for the Financial Mechanism under the Montreal Protocol – the United Nations Development Programme

(UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the World Bank – and of the secretariats of the Multilateral Fund and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) were also present. The full list of participants is contained in annex I to the present report.

D. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

5. The Committee adopted the following agenda, based on the provisional agenda circulated as document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/14/1:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
3. (a) Information from Latvia, Lithuania and the Russian Federation on the issues raised by the Implementation Committee at its thirteenth meeting and the comments by the Ad Hoc Working Group of TEAP on CEIT aspects;  
  
(b) Data report for 1994.
4. Comments on the data report by the Implementing Agencies, the Fund Secretariat and the GEF Secretariat.
5. Other matters.
6. Closure of the meeting.

III. INFORMATION FROM LATVIA, LITHUANIA AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ON THE ISSUES RAISED BY THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE AT ITS THIRTEENTH MEETING AND COMMENTS BY THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP OF TEAP ON CEIT ASPECTS

6. In considering agenda item 3, the Committee had before it two notes by the Secretariat (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/14/2 and Add.1), transmitting:

(a) A letter dated 30 May 1996 from the Minister of Environmental Protection of the Republic of Lithuania (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/14/2, annex I) forwarding to the Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat additional information and explanations to the letter dated 30 January 1996, as requested by the Implementation Committee at its thirteenth meeting (see UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/13/3, para. 27 (e));

(b) A letter from the State Minister of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia forwarding to the Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat, in response to the Secretariat's request of 27 December 1995 for information pursuant to paragraph 4 of the non-compliance procedure and the requests of the Committee at its thirteenth meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/13/3, para. 26), a report on measures adopted by the Government of Latvia to phase out ozone-depleting substances and the Latvia country programme for phasing-out ozone-depleting substances (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/14/2, annex II);

/...

(c) A letter dated 28 June 1996 from the State Minister of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/14/2/Add.1, annex I) forwarding to the Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat a note regarding measures adopted by Latvia to implement the Montreal Protocol and its proposed phase-out of ozone-depleting substances by the year 2000;

(d) A letter dated 31 May 1996 from the Minister of Protection of the Environment and Natural Resources of the Russian Federation (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/14/2/Add.1, annex II) forwarding to the Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat the response of the Russian Federation to the questions raised by the Implementation Committee at its thirteenth meeting (see UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/13/3, para. 17).

#### Latvia

7. Supplementing the information already before the Committee, the representative of Latvia said that, while his country had not yet ratified the London Amendment, its commitment to promoting the goals of the Montreal Protocol was demonstrated by such important domestic measures as the recent legislation restricting the volume of imports of ozone-depleting substances (ODS) and requiring importers of such substances to obtain licences on an annual basis. In addition, a voluntary agreement on ODS phase-out had been negotiated between aerosol and refrigerator manufacturers and the Government. He assured the Committee that the dates in that schedule remained valid and conveyed his country's firm belief that, thanks to its domestic ODS-reduction initiatives, it would be able to meet the phase-out targets indicated in its submissions to the Committee. Turning to the linkage between ratification of the London Amendment and the provision of funding from GEF, he said that the situation posed difficulties for Latvia in that, as one of the measures to reduce the size of the State budget deficit, financial contributions to international organizations were to be frozen at the 1996 level for some time into the future.

8. The representative of Latvia informed the Implementation Committee that Latvia would formulate the date of ratification of the London Amendment after the revised country programme and investment projects were finalized and discussed within the Government.

9. At the request of the Secretariat, the representative of GEF clarified that, while ratification of the London Amendment was a precondition for the granting of GEF assistance, there was some procedural flexibility which enabled GEF to prepare projects based on the willingness of countries to ratify. Thus, if countries indicated the date on which they intended to ratify the London Amendment, the inclusion of that country's project into the GEF work programme would be considered, thereby accelerating the process of endorsement of the project and the subsequent disbursement of funding once the instrument of ratification was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

10. In that connection, the representative of UNEP said that UNEP was assisting Latvia with the updating of its country programme and hoped to receive Latvia's report by the end of August so that it could be submitted

/...

for GEF funding by the end of September.

11. The representative of the Secretariat stressed the need for the earliest possible ratification of the London Amendment and for the prompt reporting of data: the correctness of the format of such reports was a secondary consideration, which should not be allowed to delay reporting.

12. Following the discussion, the Implementation Committee:

(a) Noted that, according to the information provided to it by the Government of Latvia and the statements made by its representative at the fourteenth meeting of the Implementation Committee, Latvia would be in a situation of non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol in 1996;

(b) Also noted that there was a possibility of non-compliance by Latvia in 1997 so that the Implementation Committee might have to revert to that question that year;

(c) Expressed satisfaction, however, at the major efforts being made by Latvia to meet its obligations under the Protocol, even in the absence of external financial assistance for investment projects;

(d) While recognizing that ratification of the London Amendment was a prerequisite for Latvia to receive assistance from the Global Environment Facility, and the potential value of that assistance would far exceed the level of its contributions to the Multilateral Fund, which are estimated at \$143,000 for 1996, took note of the statement by the representative of Latvia that the economic situation in his country meant that Latvia was not in a position to assume the additional financial obligations that ratification of the London Amendment would require;

(e) Recommended that international funding agencies should consider favourably the provision of financial assistance to Latvia for projects to phase out ozone-depleting substances in the country;

(f) Also recommended that Latvia should be urged to ratify the London Amendment and provide immediately a timetable for the ratification process;

(g) Further recommended that the situation with regard to the ODS phase-out in Latvia should be kept under review.

#### Lithuania

13. In her statement, the representative of Lithuania drew attention to the report by her Government on ODS phase-out measures and the corresponding action plan, which had been submitted to the Secretariat on 30 January 1996, and also to additional information contained in a letter to the Secretariat, dated 30 May 1996 and circulated to members of the Committee in annex I of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/14/2. She assured the Committee of Lithuania's firm commitment to the purposes of the Montreal Protocol, as evidenced by the information contained in those documents.

14. Like Latvia, Lithuania had been impeded from ratifying the London Amendment by financial constraints, particularly regarding the need to

/...

contribute to the Multilateral Fund. While the Ministry of the Environment favoured ratification and had started preparing the relevant documents for approval, the resulting financial implications were likely to deter the Government from granting such approval.

15. Such obstacles notwithstanding, Lithuania had undertaken a number of significant domestic measures designed to reduce ODS trade and consumption. Those included conversion of the refrigeration and aerosol industries to non-chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) technologies, resulting in a total ODS consumption decrease of 382 tonnes from 1993 to 1994, a trend that had been further reflected in 1995 as a result of those measures.

16. In response to a question from one member regarding the likely scenario for controlled substance phase-out in the event that Lithuania did not receive any external assistance for its phase-out programme, she said that, as the country's major ODS users had converted to ODS substitutes and taking into account the drop in production, 80 per cent of total CFC consumption compared to the base year (1986) had been eliminated already. The main problems would be in the area of institutional strengthening and the development of regulations, standards and legislation, where progress would be difficult without external assistance. In addition, scheduled projects related to propane and butane purification, recovery and recycling and compressor plant conversion would have to be halted; other projects could be fully implemented within two or three years of their target of the year 2000. She warned, however, that the uncertain economic and political situation in the country meant that firm predictions were hard to make.

17. Finally, the representative of Lithuania drew attention to an error in her country's base-year data for methyl bromide: the consumption level should have read 55 tonnes. That correction would be submitted to the Secretariat and reflected in future data reports.

18. The Implementation Committee:

(a) Noted that, according to the information provided to it by the Government of Lithuania and the statements made by its representative at the fourteenth meeting of the Implementation Committee, Lithuania would be in a situation of non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol in 1996;

(b) Also noted that there was a possibility of non-compliance by Lithuania in 1997 so that the Implementation Committee might have to revert to that question that year:

(c) Expressed satisfaction, however, at the major efforts being made by Lithuania to meet its obligations under the Protocol, even in the absence of external financial assistance for investment projects;

(d) While recognizing that ratification of the London Amendment was a prerequisite for Lithuania to receive assistance from the Global Environment Facility, and the potential value of that assistance would far exceed the level of its contributions to the Multilateral Fund, which are estimated at \$148,000 for 1996, took note of the statement by the representative of Lithuania that the economic situation in her country meant that Lithuania was not in a position to assume the additional financial obligations that

/...

ratification of the London Amendment would require;

(e) Recommended that international funding agencies should consider favourably the provision of financial assistance to Lithuania for projects to phase out ozone-depleting substances in the country;

(f) Also recommended that Lithuania should be urged to ratify the London Amendment and provide immediately a timetable for the ratification process;

(g) Further recommended that the situation with regard to the ODS phase-out in Lithuania should be kept under review.

Russian Federation

19. The representative of the Russian Federation provided further information in response to the three questions raised at the thirteenth meeting of the Implementation Committee that, in the view of the Secretariat, had not been satisfactorily answered in the communication dated 31 May 1996 from the Minister of Protection of the Environment and Natural Resources of the Russian Federation addressed to the Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/14/2/Add.1, annex II). The questions, as contained in paragraph 17 of the report of the Implementation Committee on the work of its thirteenth meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/13/3), concerned: the reporting of its baseline consumption and production data for 1986 and 1989; the clarification of the term "required production", which had been used in the Russian submission to the Implementation Committee at its March meeting; and the provision of information on the export quantity and destination of used, recovered, recycled or reclaimed substances.

20. On the first question - the reporting of base-year data for Annex A, B and C substances - the representative of the Russian Federation said that the Russian Federation had now provided the Secretariat with data for its 1986 production and consumption of Annex A substances and its 1989 production and consumption of Annex B and C substances. Since 1990 was the first year for which firm data were available for those substances, the figures submitted to the Secretariat were best possible estimates, as provided for in Article 7 of the Protocol.

21. With regard to the requested clarification of the term "required production", the representative of the Russian Federation drew attention to letters from the Russian Federation to the Secretariat dated 9 September and 28 November 1995, justifying its basic domestic needs for ODS. The process of ODS phase-out in the Russian Federation was mainly impeded by the problem of illegal exports. To control such exports, the Government had adopted new legislative measures on ODS imports and exports through a licensing procedure (see UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/14/2/Add.1, annex II). In addition, the cross-frontier movement of ODS was being tracked by the State Customs Committee of the Russian Federation, and quarterly reports on imports and exports of ODS and products containing such substances were to be transmitted to the Secretariat from September 1996 and would include such information as the quantities of imported or exported ODS and products containing such substances; data on the type of ODS (freshly produced, recovered, recycled, reclaimed, reused, used in feedstock); and details of

/...

the supplier, recipient and conditions of delivery of the substances. At the moment, exports to Article 5 Parties amounted to only 15 per cent of the production level allowable under the Protocol to meet the basic domestic needs of those Parties.

22. On the subject of ODS recovery and recycling, he drew attention to the comprehensive list of the names and locations of ODS recycling facilities in the Russian Federation which had been submitted to the Secretariat and informed the Committee that, since recovery of CFCs and halons was only possible from major firms, those facilities were working well below capacity. Accordingly, the Russian Federation could make its recycling facilities available to developing and other countries lacking such facilities.

23. While the Russian Federation remained committed under long-standing contractual obligations to supply ODS to countries in the Commonwealth of Independent States and the Baltic countries, it was making extensive efforts to reduce exports. To that end, a licensing commission had been established under the Ministry of Protection of the Environment and Natural Resources, which ensured compliance with a prohibition on exports to non-Party countries and also considered all ODS import and export applications. The importance attached to the problem by his Government was demonstrated by the fact that all licenses had to be signed by the Minister himself.

24. With regard to additional initiatives undertaken by his country to achieve ODS phase-out in the production sector and to mobilize resources for that purpose, he said that, with the assistance of the World Bank, the Russian Federation was organizing a round-table meeting of potential donor countries and that some funding would also be provided by the Russian Federation itself, under a special government resolution to that effect to be adopted later in 1996.

25. In response to a question from one member, he clarified that the inventory of ODS stocks under preparation in his country should be completed by the end of 1996 and that preliminary information was already available. He pointed out that, since such inventories were not a Protocol requirement, the work under way in his country should be seen as a valuable initiative, which had been proposed by the Inter-Agency Commission for Protection of the Ozone Layer.

26. The representative of the Secretariat confirmed that it had received the base-year data for Annex A, B and C substances referred to by the representative of the Russian Federation (see para. 0 above) and had found them acceptable.

27. The representative of GEF recalled that, in accordance with a decision of the GEF Council, endorsement of the second tranche of the ODS phase-out project to the Russian Federation would be contingent on a satisfactory response to the questions put by the Implementation Committee at its thirteenth meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/13/3, para. 17). He stressed the need, therefore, for the Committee to signal clearly whether or not it had accepted the Russian Federation's submission, so that GEF could decide how to proceed.

/...

28. The Implementation Committee:

(a) Noted that, according to its written submission and the statements of its representative, the Russian Federation was in a situation of non-compliance with the Protocol in 1996;

(b) Agreed that the written and oral submissions of the Russian Federation satisfactorily answered all the questions that had been raised by the Committee at its thirteenth meeting and that the information provided should be considered adequate for the purposes of the present meeting;

(c) Expressed its satisfaction at the considerable progress that had been made since the Committee had entered into its dialogue with the Russian Federation under the non-compliance procedure;

(d) Decided that the situation regarding the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances should be kept under review, specifically with regard to the additional information requested of the Russian Federation in paragraph 9 (c) of decision VII/18 of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties and, in particular, the detailed information on trade in ozone-depleting substances, which the Committee has been assured by the Russian Federation would be forthcoming;

(e) Recommended that the disbursement of financial assistance for ODS phase-out in the Russian Federation should be expedited;

(f) Further recommended, however, that the disbursement of financial assistance for ODS-phase-out in the Russian Federation should continue to be contingent on further developments with regard to non-compliance and the settlement with the Implementation Committee of any problems related to the reporting requirements and the actions of the Russian Federation;

(g) Suggested that the Russian Federation should maximize the use of its recycling facilities to meet its internal needs and therefore diminish the production of new CFCs accordingly.



Other issues related to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol in the countries with economies in transition

Ad Hoc Working Group of the Technology and Assessment Panel (TEAP) on CEIT Aspects

29. The Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Working Group on CEIT Aspects of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel announced that the project funded by the European Community under which the Group had been operating would be closing shortly. The Group had prepared a draft final report, covering such aspects as the background to its establishment, the results achieved and some preliminary recommendations. The Co-Chair then distributed the draft report to the members of the Committee for comments so that it could be finalized for submission to the Eighth Meeting of the Parties. He also pointed out that, as there were representatives of countries with economies in transition on TEAP, the Panel would stand ready to assist the Committee in dealing with problems related to such countries even after the demise of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

30. The Committee expressed its gratitude to the Ad Hoc Working Group for its valuable efforts, without which the progress achieved in the countries with economies in transition would not have been possible.

Update on compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Belarus, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Russian Federation and Ukraine at the next meeting of the Implementation Committee

31. The Committee agreed that, at its next meeting, it should be provided with an update of the situation with regard to compliance by Belarus, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Russian Federation and Ukraine, the Parties that had been the subject of individual decisions on compliance since the Seventh Meeting of the Parties.

Linkage between ratification of the London Amendment and the obligation to contribute to the Multilateral Fund

32. The Committee:

(a) Took note of the fact that some countries experienced difficulties with ratification of the London Amendment and the consequent obligation to contribute to the Multilateral Fund under that instrument;

(b) Also noted that the ratification of the London Amendment is a prerequisite for the receipt of funding from the GEF for ODS-phase-out projects in eligible countries;

(c) Further noted that this matter may be considered by the Open-ended Working Group and the Meeting of the Parties.

Clarification from the Legal Counsel of the United Nations on the status of the countries of the former Soviet Union with regard to succession to the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol

33. The Implementation Committee took note of the response of the Legal

/...

Counsel of the United Nations, as reproduced in paragraph 4 of the note by the Secretariat (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/14/2), to its request for clarification on the status of the countries of the former Soviet Union with regard to succession to the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol (see UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/13/3, para. 8 (b)).

#### IV. DATA REPORT FOR 1994

34. Introducing the data report for 1994, the representative of the Secretariat explained that the information it contained was valid as of 10 June 1996. Since that date, more Parties had reported data and information, which would be incorporated in the updated report by the Secretariat to the Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. He took the opportunity to inform members of the Committee of major changes.

Thus, with reference to paragraph 4 of the report, the number of Parties that had ratified the Montreal Protocol now stood at 157, the London Amendment at 110 and the Copenhagen Amendment at 57.

35. The following Parties had reported baseline data since the preparation of the report: for 1986 (Annex A substances), Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Lesotho, Monaco and Pakistan; for 1989 (Annex B substances), Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Lesotho, Monaco, Pakistan and Russian Federation; and for 1989 (Annex C substances), Bolivia, Ethiopia, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Lesotho, Monaco, Pakistan, Russian Federation and Togo.

36. The following Parties whose country programmes had been approved by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund had complied with paragraph (a) (iii) of decision VI/5 of the Sixth Meeting of the Parties: Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Guatemala and Togo. Guinea had also reported data for 1993, 1994 and 1995 but no baseline data, while the reports of the Central African Republic and Namibia had only been received shortly before the meeting and were yet to be analysed by the Secretariat. In addition, Lesotho and Pakistan had complied with paragraph (a) (ii) of decision VI/5.

37. Since June 1996, more Parties had reported data for 1994, bringing the total to about 100 of the 141 Parties required to report. Those included Algeria, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Guinea, Israel, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lesotho, Nigeria, Pakistan and Slovenia.

38. He pointed out that the high negative totals for the reduction of production and consumption of carbon tetrachloride for some Parties had been due to an accounting error which would be rectified so that the correct figures were reflected in the next data report to the Parties.

39. Australia, Poland, Slovakia and Ukraine had provided clarifications regarding potential non-compliance with the carbon tetrachloride reduction schedule for 1994. The Secretariat had been requested by the Implementation Committee to pursue the question of non-compliance by the Czech Republic with the halons reduction schedule for 1994 and to report back to the Committee.

40. With regard to Parties that had complied with paragraph 4 of decision VI/19 of the Sixth Meeting of the Parties, he reported that several Parties

/...

had provided information on reclamation facilities and their capacities and that information was attached to the data report before the Committee. Of those Parties, only Canada and the Russian Federation had reported full information on the type of reclaimed substances, and the capacity and location of the facilities.

41. On that same question, some countries had pointed out that they had many small reclamation facilities, on which it would be difficult to report. The Secretariat suggested, accordingly, that TEAP might wish to consider a minimum size for reporting purposes.

42. The Implementation Committee:

(a) Took note with appreciation, the report of the Secretariat and the additional information provided;

(b) Noted that of the 141 Parties required to report data, some 100 had already done so;

(c) Expressed its satisfaction with the considerable improvement in the number of Parties that had fulfilled their reporting requirements;

(d) Further noted that, according to the information provided by the Secretariat:

(i) The following 32 Parties had not yet reported their baseline data for Annex A substances: Antigua and Barbuda, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, El Salvador, Federated States of Micronesia, Grenada, Guinea, Honduras, Kiribati, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Samoa, Solomon Islands, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Yemen, and Zaire;

(ii) The following 35 Parties had not yet reported their baseline data for Annex B substances: Antigua and Barbuda, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, El Salvador, Federated States of Micronesia, Gabon, Grenada, Guinea, Honduras, Kiribati, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Samoa, Solomon Islands, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Republic of Tanzania, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, and Zaire;

(iii) The following 34 Parties had not yet reported their baseline data for Annex C substances: Antigua and Barbuda, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Dominica, El Salvador, Federated States of Micronesia, Grenada, Guinea, Honduras, Indonesia, Kiribati, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Solomon Islands, The former Yugoslav Republic

/...

of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, and Zaire; and

- (iv) The following seven Parties had not yet reported their baseline data for the substance in Annex E: Austria, Belgium, Kuwait, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland, and United States of America;
- (v) In accordance with decision VI/5 of the Sixth Meeting of the Parties, the following 17 Parties temporarily classified as operating under Article 5 that had not reported their data for more than two years will lose their Article 5 status in October 1996 unless they either reported data or sought assistance from the Executive Committee and the Implementation Committee before that date: Antigua and Barbuda, Chad, Dominica, El Salvador, Grenada, Honduras, Kiribati, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Marshall Islands, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Samoa, Solomon Islands, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, and United Republic of Tanzania;
- (e) Noted that:
  - (i) In general, the data submitted for 1994 showed a reduction in the consumption of ODS by non-Article 5 Parties according to the control measures;
  - (ii) There had been a reduction of more than 80 per cent in ODS consumption among the Parties as a whole;
- (f) Expressed concern that:
  - (i) Article 5 Parties had significantly increased their production and consumption of ODS since 1986;
  - (ii) The production of HCFCs and methyl bromide had at the same time increased significantly for the Parties as a whole;
- (g) Urged all Parties to report their data promptly;
- (h) Took note of the explanation of the Secretariat that it would be very difficult to show global trends in the data report, as recommended by the Committee at its thirteenth meeting (see UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/13/, para. 32 (b)), until such time as a sufficiently large number of Parties had reported data over the same period of time: currently, the years for which data was available varied from Party to Party depending on when they had ratified the Protocol;
  - (i) With regard to the potential non-compliance of the Czech Republic with the control measures for halons (see para. 0 above), urged the Czech Republic to reply promptly to the Secretariat's request for clarification, so that the matter could be considered at the next meeting of the Committee.

43. On the question of reporting information on reclamation facilities, in

/...

accordance with paragraph 4 of decision VI/19 of the Sixth Meeting of the Parties, the Implementation Committee:

(a) Noted that, according to the information provided by the Secretariat, a few countries reported but only Canada and the Russian Federation had reported full information on the type of reclaimed substances and the capacity and location of those facilities;

(b) Recognized, however, that it might be impractical for Parties to report on very small facilities;

(c) Suggested that, in the light of subparagraphs (a) and (b) above, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel might consider the matter with a view to a recommendation on limiting this reporting requirement to plants that are above a certain minimum capacity.

#### V. COMMENTS ON THE DATA REPORT BY THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES, THE FUND SECRETARIAT AND THE GEF SECRETARIAT

44. The representative of UNEP said that UNEP had intensified its efforts to assist Article 5 countries in data-reporting in close cooperation with the Ozone Secretariat. Of the 40 countries in non-compliance at the previous meeting of the Committee, 17 had since reported Article 7 data, representing a 43 per cent improvement, and six countries that had been about to lose their Article 5 status because of non-compliance with the data-reporting requirements had been assisted in retaining it through intensive efforts by UNEP. Of the 23 countries still in non-compliance, Antigua and Barbuda, Chad, El Salvador, Gabon, Guyana, Kiribati, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Paraguay, St. Kitts, Solomon Islands and Western Samoa were receiving UNEP assistance in formulating their country programmes, in the form of consultancies and training measures. In that context, UNEP was considering instituting a system whereby the disbursement of funds for country programmes would be contingent on compliance with data reporting requirements. Bahrain, Jamaica, Lesotho, Pakistan and the United Republic of Tanzania, which were submitting their country programmes to the twentieth meeting of the Executive Committee, would receive assistance from UNEP in compiling and reporting data to the Secretariat.

45. UNEP was seeking donor assistance for recovery and recycling programmes in Bahamas and Papua New Guinea, so that they could implement their institutional-strengthening projects. Lebanon, Guinea, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe, which had just commenced their institutional-strengthening projects, were receiving guidance in fulfilling their reporting requirements and disbursement of funds would be contingent on the satisfactory submission of those reports. Finally, the institutional-strengthening project in Maldives, was currently under way. Article 7 data for 1995 had been submitted to UNEP and the Ozone Secretariat, and UNEP would advise and assist the country on its reporting requirements.

46. The representative of UNDP said that only one country, Trinidad and Tobago, was still in arrears with its data reporting for the period 1986-1989. Efforts to assist it with its country programme had been impeded by political changes in the country, but the programme should now be ready for

/...

submission to the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund. Where the 1994 data were concerned, of the three countries with reports still outstanding, one had submitted and one was about to submit; UNDP was currently investigating the situation of the third. UNDP was similarly pleased by the substantial improvement in data-reporting.

47. The representative of UNIDO said that, since the previous meeting of the Implementation Committee, his organization had contacted a number of countries and received the outstanding information from them. He was therefore surprised that the Islamic Republic of Iran was still listed among the countries which had failed to report data and he could make available copies of their submissions to UNIDO. He understood that the last outstanding country, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, had since prepared its country programme and would shortly be submitting the requisite data.

48. The representative of the Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund said that the Fund Secretariat was prepared to follow up with the Implementing Agencies to advise countries of the possible consequences of non-reporting of data on their eligibility for assistance from the Multilateral Fund.

49. The representative of the GEF secretariat said that, while GEF was not directly involved in the gathering of data, it was not aware of any arrears in data reporting by any of the countries with which it was dealing and all eligible countries could receive assistance for data collection as soon as they applied for it under the Facility.

50. The Implementation Committee:

(a) Took note with appreciation of the information provided by the representatives of the Implementing Agencies on their efforts to improve data-reporting by Parties in which they were assisting in country programme formulation, institutional strengthening, networking and project preparation and implementation;

(b) Stressed the need for more prompt reporting by countries whose programmes had been approved;

(c) Took note of a suggestion by the representative of one Implementing Agency that the Secretariat should copy reminders sent to Parties to the ozone offices of the countries concerned and to the Implementing Agencies.

## VI. OTHER MATTERS

51. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Implementation Committee would be held in San José, Costa Rica, on Monday, 18 November 1996, immediately prior to the Eighth Meeting of the Parties.

/...

VII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

52. In accordance with past practice, the Implementation Committee entrusted the Chairman and the Rapporteur with the finalization of the report on the work of its fourteenth meeting.

VIII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

53. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the President declared the fourteenth meeting of the Implementation Committee closed at 4.15 p.m. on Friday, 23 August 1996.

/...

Annex

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

**MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

AUSTRIA

Dr. Hugo M. Schally  
International Environment Affairs  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs  
Ballhausplatz 2  
A-1014 Vienna  
Tel: (43 1) 531 15 3351/3288  
Fax: (43 1) 531 85 235  
Email: Section-3@bmaa.gv.at

BULGARIA

Mr. Vanguel Tzvetkov  
Chief of department to the Ministry of the Environment  
W. Gladstone St. 67  
Sofia  
Tel: (359-2) 876151/9802083  
Fax: (359-2) 800425/810509

CANADA

Mr. Denis Langlois  
Legal Counsel  
International Environment Law  
Legal Operations Division (JLO)  
Department of Foreign Affairs and  
International Trade  
125 Promenade Sussex  
Ottawa, Ontario KIA OG2  
Tel: (1-613) 995-1135  
Fax: (1-613) 992-6483  
Email: denis.d.l.langlois@extott07.x400.gc.ca

PHILIPPINES

Ms. Elvira L. Salvani/Senior Env'tl. Management Specialist  
Department of Environment and Natural Resources  
Environmental Management Bureau  
Topaz Bldg., 99-101 Kamias Road  
Quezon City,  
Tel: (63-2) 928-3675/928-3773  
Fax: (63-2) 924-7540

Ms Monina Estrella G. Callangan  
Third Secretary  
Philippine Mission to the United Nations  
Office of Other International Organizations in Geneva  
47, Avenue Blanc  
Geneva, Switzerland  
Tel: (41-22) 731-8320/731-8329

/...



## PERU

Mr. Antonio Garcia Revilla  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Lampa 545  
Lima 1  
Tel: (51 1) 4273860  
Fax: (51 1) 4885751

Mr. Carlos Alvarez Ponce de Leon  
Environment Division  
Ministry of Foreign  
Affairs  
Lampa 545  
Lima 1  
Fax: (51 1) 4285751  
Email: dmaol@rree.gob.pe

## SRI LANKA

Dr. Janaka Ratnasiri  
Coordinator, Montreal Protocol Unit  
Ministry of Environment  
P.O. Box 1583  
Unity Plaza, 6th Floor  
Colombo 4  
Tel: (94 1) 592927  
Fax: (94 1) 592927/502566  
Email: janakar@minenv.lanka.net

## UKRAINE

Dr. Vladimir Demkin  
Ministry for Environmental Protection and Nuclear Safety  
5 Khreshchatyk St.  
Kiev 1  
Tel: (38 44) 2280786  
Fax: (38 44) 2298050/8383  
Email: demkin@mep.freenet.kiev.ua

## UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

Mr. Sanjo M. Mgeta  
Division of Environment  
Vice-President's Office  
P.O. Box 72243  
Dar-es-Salaam  
Tel: (255 51) 114373/28464  
Fax: (255 51) 113082/23230

## URUGUAY

Mr. Luis Santos  
Ministry of Environment  
Zabala 1440  
Montevideo  
Tel: (59 82) 961899  
Fax: (59 82) 961895

/...

ZAMBIA

Mr. Wilson Ndhlovu  
Natural Resources Department  
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 50042  
Lusaka  
Tel/Fax: (260 1) 238427  
Fax/Fax: (260 1) 252952

**PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL PARTICIPATING  
AT THE INVITATION OF THE COMMITTEE**

LITHUANIA

Marija Feriosina  
Environmental Protection Ministry  
Juoyapaviciaus 9  
2600 Vilnius  
Tel: (370 2) 722509  
Fax: (370 2) 728020

LATVIA

Mr. Armands Plate  
Ministry of Environmental Protection  
and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia  
Peldu Ielu 25  
LV-1494 Riga  
Tel: (371 7) 026509  
Fax: (371 7) 820442  
Email: vilis@varam.gov.lv

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mr. Vladimir Zimianin  
Senior Counsellor  
Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation  
with the Office of the United Nations in Geneva  
Avenue de la Paix 15  
Case postale 1211 Geneva 20  
Tel: (41 22) 7331870  
Fax: (41 22) 7344044

Mr. Alexandre A. Solovianov  
Deputy Minister  
Ministry of Protection of the Environment and Natural  
Resources of the Russian Federation  
Kedrova St. 8, Building 1  
117874 Moscow  
Tel: (7 95) 1255282  
Fax: (7 95) 1245551/2548283

Mr. Vasily N. Tselikov  
Investment Manager  
GEF ODS Phase-out Project Unit  
Centre for Preparation and Implementation of International  
Projects on Technical Assistance  
5th floor, 36 Obrutelieva Str. 117342  
Moscow  
Tel: (7 95) 2805788/9711172  
Fax: (7 95) 9710423/3342933

/...

Mr. Evgueni F. Outkine  
IAC Executive Secretary, Head of Bilateral  
Cooperation and International Programmes Branch  
Ministry of Protection of the Environment and  
Natural Resources of the Russian Federation  
4/6, B. Gruzinskaya, GSP, Moscow, 123812  
Tel: (7 95) 2544847  
Fax: (7 95) 2548283

Mr. Valeriy G. Barabanov  
Chief of Laboratory  
Russian Scientific Centre "Applied Chemistry"  
14, Dobrolyubov Ave., 197198,  
St. Petersburg, Russia  
Tel: (7 812) 2389053, 2389368  
Fax: (7 812) 2389534, 2388989

#### UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES

##### A. Implementing Agencies and the Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund

###### UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)

Mr. Frank Pinto  
Principal Technical Adviser and Chief, Montreal Protocol  
Montreal Protocol Unit  
EAP/SEED/UNDP  
Room FF-9116, 304 East 45th Street  
New York, NY 10017  
Tel: (1 212) 906 5042  
Fax: (1 212) 906 6947  
Email: frank.pinto@undp.org

###### UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)

Ms. Gladys Hernandez  
Programme Officer  
OzonAction Programme  
Industry and Environment Centre  
Tour Mirabeau  
39-43 Quai André Citroën  
75739 Paris Cedex 15  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 44371454  
Fax: (33 1) 44371474  
Email: ghernandez@unep.fr

###### UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (UNIDO)

Mr. Menad Siahmed  
United Nations Industrial Development Organization  
Industrial Sector and Environment Division  
Vienna International Centre  
A-1400 Vienna  
Austria  
Tel: (43 1) 21131/3782/3654  
Fax: (43 1) 21131/6804

/...

WORLD BANK

Mr. Bill Rahill  
1818 H Street, N.W. Room S-2019  
Washington D.C. 20433  
USA  
Tel: (1 202) 4737289  
Fax: (1 202) 5223258  
Email: brahill@worldbank.org

MULTILATERAL FUND SECRETARIAT

Mr. Lang Shengshuo  
Deputy Chief Officer  
Multilateral Fund Secretariat  
1800 McGill College Avenue  
Montreal  
Quebec  
Canada  
Tel: (1 202) 458 5044  
Fax: (1 202) 522 3240/3245

B. Other

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

Mr. Frank Rittner  
Global Environment Facility (GEF) Secretariat  
1818 H Street  
Washington D.C. 20433  
USA  
Tel: (1 202) 458 5044  
Fax: (1 202) 522 3240/3245  
Email: frittner@worldbank.org

**ASSESSMENT PANELS**

**CO-CHAIRS OF THE TEAP AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON CEIT ASPECTS**

Dr. Lambert Kuijpers  
Technical University WS404  
P.O. Box 513  
NL-5600 MB Eindhoven  
Netherlands  
Tel: (31 40) 250 3797/247 2487  
Fax: (31 40) 246 6627

Mr. Laszlo Dobo  
Consultant to the Ministry for Environment and Regional Policy  
H-1011 Budapest  
Fö u. 44-50  
Hungary  
Tel: (361) 457 3565  
Fax: (361) 201 3056

-----