



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.: General  
17 July 2006

Original: English



**Ozone Secretariat Workshop  
on the IPCC/TEAP Special Report**  
Montreal, 7 July 2006

**Report of the Ozone Secretariat Workshop on the IPCC/TEAP  
Special Report**

**Introduction**

1. The Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) developed in 2005 a special report on protecting the ozone layer and the global climate system (the Special Report) as requested by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).
2. At its twenty-fifth meeting, the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol requested TEAP to prepare a supplementary report explaining clearly the ozone depletion implications of the issues raised in the Special Report.
3. The Seventeenth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol considered the TEAP supplementary report and adopted decision XVII/19. In accordance with that decision, the Ozone Secretariat convened an experts' workshop on the IPCC/TEAP special report on 7 July 2006 at the headquarters of the International Civil Aviation Organization in Montreal, Canada, immediately after the twenty-sixth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.
4. Paragraphs 1 and 3 of decision XVII/19 specified the objectives of the workshop as follows:
  - "1. To request the Ozone Secretariat to organize an experts workshop in the margins of the twenty-sixth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group in 2006, to consider issues as described in paragraph 3 of the present decision, arising from the special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's supplementary report;"
  - "3. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to present a summary of the reports at the workshop and that experts then produce a list of practical measures relating to ozone depletion that arise from the reports, indicating their associated ozone-depleting substances cost effectiveness and taking into account the full costs of such measures. The list should also contain information on other environmental benefits, including those relating to climate change, that would result from these measures;"

K0652286 250806

5. The agenda of the workshop was as follows:
  1. Opening of the workshop
  2. Presentations on the IPCC/TEAP Special Report on Safeguarding the Ozone Layer and the Global Climate System and the supplemental report thereto prepared by TEAP for consideration by the Seventeenth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.
  3. Development of a list of practical measures relating to ozone depletion arising from the report.
  4. Consideration of the ozone-depleting substances cost effectiveness of measures arising from the report, taking into account their full costs and the other environmental benefits that would result from those measures, including those related to climate change.
  5. Conclusions and closure of the workshop.
  
6. The workshop was attended by 201 experts from the following 117 Parties : Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, European Community, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines , Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & Grenadines, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe
  
7. Representatives of TEAP also attended the workshop as advisors. Representatives of the following United Nations entities, organizations and specialized agencies attended the workshop as resource persons: United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, World Bank, Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol and the Scientific Assessment Panel.
  
8. A full list of participants is contained in annex II to the present report.
  
9. The workshop was chaired by Ms. Marcia Levaggi (Argentina).

## **I. Opening of the Workshop**

### **A. Statement by the Executive Secretary**

10. The workshop was opened by Mr. Marco Gonzalez, Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat, who recalled the meeting's mandate as set out in decision XVII/19. Observing that decision XVII/19 had been carefully negotiated and drafted by the Parties in Dakar, he expressed the hope that the workshop participants would not spend time on questions of interpretation of the wording in the decision. He thanked six Parties that had provided written inputs for the list of measures, namely, El Salvador, the European Community, Guyana, Mexico, the United States of America and Uganda, and noted that a compilation of those inputs had been circulated the day before the workshop at the twenty-sixth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. He also thanked the TEAP Co-Chairs and members for their hard work on the reports and their advice and service during the workshop.

## B. Statement by the Chair

11. The Chair thanked the participants and made some remarks on the agenda and organization of work. She noted that agenda items 3 and 4 would be taken up together on the basis of the list of submitted measures distributed by the Secretariat. She also reminded the participants that the task of producing a list of practical measures had to be completed in just one day, which meant that work would have to proceed with utmost efficiency.

## III. Presentations on the IPCC/TEAP Special Report on Safeguarding the Ozone Layer and the Global Climate System and the supplemental report thereto prepared by TEAP for consideration by the Seventeenth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (agenda item 2)

### A. Presentation on the IPCC-TEAP Special Report

12. At the invitation of the Chair of the Workshop, TEAP Co-Chair Mr. Lambert Kuijpers provided a summary of the IPCC/TEAP Special Report.

13. Mr. Kuijpers began with an overview of past and present atmospheric concentrations of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and of trends in halocarbon emissions into the atmosphere, and then went on to examine sources of emissions, explaining the importance of banks. He stated that a significant portion of CFC, HCFC and HFC emissions came from their respective banks and noted that the amount of HFCs and HCFCs in banks was increasing, while the amount of CFCs in banks was decreasing. He also pointed out that there were no control obligations under the Montreal Protocol or the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to restrict CFC and HCFC emissions. He specified that, although the foam bank was larger, it accounted for a smaller proportion of emissions because foams released greenhouse gases at a relatively slower and lower rate than did refrigeration equipment. Refrigerant banks, though smaller than foam banks, accounted for a larger proportion of emissions due to the greater probability of leakage from refrigeration equipment.

14. Following a description of the development of banks and emissions by sector and by substance group, Mr. Kuijpers presented projections of future emission reduction trends. Under a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario, it was estimated that CFC emissions would diminish by about 80 per cent in 2015 when compared to 2002 (on the basis of carbon dioxide equivalents). The primary reason for that reduction would be the phase-out of CFC-containing equipment. Under a mitigation scenario, in which best practices were assumed for use, recovery and destruction globally, the estimated reduction would be increased to about 86 per cent in 2015, compared to 2002. Meanwhile, HCFC emissions in 2015 were forecast to be at least double the CFC emissions in 2015 under the BAU scenario. In that light, Parties might wish to consider how, under the Montreal Protocol, HCFC mitigation measures could reduce emissions. Early HCFC production controls would certainly also contribute.

15. He noted that the Special Report had identified a number of options for achieving a significant reduction in CFC and HCFC emissions by 2015: containment (i.e., reduced, low leakage); recovery, recycling and destruction; and use of not-in-kind technologies or substitutes, with a preference for those with low global warming potential (GWP). To the extent possible, those options had been analyzed using life-cycle climate performance and life-cycle assessment methods.

16. In terms of the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from ozone-depleting substance replacements, the Special Report covered the refrigeration and air conditioning sector, foams, medical aerosol products, fire protection, non-medical aerosol products, solvents and HFC-23 by-product emissions. The gases covered by the Special Report were CFCs, HCFCs and halons, as well as those HFCs and perfluorocarbons (PFCs) replacing ozone-depleting substances, with the emphasis on the latter. The Special Report did not cover HFCs and PFCs in applications not replacing ozone-depleting substances, or methyl bromide.

17. Conversion to low GWP alternatives had arisen as a principal measure for reducing the climate impact of emissions for all applications in the refrigeration and air conditioning sector, i.e., domestic refrigeration, vending and beverage dispensing, commercial refrigeration, food processing and large refrigeration systems, transport refrigeration, stationary air conditioning and heat pumps and mobile air

conditioning. Early replacement of old equipment with more energy -efficient models, recovery of refrigerants at service and at end of life, reduction of refrigerant charges and reduction of refrigerant leakage were further emission-reducing measures highlighted in the Special Report.

18. In the foam sector, greenhouse gas emissions from ozone-depleting substance replacement could be reduced through the adoption of life cycle climate performance analysis for selecting among insulation types (leading to a preference towards hydrocarbon foams in many applications) and through recovery of blowing agents at end of life. In the medical aerosol product sector, a complete transition from CFC to HFC metered-dose inhalers and a subsequent transition from HFC metered-dose inhalers to dry powder inhalers or to some other not -in-kind alternative not dependent on propellants was the way forward to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Emissions from the fire protection sector could be reduced by using agents with no impact on climate change, to the extent possible, and by managing banks of all fire-protection materials carefully and responsibly. Finally, the application of low GWP compounds satisfying environmental health and safety criteria and the application of improved containment systems were measures that could be used to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the solvent sector.

19. With respect to current and future supply of ozone-depleting substance replacements, the Special Report identified the Montreal Protocol as the major driver for HFC and PFC demand, as it had been instrumental in introducing a variety of CFC replacements. Consequently, CFC emissions had fallen significantly over the 1990–2000 period, while HCFC and HFC emissions had grown. Demand for HCFC was expected to grow significantly during the 2002-2015 period, particularly in Article 5 countries. Furthermore, the existing CFC bank was still more than one million tonnes and constituted a significant source of potential future emissions. By-product emissions of HFC-23 were also expected to rise globally by 60 per cent by 2015 under a BAU scenario.

20. The Special Report estimated total direct emissions at about 2.5 GT<sup>1</sup> of carbon dioxide equivalents per year, which was similar to the estimate based on atmospheric measurements. Chemical-specific observations, however, indicated higher emissions than the calculated estimates for individual substances from banks, particularly for CFC-11, HCFC-141b and HCFC-142b. With respect to emission estimates, the Special Report set forth qualitatively sound conclusions, but a great deal more work beyond the scope of the Special Report would be required to provide accurate quantitative conclusions, in particular for the above-mentioned chemicals.

## **B. Presentation on the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's Supplementary Report**

21. Following Mr. Kuijpers's presentation on the Special Report, Mr. Paul Ashford made a presentation on the TEAP supplementary report on ozone-related aspects of the issues raised in the Special Report. In doing so, he also cited a number of other relevant reports.

22. Mr. Ashford's presentation drew on five primary sources. The first source was the supplementary report itself, which had been presented at the Seventeenth Meeting of the Parties. That report, which had focused on the ozone-related aspects of the information in the IPCC/TEAP Special Report, did not examine the possible impact of future ozone-depleting substance consumption measures, but rather looked at the ozone-related impacts of the list of proposed emission reduction measures set out in the IPCC/TEAP report. It therefore did not look at all of the possible measures available under the Montreal Protocol for reducing ozone-depleting substance emissions. Nonetheless, it did consider ozone-depleting substance emission reductions (expressed in ODP-tonnes) under both a business-as-usual scenario and a mitigation scenario. While the emission reductions for those substances were expected to be significant between 2002 and 2015, there was not a big difference between reductions predicted for 2015 under the two scenarios. Emissions from foams were expected to be small in relation to the quantity of blowing agent in the banks. In contrast, the ozone layer impact of emissions of halons used in fire protection was expected to be significant, partially due to the high ozone-depleting potential of the halons in question. Emissions of refrigerants would also be significant in the period from 2002 to 2015 but would experience significant reductions over that period as the base of CFC-containing equipment dwindled, which would lead to a reduction in emissions from approximately 150,000 ODP-tonnes in 2002 to less than 50,000 ODP-tonnes in 2015. The supplementary report also presented the data on anticipated emission reductions by type of ozone-depleting substance. In addition, it addressed the differences between the Special Report and the

---

<sup>1</sup> GT = 10<sup>9</sup> tonnes (one thousand million tonnes)

Scientific Assessment Panel's report with regard to the methodologies used to establish emission projections and to predict dates for ozone-layer recovery.

23. In considering this issue further, Mr. Ashford noted that the Scientific Assessment Panel Report, published in 2003, had made ozone-depleting substance emission projections based on atmospheric concentrations. This had led to an assessment of ozone hole recovery in 2044. However, the assessment of banks established by the bottom-up method in the supplementary report indicated a later recovery, in 2046–2048, with the possibility of recovery two years earlier if banks were managed carefully. Although discrepancies remained between the bank estimates derived from atmospheric concentrations and those derived by bottom-up methods, the Scientific Assessment Panel had elected to adopt the IPCC/TEAP Report bank estimates as its starting point for the 2006 science assessment currently in progress. Work was continuing on issues such as the impact of uncertainties in atmospheric lifetimes as well as in mixing ratios and other transport phenomena. Mr. Ashford noted that these factors had been covered in recent papers scheduled for publication by members of the Scientific Assessment Panel and that the Task Force on Emission Discrepancies (following Decision XVII/19) would also be addressing those sensitivities. Finally, it was noted that transport phenomena into the lower Antarctic stratosphere were at present assumed to be slower than originally thought (the age of air in the lower stratosphere being older than elsewhere), leading to the observation that the ozone hole (in the 1980's) started at lower concentrations than expected and recovery will also occur at lower concentrations than originally thought. By association, (delayed) emissions from banks could remain significant factors in the recovery of the Antarctic ozone hole.

24. For its part, the TEAP HCFC Task Force Report of 2003 had addressed the production and consumption of HCFCs and their ozone implications and had briefly mentioned climate change implications, including those associated with HFC -23 production (and emissions) as a by-product of HCFC-22 production. It predicted an increase in the demand for HCFCs to between 350,000 and 400,000 tonnes in 2015, but those predictions were being adjusted to values in the 500,000–600,000 tonnes range, and, in some quarters, to more than 700,000 tonnes. The demand was expected to be mainly for HCFC-22 in stationary air conditioning and refrigeration applications. There would be continuing use of HCFC-141b in polyurethane foams and solvent uses, however, as well as growth in HCFC-142b use for extruded polystyrene board applications. In summary, the main demand-driving sectors in countries operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol would be air conditioning, commercial refrigeration and foams.

25. According to the 2005 TEAP Foams End-of-Life Report, which dealt primarily with ozone-depleting substances, emissions could be reduced through blowing agent recovery from appliances. That practice was widespread in Japan and the European Community and its technical feasibility had been demonstrated. Its cost-effectiveness had also been verified and, although more costly than other forms of emission mitigation, it was clearly commercially practical. With regard to foams in buildings, emissions over the 2002–2015 period were particularly low because emissions from those foams were only released significantly when the buildings containing them were demolished – a process likely only to take place after 2015. The economics of building insulation foam recovery were still being examined in an attempt to evaluate opportunities for that activity.

26. Finally, the report of the Meeting of Experts on the Collection and Disposal of non-reusable and unwanted ozone-depleting substances in Article 5 countries (Collection and Disposal Workshop), held in March 2006, had also focused on banks and on emission issues. The report of that workshop assessed the “specific effort” required to collect and dispose of various ozone-depleting substances. Refrigerants were given a low “specific effort” rating if they were localized and concentrated and a medium rating if they were widely dispersed. A similar rule applied to halons, with the additional factor of size in fixed systems. Since foam blowing agents were more difficult to extract, they were given a medium “specific effort” rating even if they were localized, and a high “specific effort” rating if they were dispersed. This classification had made it possible for Multilateral Fund efforts to focus on low “specific effort” recovery projects. Mr. Ashford further explained that the Ozone Secretariat had used the term “practicality” to prepare examples within the blank tables circulated to Parties in order to solicit proposals for the list. TEAP, however, had prepared summary tables on the submissions and had decided, based on the successful experience of the Collection and Disposal Workshop, to change the term “practicality” to “specific effort” in the heading of the summary tables to facilitate the discussions at the current workshop. Similarly, the term “cost effectiveness” had been converted to “cost” to overcome some confusion with submissions.

### **III. Development of a list of practical measures relating to ozone depletion arising from the report (agenda item 3) and consideration of the ozone-depleting substances cost effectiveness of such measures, taking into account their full costs and the other environmental benefits that would result from those measures, including those related to climate change (agenda item 4)**

27. Following a presentation by TEAP, at the invitation of the Chair, a representative of the Secretariat explained that the list of measures distributed prior to the meeting was a compilation of all the Parties' submissions, exactly as received by the Secretariat, based on the framework tables, with examples, that had been prepared by the Secretariat to facilitate the Workshop. With the help of TEAP the submitted proposals had been categorized by use sector and sorted into groups of duplicated or otherwise similar measures such as those related to recovery of ozone-depleting substances in refrigerators, conversion/retirement of equipment, leakage reduction, and so on. A total of 64 submitted proposals under the seven use sectors of ozone depleting substances had thus been categorized into 31 distinct measures. She noted that TEAP had carried out further work to produce summary tables for each sector, listing distinct measures and summarizing relevant information such as on cost effectiveness, practicality, and environmental benefits that were contained in the submissions.

28. At the request of the Chair, the TEAP representatives, Mr. Paul Ashford, Mr. Lambert Kuijpers and Mr. Daniel Verdonik, presented by way of example the two summary tables for the domestic refrigeration sector. The first table showed which Parties had made submissions against the five identified measures in the domestic refrigeration sector. The second summary table was a list of the five distinct measures, accompanied by information on ozone-depleting substance relevance, significance, degree of effort, cost and environmental benefit in terms of climate change and other environmental aspects. The TEAP representative described the logic and method used in summarizing the submissions. It was explained that some of the submissions actually formed relevant steps or parts of identifiable measures but did not represent measures in their own right. References were made to the relevant parts of the Special Report as necessary to make the links between the submissions, measures and relevant information within the Special Report.

29. A short general discussion ensued regarding how the workshop participants should proceed with the task of listing the practical measures as required by decision XVII/19.

30. One participant commented that some of the practical measures submitted by the Parties were not consistent with the requirement that they should "arise from" the IPCC/TEAP Special Report and TEAP Supplement Report even though they might be excellent, practical ideas for domestic implementation. Another participant said that the workshop should not reject such submissions since they were all valuable and inspired by the reports; he suggested that the workshop should focus on distinct measures arising from summaries of submissions prepared by TEAP and their relevance in terms of ozone-depleting substance reduction and practicality. Another participant emphasized that the important objective was to consider all relevant measures that might mitigate emissions of ozone-depleting substances and that the phrase "arise from" did not necessarily mean "specifically stated in the report". Rather, a non-restrictive understanding of the meaning of "arise from" would be desirable. A few participants also stated that some of the submitted proposals, not strictly arising from the reports, were of key concern especially to Article 5 countries. Hence they should be retained on the list but possibly with an appropriate identifier that they were not expressly mentioned in the reports. A number of participants suggested creating two lists; one with measures arising from the reports and another with measures that were not specifically mentioned in the reports but were inspired by them.

31. One participant commented that International Standards Organization standards such as the ISO 9000 and 14000 series should be taken into consideration under the various measures being considered. Those standards would help ensure responsible manufacture and handling of refrigerators through end of life including destruction, recovery and recycling, from both quality and environmental management perspectives.

32. At the suggestion of the Chair, there was consensus that the TEAP summary tables for the other sectors should be presented and that working groups should then be established to examine the issues in more detail. It was agreed that the working groups would use the TEAP summary tables as the basis for the discussion to produce the final lists of measures for the workshop report and to use the long list of submissions distributed earlier as a reference. It was also agreed that the headings in the TEAP

summary tables should be changed to be consistent with the original submissions and that the original list would be annexed to the final report of the workshop.

33. The TEAP representatives then proceeded to present the respective summary tables for commercial refrigeration, transport refrigeration, stationary air conditioning, mobile air conditioning, foams and fire protection.

34. Following the presentation, two working groups were established. Group I was chaired by an expert from Brazil, Mr. Paulo Azevedo, and dealt with four sectors: domestic refrigeration, commercial refrigeration, transport refrigeration and stationary air-conditioning and heat pumps. Group II was chaired by an expert from Denmark, Mr. Mikkel Sorensen, and dealt with three sectors: mobile air conditioning, foams and fire protection.

35. The Chair of each group reported in Plenary on the outcome of the groups' deliberations. Each group presented final lists of distinct measures and associated information for each of the sectors. Furthermore each group reported that the full compilation of the submissions by the Parties had also been discussed and a few, mostly editorial, changes had been made. The workshop participants agreed on the list of practical measures set out in the summary tables below. The compilation of the submissions, as corrected, is also attached to the present report as annex I.

**Table 1: Domestic refrigeration**

		<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance (ODP-tonnes)</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effective</i>	<i>Env benefits (GWP)</i>	<i>Env considerations (Other)</i>
1	Recover ODS @ E-o-L	Yes	107k	M/H	M/H	H	Steel recycling option
			340k	L/M	L/M	H	
2	Conversion/Early retirement	Yes	L	M/H	M/H	L	Energy efficiency
3	Leakage reduction (New/existing equipment)	Yes	L	L/M	L/M	L	None
4	Phase-out of ODS in new equipment	Yes	L	M/H	M/H	M	None
			L	M/H	M/H	L	
5	Elimination of ODS "flushing"	Yes	Unkn	M/H	Unkn	Unkn	None

L=low; M=medium; H=high; E-o-L=end of life; Unkn=unknown

**Table 2: Commercial refrigeration**

		<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance (ODP-tonnes)</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effective</i>	<i>Env benefits (GWP)</i>	<i>Env considerations (Other)</i>
6	Leakage reduction (existing equipment)	Yes	70k/yr	L/M/H	M/Variable	M/H	Energy efficiency
7	Early retirement (revolving fund)	Yes	M	M/H	M/H	M/H	Energy efficiency
8	Earlier phase-out of HCFCs (new equipment)	Yes	H	M/H	Variable	Depends on replacement	Energy efficiency
9	Reduced charge by using indirect systems	Yes	H	M	M	L/M	Variable
9a	Reduced charge by other means	Yes	H	M	M	L/M	Variable
10	Recover ODS in different types of commercial refrigeration equipment @ E-o-L	Yes	M/H	M	Variable	M/H	Steel recycling option
10a	Elimination of ODS 'flushing'	Yes	Unkn	M/H	Unkn	Unkn	None

L=low; M=medium; H=high; E-o-L=end of life; Unkn=unknown

**Table 3: Transport refrigeration**

		<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance (ODP tonnes)</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effective</i>	<i>Env benefits (GWP)</i>	<i>Env considerations (Other)</i>
11	Reduce leakage from existing equipment	Yes	M	M/H	M/H	L/M	Energy efficiency
12	Encourage move from [CFCs and] HCFCs	Yes	L	H	H	L/M	Energy efficiency

L=low; M=medium; H=high; E-o-L=end of life; Unkn=unknown

**Table 4: Stationary air conditioning and heat pumps**

		<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance (ODP tonnes)</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effective</i>	<i>Env benefits (GWP)</i>	<i>Env considerations (Other)</i>
13	Reduction of charge size	Yes	H	L /M	Unk	M/H	Energy Efficiency
14	Recovery & recycling at E-o-L	Yes	M/H	M	M	M/H	Steel recycling option
15	Reduce leakage rates (existing equipment)	Yes	M/H	M/H	M/H	M/H	None
16	Early retirement (revolving fund)	Yes	M	M	M	M	Energy efficiency
17	Earlier phase-out of HCFC (new equipment)	Yes	H	H	M	Variable	Energy efficiency

L=low; M=medium; H=high; E-o-L=end of life; Unkn=unknown

**Table 5: Mobile air conditioning (MAC)**

		<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance (ODP tonnes)</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effective</i>	<i>Env benefits (GWP)</i>	<i>Env considerations (Other)</i>
18	Recovery at service and at E-o-L	Yes	Variable	M/H	M/H	M/H	Energy efficiency
19	Improved technological containment	Yes	M/H	M/H	M/H	M/H	Energy efficiency
20	Standard practices for service emission	Yes	M/H	M	M/H	M	Energy efficiency
21	Earlier phase-out of MAC CFCs by import bans	Yes	L/M	M	M/H	M	Fuel efficiency & lower emissions

L=low; M=medium; H=high; E-o-L=end of life; Unkn=unknown



**Table 6: Foams**

		<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance (ODP tonnes)</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effective</i>	<i>Env Benefits (GWP)</i>	<i>Env Considerations (Other)</i>
22	Steel faced panels E-o-L treatment	Yes	350k 11k	M/H	M	M/H	Steel recycling option
23	Restrict ODS in One Component Foam	Yes	Low	M/H	Uncert	M/H	Energy efficiency
24	Earlier phase-out of HCFCs	Yes	Variable	L/M	Variable	M	Energy efficiency
25	Reduce 1 <sup>st</sup> yr emissions	Yes	L/M	Variable	Variable	M	Energy efficiency
26	Building design improvements	Yes	L/M	M/H	Variable	Variable	Steel recycling option
27	Extend E-o-L treatment to all appliances	Yes	460k 23k	M/H	M	M/H	Steel recycling option

L=low; M=medium; H=high; E-o-L=end of life; Unkn=unknown

**Table 7: Fire protection**

		<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance (ODP tonnes)</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effective</i>	<i>Env benefits (GWP)</i>	<i>Env considerations (Other)</i>
28	Limited emissions from all banks	Yes	H	M/H	M/H	L/M	None
29	Early transition in fixed systems	Yes	M/H	L	M	L	None
30	Early transition in portables	Yes	L	M/H	M/H	L	None
31	Proper E-o-L management for all halocarbon containing extinguishers	Yes	H	M/H	M/H	L	None

L=low; M=medium; H=high; E-o-L=end of life; Unk=unknown

36. During the Group I deliberations, one participant stated that comprehensive life-cycle management of refrigerants could significantly reduce unnecessary emissions and improve efficiency of equipment across all refrigeration and air conditioning sub-sectors. A variety of approaches could be considered including application of responsible use practices, “no venting” and recycling regulations, recovery equipment optimization, service technician training, deposit/rebate programmes, and destruction incentives.

37. Another participant commented on conversion of in-use domestic appliances, saying that conversion from CFC-12 to HFC-134a was technically and economically questionable, while conversion to hydrocarbon blend was technically easy, often resulting in energy efficiency gains, and was also cost effective under Article 5 countries’ conditions (low handling costs). He further commented that conversion or early retirement of equipment could reduce leakages and emissions before end-of-life of equipment, thus resulting in more efficient refrigerant management. Another participant stated that the comment regarding conversion of domestic appliances to hydrocarbon refrigerants was an opinion and that such conversion might not be practical or legal in some countries such as the United States of America.

38. Following the reports from the Chairs of the working groups, participants made general comments on the Workshop’s deliberations and outcome. Several participants thought that the workshop resulted in a very useful exchange of views and experiences on the various measures. It was also clear that the situation, needs and constraints in different countries meant that measures and their relevance and feasibility would vary from country to country as well. It was suggested that further inputs to the list of measures could be requested from other Parties before the Eighteenth Meeting of the Parties in an attempt to make the list of measures even more comprehensive. Another participant emphasized that as the agreed list of measures was the final product of the Workshop, it should not be

subject to change; instead, the list should be presented to the Eighteenth Meeting of the Parties for further consideration. Any future actions were for the Meeting of the Parties to decide.

39. Another participant said that the time had come to stop talking and to start implementing the measures, which had now been clearly identified in the agreed list of measures. Another participant stated that creative ideas had come forth in the workshop and that clear linkages between ozone-depleting substances and climate change existed. While estimates of future production and emissions of HCFCs were staggering, implementation of some of the measures would greatly help to reduce HCFCs not only for ozone benefits but also in terms of significant reductions in carbon equivalent emissions. She appealed for urgent action to reduce the impacts of climate change.

#### **IV. Closure of the workshop**

40. The workshop was adjourned at 4.46 p.m.

## Annex I

## Compilation of the submitted list of measures arising from the IPCC/TEAP Special Report

<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
<b>Domestic refrigeration</b>							
Recover ODS contained in domestic refrigerators and freezers at end of life.  [SROC §4.2.8 pp 237]	Yes – Banks of both CFCs & HCFCs are present in domestic appliances.	High – Banks of ODS in appliances as refrigerants were estimated at 107,000 tonnes and as blowing agents at 320,000 tonnes in 2002.	Low/Medium/High effort – Several approaches have been demonstrated globally. Refrigerant is generally easier to recapture than blowing agent. Most easily practiced around large conurbations. Collection from remote regions is challenging.	Low/Medium – Costs vary according to approach, with refrigerant recovery being the easiest. Any blowing agent removal will be medium cost. Processing a refrigerator will typically cost \$10–15 per unit although this includes an offset for the re-sale of other recycled components (e.g., steel).	High - CFC-11 and CFC-12 have significant GWP and volumes of both refrigerant and blowing agent are also substantial. A deliberate strategy to isolate appliances in the waste stream also assists other recycling programmes. Care needs to be taken to monitor the impact of transportation logistics.	Example Uganda	1
Recover ODS contained in domestic refrigerators and freezers at end of life.	Yes – Banks of both CFCs & HCFCs are present in domestic appliances.	High – in 2002 banks of ODS in appliances as refrigerants were estimated at 107,000 ODP-tonnes, which represented about 1/3 of the whole refrigeration sector (totalled 336,000 ODP-tonnes in 2002).	Low/Medium/High effort - Several approaches have been demonstrated globally. Refrigerant is generally easier to recapture than blowing agent. Most easily practiced around large conurbations. Collection from remote regions is challenging. In some Parties there is already a mandatory requirement to recover electronic equipment, e.g., in EU (the WEEE directive).	Low/Medium – Costs vary according to approach, with refrigerant recovery being the easiest. Any blowing agent removal will be medium cost. Processing a refrigerator will typically cost \$10–15 per unit although this includes an offset for the re-sale of other recycled components (e.g., steel).	High - CFC-11 and CFC-12 have significant GWP and volumes of both refrigerant and blowing agent are also substantial. A deliberate strategy to isolate appliances in the waste stream also assists other recycling programmes. Care needs to be taken to monitor the impact of transportation logistics.	EC	1
Designate a warehouse where the general public can lodge their old refrigerators and freezers. The	Yes – even trainee technicians can recover CFC gases.	High – it represents another closure to the use of CFCs	Medium/High – Finding a suitable place to maintain and secure can prove difficult.	High – costs of transporting the equipment to the facility may be the responsibility of the owner, which can discourage contributions.	High – this form of “clean-up campaign” can raise public awareness of the Montreal Protocol’s objectives.	Guyana	1

(\*) This column refers to explanation included in paragraph 27 of this report.

<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
refrigerants could be extracted and recycled.							
Recover ODS contained in domestic refrigerators and freezers at end of life.  [SROC §4.2.8 p 237]	Yes – Banks of CFCs, HCFCs, and HFCs are present in domestic refrigerators (in refrigerant and foam). (Table 4.1 p 232)	High – Banks of CFC refrigerants from appliances were estimated at 107,000 tonnes in 2002, which represents 19% of total CFC banks and 4% of total refrigerant banks; banks of CFC blowing agents in appliances are also large (discussed below). To prevent emissions of these banks, end-of-life recovery is critical, since it is at appliance disposal stage when ODS foam blowing agent and the remaining refrigerant charge (typically 50%) can be released. (Table 4.1 p 232)	Medium - Several approaches have been demonstrated globally. Refrigerant is easier to recapture than blowing agent. Most easily practiced around population centers. Collection from remote regions is challenging.	Low – Costs vary according to approach. SROC notes that the small refrigerant charge size of domestic appliances makes recovery uneconomical. Any blowing agent removal will be high/medium cost and will require significant manual labor (p 343). Although recovery of blowing agent may reach 250-325g per unit, the cost of recapture and destruction at \$30-60 per kg of blowing agent make it uneconomical but not prohibitive (pg 343). However, the recovery of refrigerant and foams provides an opportunity for the recovery/recycling of other materials as well (e.g., aluminum, steel), which may offset these costs.	High - CFC-11 and CFC-12 have significant GWP and the volumes of both refrigerant and blowing agent contained in old equipment still in use are substantial. Isolating appliances in the waste stream can also assist other recycling programs. Impact of transportation in reclaiming or destroying the refrigerant and foams, as well as recycling of other refrigerator components, should be accounted for.	USA	1
Recover blowing agents from refrigeration equipment at end of life.	Yes – Emissions of both CFC-11 and HCFC-141b as well as HFC-134a can be prevented by such measures.	Medium/Large – Current estimates of blowing agent banks in products within this sector are approx. 350,000-450,000 tonnes of CFC-11 and 100,000 – 150,000 tonnes of HCFC-141b.	Medium/High effort – Technologies are well established for recovery of foams from domestic appliances. However, geographic spread will make some units difficult to reach.	Medium - Any blowing agent removal will be medium cost. Processing a refrigerator will typically cost \$10-15 per unit, although this includes an offset for the re-sale of other recycled components (e.g., steel).	High - CFC-11 has a significant GWP. A deliberate strategy to isolate appliances in the waste stream also assists other recycling programmes. Care needs to be taken to monitor the impact of transportation logistics. If early retirement of appliances is considered, there could be additional energy efficiency benefits.	EC	1
Situation of rigid foam used for	Since 2001, refrigeration	This change was highly significant, since it solved	Rigid foams, be it for the refrigeration sector or other	The cost effectiveness of manufacturing cfc-free foams is	Since 2000, there are few atmospheric emissions of	El Salvador	1

<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
refrigerator insulation systems and other insulation systems	insulation systems have been retrofitted; the blowing agent was changed from CFC-11, which has an ODP of 1.00, to HCFC-141, with an ODP of 0.05 or less, thus providing 80% control of the ODP. There is the added possibility that the HFC family will yield a blowing agent that will not harm the ozone layer.	the problem of cfc blowing agents by using non-CFC blowing agents.	sectors, no longer use CFC-11 blowing agents; 100% retrofitting has taken place and technicians have managed to handle this technology very well.	very low, since the process uses a blowing agent that does not harm the ozone layer, giving a very low, almost zero, conversion rate.	CFC as a blowing agent or cleaning agent for refrigerators in El Salvador, because the sector has been virtually 100% retrofitted.		
Manufacture refrigerators using HFC-134 as refrigerant and HCFC-141 as blowing agent; in Article 5 countries, technology retrofitting has taken place in factories. Use nitrogen as a cleaning agent for refrigerators, first replacing CFC-11, then replacing HCFC-141.	There is a bank of HFC-134a refrigerators in Article 5 and non-Article 5 countries in a number of factories with retrofitted technology.	By looking at the import statistics of several countries, it can be observed that quantities of HFC-134a have increased over the last 5 years from less than 10 metric tonnes to over 220 metric tonnes, making it necessary to take this strategy into account, since there will be more HFC-134a than CFC-12 by the end of 2010.	It is easier to acquire a new refrigerator with HFC-134a, since that is the market alternative. There is already a batch of these in each country, with a new blowing agent and refrigerant. How long can recycled CFC-12 be used? Until after 2010?	The cost effectiveness of manufacturing a new refrigerator would be the same or lower than with the former technology, since the cost of investment would be multiplied by an ODP factor of 0.00.	The odp factor of CFC-12 is 1.0, compared to zero for HFC-134a; the GWP of CFC-12 is 7000 to 8000 times greater than the GWP of HFC-134a, which is between 2000 and 4000, which implies that reducing CFC-12 and replacing it with HFC-134a would reduce the impact on the ozone layer and lessen climate change.  The same would occur by replacing CFC-11 with HCFC-141, since the ozone depleting potential would be reduced from 0.055 to 0.00.	El Salvador	2 A nd 5
Recover ODS contained in domestic	Yes, CFC and HFC banks are present in domestic	High.-in fact, it has been calculated that, worldwide, there are 107,000 tonnes of	It has been demonstrated that CFC recapture is more practicable than cleaning	Cost effectiveness comes in at the time of manufacturing the refrigerator, as it is applied to	Impact on the environment, preservation of the ozone layer, and climate change, of	El Salvador	2

<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
refrigerators and freezers during useful life.	refrigerators.	CFC and 320,000 tonnes of CFC. How long will these quantities last for all countries?	agent recovery. It is impossible or very difficult to recover the blowing agent.	recovered CFC.	course, because the recovery-recycling of CFC increases benefits for the environment		
Create a revolving fund to finance the change of old equipment for new refrigerators.	High.- With this measure the recovery of CFC and HCFC will be increased exponentially.	High.- The recovery of refrigerant gas in combination with the destruction of old equipment will reduce the necessity of CFC as refrigerant.	High.- with this revolving fund with low interest rate, the financing of new equipment will increase year by year.	Low.- The cost of recovery of refrigerant is variable, but on the other hand it represents a benefit to the recoverer. Also, destruction of some components of refrigerators is an additional benefit. The financial mechanism should include a fee for destruction of the refrigerant gas and the foam recovered.	Creation of a recovery culture, and recovery of HFCs, with a high global warming impact	Mexico	2
Fund establishment of equipment destruction programme through a recovery fee, preceded by a seed fund to initiate the programme.	High.- With this measure the ozone depletion problem will be completely eliminated, at least with respect to CFCs.	High.- With the destruction of CFCs the problem of managing recovered CFCs is reduced to a minimum.	Medium- The difficulty is to implement a fee for establishing the destruction programme.	Medium.- The owners of old equipment should pay for the destruction. This could be an disincentive to the programme.		Mexico	2
Stress leak control and recovery of HFC-134a and CFC-12 in refrigerator maintenance.	The relevance is that we would end up with a demand for a smaller quantity of both CFC-12 and HFC-134a for domestic refrigerator maintenance.	After 2010, it is more likely that there will be more HFC-134a than recycled CFC-12 and LPG available. In the medium term, CFC-12 refrigerators will tend to disappear, since recycled refrigerant will be scarcer.	How effective will the CFC-12 recovery and recycling process be, compared to the quantity of HFC-134a, after 2010, to guarantee that CFC-12 needs are met?	The cost-effectiveness of manufacturing CFC-12 domestic refrigerators is \$10–\$15 per kilogram; which is the same as for HFC-134a refrigerators, compared to LPG refrigerators, which will be less than \$1.00 per kilogram, since they will use the same parts as CFC-12 refrigerators.	The flammability of LPG and cyclopentane blowing agent refrigerators imply that countries will have to increase safety standards in servicing workshops.	El Salvador	3
Reduce leakage of refrigerant from new and in-use units.	Yes – But only where ODS are permissible as refrigerants and are still being used.	Low – Charge sizes and leak rates are low; CFC emissions from appliances were estimated at 8,000	Low – Leak rates from new and existing equipment are already low. Moreover, reducing leak rates in millions	Low- The cost to inspect and service existing refrigerators in millions of homes is substantial. (p 235)	Low – Reductions in emissions of both ODS (which have significant GWP) and HFC-134a—however	USA	3

<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
[SROC §4.2.6 p 235]	New equipment uses HFC-134a or HC-600a, but many units still in use rely on CFC-12. (p 231)	tonnes in 2002, representing only 1.6% of total refrigerant emissions, much of which may have been emitted at end of life, not during use. (Table 4.1 p 232)	of in-use refrigerators would require home owners to have their units serviced to ensure minimum leakage, even if the equipment seems to be operating well (p 237)		small—will have a positive impact on climate change.		
Use liquid blends of propane-butane (LPG) in refrigerators.	Relevant, since there will be a shift to manufacturing refrigerators without R-12 or R-134, 100% ozone-layer and climate friendly.	R-12 refrigerators are retrofitted directly to LPG without major changes to their systems.				El Salvador	4
Require conversion of in-use domestic appliances to non-ODS alternatives or require retirement or replacement of units when servicing is required.  [SROC §4.2.5 p 234-235]	Yes – A significant number of appliances still in use rely on CFCs. (p 235)	Low – Replacement of CFC-12 units can lead to significant emission reductions <i>if</i> the refrigerant is recovered and properly destroyed. In-use leakage rates from domestic refrigeration equipment do not tend to be high.	Low – SROC notes that the limited capital resources in developing countries leads to labor-intensive servicing of units compared to retirement/replacement with new non-ODS units (p 235)	Low - Developing countries may not have the resources to purchase new units. Moreover, the technical feasibility of retrofitting CFC-12 units to HFC-134a is questionable (material incompatibility and decreased appliance functioning) and the costs of such retrofits are unknown.	Low/Medium - There will be an increased number of units entering the waste stream that will need to be properly recycled to achieve environmental benefits (p 235). However, if all waste refrigerant, foam, and other materials are properly recycled/destroyed, ODS and GHG benefits may be significant. Replacement units will use HFC-134a which has a high GWP, or HC-600a. (p 231). However, energy efficiency gains (refrigerators may be 3x more efficient) may significantly reduce greenhouse emissions.	USA	2
Reduce availability of CFC-11 & CFC-12 dependent refrigerators &	Yes – There will be less need for the use of virgin CFCs in case of leakage and		Medium effort – assists in the transition rate to cleaner technologies.	Low/medium – replacement refrigerant gases reduce the profit margin of technicians.	High – reduction in CFC-11 & 12 technologies will reduce GWP.	Guyana	4

<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
freezers on the market.	repairs.				Assists in maintaining compliance.		
Promote environment friendly refrigerators & freezers that do not require CFCs.	Zero use of ODS in Refrigeration sector	High – It represents another closure to the use of CFCs.	Replacement & new technologies	Medium/high – reduced consumer costs	High – Shows advancement of technology for countries.	Guyana	4
<b>Commercial refrigeration (includes retail food equipment, food processing/cold storage, industrial refrigeration)</b>							
Reduce leakage of refrigerant from existing systems.  [SROC §4.3.6 – pp243]	Yes – but only where HCFCs are permissible as refrigerants	High – Use phase emissions from commercial refrigeration systems can represent up to 60% of total lifetime emissions.	Low/Medium – Some measures are related to changes in practice, although others will require some investment.	Medium – Refrigerant emission abatement measures have a cost range of \$20-280 per tCO <sub>2</sub> -eq.	Medium/High – Leakage reduction measures will have benefits for all refrigerants and in particular for those with high GWP.	Example Uganda	6
Reduce leakage of refrigerant from existing systems.	Yes – but only where HCFCs are permissible as refrigerants	High – Use phase emissions from commercial refrigeration systems can represent up to 60% of total lifetime emissions.	Low/Medium – Some measures are related to changes in practice, although others will require some investment.	Medium – Refrigerant emission abatement measures have a cost range of \$20-280 per tCO <sub>2</sub> -eq.	Medium/High – Leakage reduction measures will have benefits for all refrigerants and in particular for those with high GWP.	EC	6
Reduce leakage of refrigerant from existing systems.  [SROC §4.3.6 – pp243]	Yes – Many types of commercial refrigeration equipment containing ODS have high leakage rates. (pp 240-241)	High – Commercial refrigeration comprises 40% of total global annual refrigerant emissions. Specifically, in 2002, commercial and industrial refrigeration equipment was responsible for 43% of global CFC refrigerant emissions (62,000 out of 144,000 tonnes/yr) and 56% of HCFC refrigerant emissions (131,000 out of 236,000 tonnes/yr). (Table 4.1 p 232)	Medium/High – Technician training, increased frequency and comprehensiveness of leak inspection activities and investment in leak detection technologies/repair materials will be required. However, costs borne by equipment owners will be offset by refrigerant cost savings. Industry efforts and government regulations may also be required. (p 243)	Variable – Refrigerant emission abatement measures have a cost range of \$10-300 per tCO <sub>2</sub> -eq (p 245). Overall, for certain systems cost-effectiveness will be high and for those where technical barriers are significant, cost effectiveness will be low.	High – Leakage reduction measures will have high benefits, particularly for equipment with high-ODP/GWP refrigerant. In addition, leak reduction may improve system efficiency, resulting in lower indirect emissions associated with energy consumption, as well as improve product (e.g., food) quality. (pp 245-247)	USA	6



<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
Create a revolving fund to finance the change of old equipment for new refrigerators	High.- With this measure the recovery of CFC and HCFC will be increased exponentially.	High.- The recovery of refrigerant gas in combination with the destruction of old equipment will reduce the necessity of CFCs as refrigerant.	High.- with a revolving fund with a low interest rate, the financing of new equipment will be increased year by year.	Low.- The cost of recovery of refrigerant is variable, but on the other hand it represents a benefit to the recoverer, and destruction of some components of refrigerators will yield an additional benefit. The financial mechanism should include a fee for destruction of the refrigerant gas and the foam recovered.	Creation of a recovery culture, and also some HFCs will be recovered, with a high impact on the reduction of global warming.	Mexico	7
Use ammonia & HCFCs in commercial operations	Yes – until the phase out of the HCFCs begin	Medium – due to number of applications	Medium/high – New investments will install new technologies.	High – low maintenance & operational expenses	Medium/high – reduced ODS emissions & GWP gases	Guyana	8
Early transition to non-HCFC alternatives	Yes – HCFCs are still widely used in commercial refrigeration outside Europe.	High – The use of HCFCs is expected to be substantial in developing countries before phase-out in 2040. Earlier transition to alternative technology will greatly diminish future stocks and HCFC emissions.	High – Stand-alone equipment is the dominant form of commercial refrigeration in developing countries. HFC equipment is used already and its use is expected to increase in the future. Other technologies, (e.g., HCs and CO <sub>2</sub> ) are being evaluated.	Low/medium – Alternative technologies are more expensive than ODS technology right now but further development is expected to reduce the cost.	High – HCFCs have a high GWP and reducing their emissions will have a positive effect on the climate change. The total impact depends, however, on alternative technologies chosen. There should be careful consideration of maximizing energy efficiency and choosing refrigerants with a low GWP value.	EC	8
Earlier phase-out of HCFCs in new equipment.  [SROC §4.3.3.1 p 241]	Yes – The majority of new commercial refrigeration equipment produced outside of Europe and U.S. contains HCFCs.	High – Future HCFC consumption in new commercial refrigeration equipment is expected to be substantial before phase-out in developing countries in 2040. By phasing out new HCFC equipment early, future stocks and subsequent emissions of	High – Stand-alone equipment is the dominant form of commercial refrigeration in developing countries. HFC stand-alone equipment is available on the market and HC and CO <sub>2</sub> technologies are being evaluated. (pp 239, 241-242)	Medium/High - The capital costs of equipment using alternatives is greater than that containing ODS; however, an earlier phase-out could create new market forces, effectively reducing the cost premium. (p 244)	Medium/High - Care needs to be given to selecting alternatives that maximize energy efficiency. Where high GWP refrigerants are used, actions to minimize leakage and maximize end-of-life recovery are important to prevent direct emissions of GHGs. New energy-efficient	USA	8

<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
		HCFCs will be greatly curtailed—as will the servicing demand for that equipment.			equipment can reduce energy consumption by 10-20% (p 243).		
Reduce charge size by promoting the use of indirect commercial refrigeration systems.  [SROC §4.3.4.2.2 p 242]	Yes – Where CFCs or HCFCs are permissible as refrigerants in new equipment  The use of indirect systems can limit the charge size and leak rates of HFC systems (thereby lowering GHG emissions). (Table 4.11 p 246)	High – Indirect systems can reduce refrigerant charge by up to 90% and bring annual leakage rates down to about 5% (from about ≥ 15%). Moreover, these systems can rely on primary refrigerants with low or zero ODP/GWP. (Table 4.11 p 246, p 245)	Medium - Indirect systems have not significantly penetrated the market yet, except in some European countries. They entail higher capital and operating costs. (pp 242, 244)	Medium – the capital costs associated with an indirect system may be 10-25% higher than the costs of a direct system, with annual energy costs being about 10% more. (p 244, Table 4.11 p 246)	Low/Medium – Care is needed in selecting alternatives that have low GWP and/or minimize emissions. Where natural refrigerants (i.e., CO <sub>2</sub> , HCs, or ammonia) are used, safety measures are needed to minimize leakage and limit human and environmental health risks. Care is needed to design and operate indirect systems to negate or minimize energy efficiency penalties, which were seen in early designs, and to ensure that total equivalent warming impact of refrigerant plus energy is reduced.	USA	9
Recover ODS contained in stand-alone equipment at end of life	Yes – Banks of both CFCs & HCFCs are present in domestic appliances.	Low/Medium – Banks of ODS in stand-alone equipment as refrigerants were probably already below 40,000 tonnes in 2002. There is no specific data on banks of ODS blowing agents, although it is estimated that total banks in “other appliances” (which also includes water heaters) amounted to 48,000 tonnes.	Low/Medium/High effort - Several approaches have been demonstrated globally. Refrigerant is generally easier to recover than blowing agent. Recovery is most easily practiced around large conurbations. Collection from remote regions is challenging. Size variation in stand-alone equipment may also work against mechanized recovery of blowing agent.	Low/Medium – Costs vary according to approach with refrigerant recovery being the easiest. Any blowing agent removal will be medium cost. Processing a refrigerator will be above that for domestic refrigerators because of size variations. Again net costs will include an offset for the re-sale of other recycled components (e.g., steel).	Medium - CFC-11 and CFC-12 have significant GWP and volumes of both refrigerant and blowing agent are also substantial. A deliberate strategy to isolate appliances in the waste stream also assists other recycling programmes. Care needs to be taken to monitor the impact of transportation logistics.	EC	10
Recover ODS contained in	Yes – Banks of CFCs and HCFCs are	High – A significant amount of ODS refrigerant	Medium – Many countries have adopted recovery	Variable – Will depend mostly on the economic value of the	High – If recovery at end of life is performed on all	USA	10

<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
commercial refrigeration equipment at end of life.  [SROC §4.4.5 p 249]	present in commercial refrigeration equipment. (Table 4.1 p 232)	is banked in commercial equipment, much of which will be intact at time of equipment disposal. Existing banks of CFC refrigerants in 2002 in commercial and industrial refrigeration were estimated at 221,000 tonnes, representing 39% of total CFC banks (8% of total refrigerant banks); HCFC banks were estimated at 458,000 tonnes, representing 30% of HCFC banks (17% of total refrigerant banks). Recovery at end of life is critical to avoiding venting much of the bank. (Table 4.1 p 232)	vacuum requirements of 0.3 or 0.6 atm, resulting in a recovery rate of 92–97% of total refrigerant charge—if in fact recovery is practiced, and practiced properly. Ensuring compliance with recovery laws is difficult unless economic incentives support such activities. Additionally, adequate infrastructure is also required (e.g., recovery equipment, reclamation facilities). (p 249)	refrigerant recovered. For higher-valued refrigerants, recovery of large banks at end of life and reuse or reselling will be cost-effective. Additionally, recovered refrigerants may be used in other systems after chemical production has ceased, thereby allowing existing equipment to be replaced when it makes economic sense. Added costs would need to be considered for destruction.	equipment, HFCs will be recovered and reclaimed/destroyed, as well as ODS. This will ensure that GHG emissions are avoided. (p 249)		
Use HCFC and HFC in commercial refrigeration equipment, such as certain refrigerators, cold rooms, freezers, as an alternative, since, by including the two groups of refrigerants, HCFC and HFC, all refrigeration systems are covered, from the	Both for HCFC and HFC, there is no reduction control until 2015–2016, which is why these refrigerants will be used for refrigeration technology in the medium term; during this time, HCFC will gradually be replaced by HFC.	Countries' dependency on refrigerants for refrigerators and blowing agents is moving toward both hfc and HCFC; since the ODP of HCFC is 0.055 to 0.01; since the ODP of HFC is zero, it represents 20 times less damage than CFC.	The practicality of using HFC, as with HCFC, tells us that the servicing workshops that handle these refrigerants will have to be highly technical, but we have 10 years in which to train technicians and certify them in order to have workshops with the required capacity by 2015.	Cost-effectiveness cannot be calculated yet, since the refrigerator retrofitting step still gives enough time to train and certify refrigeration technicians and build the capacity of servicing workshops.	By dominating the refrigeration system market with HCFC and HFC, with maintenance technicians and equipment conversion to these systems, we guarantee HCFC with an ODP of 0.05 to 0.01 and HFC with an ODP of zero, virtually solving the problem of protecting the ozone layer, and a GWP lower than 4000, for both HFC and HCFC, will leave us with the goal of fine-tuning technology that will create zero global warming damage by the mid-	El Salvador	10

<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
near future through to 2040, and as we will not reach the ceiling (basic level of HCFC) until 2016, availability is guaranteed.					21st Century or before using simple chemical refrigerants, such as CO <sub>2</sub> , NH <sub>3</sub> and others.		
<b>Transport refrigeration</b>							
Reduce leakage rates of existing equipment, particularly in larger vessels.	Yes – CFCs and HCFCs are used.	Medium – Virtually all of the 35,000 plus merchant ships worldwide larger than 500 gross tonnes have on-board refrigeration systems, the majority of which use HCFC-22 as refrigerant. Estimates of annual leakage rates are 15–20% of the system charge (2/3 of the systems are direct systems with up to 5 tonnes of refrigerant per system).	Medium – The likelihood of leaks is greater due to vibrations, sudden shocks, risk of collisions with other objects, etc. Frequent leak checks and repairs will be needed.	Medium – For larger vessels early detection and repair of leaks may be cost effective as it saves refrigerants used and ensures better functioning of refrigeration equipment.	Medium – Reducing HCFC-22 emissions will also help mitigate climate change.	EC	11
Reduce leakage rates from existing equipment.  [SROC §4.6.1 p 256]	Yes – CFCs, HCFCs, and HFCs are in use. (p 256)	Medium – Leakage from this equipment represents a relatively low percentage of overall refrigeration/AC emissions. In 2002, refrigerant emissions from transport refrigeration represented less than 1% of CFC emissions (1,000 out of 144,000 tonnes/yr), less than 1% of HCFC emissions (1,000 out of 236,000 tonnes/yr) and only 3% of HFC emissions (3,000 out of 100,000	Low/Medium – Equipment is more susceptible to vibrations, sudden shocks and other incidents that may cause equipment to leak more than stationary equipment. Frequent leak inspection and/or repair activities will be required. Industry efforts and government regulations may also be required. (p 256)	Low/Medium – Emissions from this end use do not represent a significant share of sector emissions (with most applications having small charge sizes). However, for the larger applications with higher leakage rates, time and money spent on repairing leaks and applying leak control technologies may be cost-effective.	Low/Medium – Direct GHG emissions from this end use are a significant contributor to the climate impact of transport refrigeration; however, emissions from the transport refrigeration end-use are very low relative to other end uses.	USA	11

<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
		tonnes/yr).  However, some transport applications have particularly high leakage rates. Specifically, refrigerated transport vehicles and fishing vessels are estimated to leak 15-20% of system charge annually. Road transport units and refrigerated railway transport leak even more—about 20-25% annually. Therefore, targeted leak reduction may be worthwhile. (p 256-257)					
Encourage transition away from HCFCs.  [SROC §4.6.1 p 256]	Yes – HCFCs are still widely used in sea transport & fishing and some intermodal transport. HFCs are often used as alternative refrigerants in other sectors such as road and rail transport. (Table 4.15 p 260)	Low – Banks of HCFCs in this end use were estimated at 4,000 tonnes (only 1% of total 2002 bank). However, 25% of total banks in transport refrigeration in 2002 were HCFCs. For new equipment in many transport refrigeration sub-sectors, the transition away from HCFCs is almost complete. (Table 4.15 p 260)	High – This sector has almost entirely transitioned away from ODS; hence, remaining phase-out would be relatively easy to implement. (pp 257–259)	Low – Most new equipment already contains non-ODS refrigerants; thus, alternative technologies are already competing strongly in the market.	Low/Medium – Where natural refrigerants (i.e., CO <sub>2</sub> , HCs, or ammonia) are used to lower GWP and climate impact, safety measures must be taken to minimize leakage and limit potential human and environmental health risks. In addition, energy efficiency must be taken into account when selecting alternatives; increased energy requirements of alternatives may increase GHG emissions from fuel usage.	USA	12
<b>Stationary air conditioning and heat pumps</b>							
Reduce charge size.  [SROC §5.1.2 p 273]	Yes – ODS are still widely used in stationary equipment. 90% of unitary air conditioners	High – Reducing equipment charge size will translate into reduced leakage of refrigerant from future stationary A/C	Low/Medium – Charge sizes, particularly in domestic A/C, are already quite low. Furthermore, in most cases for unitary equipment, energy	Unknown	Medium/High – Reducing charge size may also help limit emissions of high-GWP refrigerants. Banks of HFCs in stationary A/C in 2002	USA	13

<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
[SROC §5.2.3.1 p 283]	produced use HCFC-22. HFCs are also used in some new equipment. (p 271)	equipment. Because the use of stationary A/C equipment is so widespread, and because charge sizes can be high, the environmental impact of such a change would be significant. In 2002, refrigerant contained in stationary A/C equipment represented 15% of total CFC refrigerant banks (84,000 tonnes) and 68% of total HCFC refrigerant banks (1,028,000 tonnes). Reducing charge size would lower future banks compared to business as usual. (Table 4.1 p 232)	efficiency is achieved with the use of larger heat exchangers requiring more refrigerant. However, additional R&D may provide an opportunity to reduce the charges of large equipment such as chillers and may provide ways to reduce unitary equipment charge sizes without reducing energy efficiency. (pp 273, 283-284)		were estimated at 81,000 tonnes, which represented 16% of total HFC banks (3% of total refrigerant banks). Therefore, reducing charge size would lower HFC banks in future, compared to a business as usual scenario. (Table 4.1 p 232)		
Recover refrigerant at end of life.	Yes – Banks of ODS are substantial and will otherwise reach the waste stream until all ODS-containing equipment is decommissioned.	Medium/High – In 2002 the banks of HCFCs in A/C equipment were estimated to be in excess of 1 million tonnes. For CFCs the figure is approximately 84,000 tonnes.	Low/Medium/High effort - Several approaches have been demonstrated globally. Refrigerant is generally easier to recover than blowing agent and is most easily practiced around large conurbations. Collection from remote regions is challenging. Size variation in A/C equipment may also work against mechanized recovery of blowing agent.	Medium – Amounts of refrigerant per unit are relatively large, particularly for chillers. However, manual recovery is necessary and the geographic location of some units may make recovery challenging. Specific abatement costs dealing with existing banks can range from 3 to 170 US\$ Mt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq.	Medium /High - CFC-12 and HCFC-22 have significant GWP. Bearing in mind the quantities involved, the impact on greenhouse gas emissions could be substantial.	EC	14
Proper recovery and recycling of refrigerant at equipment end of life.	Yes – For equipment using CFCs, HCFCs, and HFCs.	High – Given the large number of unitary units in use, and the high charge size for some other equipment types (e.g., chillers), refrigerant	Medium – Recovery and reuse of refrigerant is economical from large equipment, although potentially not for smaller systems. Industry standards and/or government	Medium – Technician training and infrastructure will require expenditures. Regulations and industry standards will need to be established. (p 275)	High - For equipment using HFCs, refrigerant recovery will reduce direct emissions of GHGs.	USA	14

<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
[SROC §5.1.3.1 pp 274-275]		emissions prevented at disposal can be significant. (pp 273, 275)	incentives or regulations may be required, as well as increased technician training and infrastructure (e.g., recovery equipment, reclamation facilities). Ensuring recovery from small equipment where it is not economical may be difficult, even if regulations are in place. (p 275)				
Reduce leakage rates from existing stationary A/C equipment.  [SROC §5.2.3.1 – pp283]	Yes – HCFC-22 is still in widespread use within unitary air conditioners. CFCs are also still in use in 50% of large-scale centrifugal chillers globally.	Medium/High – As with commercial refrigeration, leakage from A/C equipment can represent a substantial proportion of life-time impact. In 2002, the banks of HCFCs in A/C equipment were estimated to be in excess of 1 million tonnes. For CFCs the figure is approximately 84,000 tonnes. Reduction in leakage will not change the size of the banks but will change the demand for servicing.	Low/Medium effort – Measures would include the introduction and enforcement of improved maintenance practices. Because of the amounts available in larger equipment, on-site recycling can be encouraged.	Low/Medium – Costs should be limited to training inputs and minor expenditure in other engineered leakage reduction measures.	Medium /High - CFC-12 and HCFC-22 have significant GWP. Bearing in mind the quantities involved, the impact on greenhouse gas emissions could be substantial.	Example Uganda	15

<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
Reduce leakage rates from existing stationary A/C equipment.	Yes – HCFC-22 still in widespread use within unitary air conditioners. CFCs also still in use in 50% of large scale centrifugal chillers globally.	Medium/High – As with commercial refrigeration, leakage from A/C equipment can represent a substantial proportion of life-time impact. In 2002 the banks of HCFCs in A/C equipment were estimated to be in excess of 1 million tonnes. For CFCs the figure is approximately 84,000 tonnes. Reduction in leakage will not change the size of the banks but will change the demand for servicing.	Low/Medium effort – Measures would include the introduction and enforcement of improved maintenance practices. Because of the amounts available in larger equipment, on-site recycling can be encouraged.	Low/Medium – Costs should be limited to training inputs and minor expenditure in other engineered leakage reduction measures.	Medium /High - CFC-12 and HCFC-22 have significant GWP. Bearing in mind the quantities involved, the impact on GHG emissions could be substantial.	EC	15
Regular and timely maintenance checks.	Yes – Reduced consumption of virgin ODS	High	Medium/high – Recycling options to be implemented	Medium – The use of existing technology will appeal to users.	Medium/high – Reduced dependence on HCFCs & GWP	Guyana	15
Reduce leakage rates from existing stationary A/C equipment.  [SROC §5.2.3.1 – p 283]	Yes – Stationary equipment containing ODS refrigerant is widespread. For example, CFCs are still in use in 50% of large-scale centrifugal chillers globally, while the use of HCFC-22 is widespread in unitary air conditioners. In 2002, HCFC banks in A/C equipment were estimated to be in excess of 1 million tonnes; for CFCs, banks are approximately 84,000	Medium/High – Leakage from A/C equipment can represent a substantial proportion of lifetime impact. In 2002, 15% of the CFC refrigerant banked in stationary A/C equipment (13,000 tonnes) and 9% of the HCFC refrigerant was emitted. The environmental impact of repairing leaks will be most significant in equipment with large charge sizes and high leak rates. (Table 4.1 p 232)	Medium/High – Measures would include technician training, increased frequency/comprehensiveness of leak inspections and investment in leak control/reduction technologies. (p 275)	Medium/High – Costs should be limited to training inputs and minor expenditures in leak inspection activities and other engineered leakage reduction measures. Efforts should focus on those end uses with high charge sizes and large leak rates. (pp 274-275)	Medium/High - Bearing in mind the quantities involved, a reduction in leak rates from these equipment types would also decrease emissions of GHG alternatives. In 2002, emissions of HFCs from stationary A/C were estimated at 6,000 tonnes. This number can be expected to increase with the transition away from ODS. (Table 4.1 p 232)	USA	15



<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
	tonnes. HFCs are also used in A/C equipment, with banks estimated at 81,000 tonnes. (Table 4.1 p 232)						
Fund establishment of equipment destruction programme through a recovery fee, preceded by a seed fund to initiate the programme.	High.- With this measure the ozone depletion problem will be completely solved, at least with respect to CFCs.	High.- With the destruction of CFCs the problem of manage recovered CFCs is reduced to a minimum.	Medium.- The difficulty is to implement the fund for destruction through a fee.	Medium.- The owners of old equipment should pay for the destruction, and it could be an disincentive to the programme.		Mexico	16
Phase-out HCFC in new equipment earlier.  [SROC §5.2.3.2 – pp284-285]	Yes – Since 90% of air conditioners are produced to use HCFC-22, there is substantial value in earlier transition to new refrigerants.	Medium/High – Future cumulative HCFC consumption in new stationary A/C equipment is expected to be substantial before phase-out in developing countries in 2040.	Low – Technologies are already available to assist this transition and the only barriers anticipated will be those of cost.	Medium – Technology already exists to address this issue and any costs will be related to the higher investment costs (capital and/or revenue) associated with alternative technologies. There should be economies of scale if the transition is universal.	Low/Medium – Care needs to be given to selecting alternatives which maximize energy efficiency. Where high GWP refrigerants are required to achieve this, actions to minimize leakage and maximize end-of-life recovery are important.	Example Uganda	17
Early transition to non HCFC alternatives.	Yes – It is estimated that more than 90% of the installed base of stationary A/C equipment currently use HCFC-22, and an estimated 368 million air-cooled A/Cs and heat pumps are installed worldwide.	High – The use of HCFCs is expected to be substantial in developing countries before phase-out in 2040. Earlier transition to alternative technology will reduce future stocks of HCFCs.	High – alternative technology already exists and HFC blends and hydrocarbons are being used.	Medium/low – Alternative technology is already available but its cost is still higher than with ODS. Energy efficiency and operational costs vary depending on the technology chosen and local requirements.	High – HCFCs have a high GWP and reducing their emissions will have a positive effect on climate change. The total impact depends, however, on the alternative technology chosen. There should be careful consideration of maximizing energy efficiency and choosing refrigerants with a low GWP value.	EC	17
Phase-out HCFCs	Yes – 90% of A/C	High – Future HCFC	High – Technologies are	Medium/High –Equipment	Low/Medium – HFC	USA	17

<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
<p>in new equipment earlier.</p> <p>[SROC §5.1.3.2 pp 275-276]</p> <p>[SROC §5.2.3.2 – pp 284-285]</p>	<p>units are produced to use HCFC-22. (pp 271, 274)</p>	<p>consumption in new stationary A/C equipment is expected to be substantial before phase-out in developing countries in 2040. Reducing future stocks of HCFCs will also reduce servicing demand for decades.</p>	<p>already available to assist this transition in the US and the only barriers anticipated will be those of cost. (pp 274-276, 284-285)</p> <p>Technical challenges could be greater in developing countries because of equipment and training constraints.</p>	<p>using alternative refrigerants is widely available, although it is typically associated with higher capital and, in some cases, electricity costs. There should be economies of scale if the transition is universal, as it would decrease the cost premium. (pp 275, 284)</p>	<p>refrigerants can be used responsibly and achieve greater energy efficiency and thereby reduce indirect GHG emissions from energy generation. Care is needed in selecting alternatives that maximize energy efficiency. Where high GWP refrigerants are used, actions to minimize leakage and maximize end-of-life recovery are important to prevent direct emissions of GHGs.</p>		
<b>Mobile air conditioning (MAC)</b>							
<p>Recover refrigerants contained in existing vehicles.</p> <p>[SROC §6.4.1.2 pp304]</p>	<p>Limited – Old systems are likely to be leaky and most CFC-12 will already have been released. There is some on-going servicing requirement which is usually met from recycled material.</p>	<p>Low/Medium – In 2002, the bank of CFC-12 globally was estimated at 149,000 tonnes but is expected to have reduced fairly rapidly since then as vehicles have been replaced.</p>	<p>Low/Medium effort – Technology is relatively straightforward, although logistics can be a problem because of the fragmented and geographically widespread ownership of automobiles.</p>	<p>Low/Medium - Cost of recovery equipment is modest and should also have been already encouraged under various refrigeration management plans.</p>	<p>Medium - CFC-12 has a significant GWP. However, replacements may also have some direct impact. The efficiency of air conditioning equipment will influence the charge required and potential emissions from a system during its lifetime.</p>	<p>Example, EC</p>	<p>18</p>
<p>(Personnel transportation)</p> <p>Recover refrigerant from abandoned cars.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Low – Fewer vehicles use CFCs.</p>	<p>Low – There are a small number of vehicles over a large area; it would also be dependent on resource availability.</p>	<p>Low – due to wide distribution of units</p>	<p>Low/medium – due to operational demands</p>	<p>Guyana</p>	<p>18</p>

<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
<p>Recover refrigerants contained in existing vehicles during service and at vehicle end of life.</p> <p>[SROC §6.4.1.2 p 304]</p>	<p>Yes – CFC-12 MVACs are still in widespread use in developing countries and may continue to be manufactured in new systems until 2008. HFC-134a is used in most newer MVACs, and its market penetration will increase in developing countries as CFC-12 is phased out. Recovery of refrigerant at service and disposal is critical to reducing ODS &amp; GHG emissions.</p>	<p>High – Although MVACs have a small charge size, their large numbers translate into high emissions unless refrigerant is recovered during service and disposal events.</p>	<p>Medium/High – MVAC refrigerant recovery programmes have already been implemented in many developing countries. Technology is relatively straightforward, although the logistics of recovery can be a challenge because of the large number of dispersed service stations. Do-it-yourselfers cannot easily be targeted or monitored.</p>	<p>Medium/High - Costs of technician training and recovery equipment are modest and have already been promoted under various refrigeration management plans.</p>	<p>Medium/High - CFC-12 has a significant GWP and its replacement—HFC-134a—also has a high GWP. Therefore, recovering these refrigerants is critical to minimizing emissions of GHGs, not just ODS.</p>	USA	18
<p>Improve containment of refrigerants.</p>	<p>Yes – CFC-12 MACs are still widely used and will be produced in developing countries until 2008. In one study (SROC p. 300), CFC-12 emissions were approximately 105 tonnes in 1990 and are expected to be around 5192 tonnes in 2015. Leak checks and repairs could decrease emissions of refrigerants.</p>	<p>Medium/high – Via improved containment avoided emissions could be significant, particularly in developing countries where the use of MACs is increasing.</p>	<p>High – MAC technology is being improved as MAC use becomes more common in motor vehicles. Training of servicing personnel is required and could be done at a moderate cost, partly with the help of MAC manufacturers. In some developing countries, phase-out of CFC-12 has permitted the implementation of good practices.</p>	<p>Medium/high – Costs associated with improved HFC-134a systems are \$24–36 per functional unit. Other technologies under development are CO<sub>2</sub> (costs \$48–180 per functional unit) and HFC-152 (costs \$48 per functional unit).</p>	<p>High – Improved containment will reduce direct emissions of ODS and GHGs and thus help mitigate the climate change.</p>	EC	19
<p>Improved containment of</p>	<p>Yes – Improved refrigerant</p>	<p>Medium/High – If leakage rates were reduced through</p>	<p>High – Improved HFC-134a systems are under</p>	<p>Medium/High – Capital costs associated with improved</p>	<p>Medium – Improving containment will reduce direct</p>	USA	19

<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
refrigerant  [SROC §6.4.1 p 304]	containment could decrease emissions of both CFC-12 and HFC-134a, depending on which refrigerant manufacturers in developing countries are using (full transition from CFC-12 is not required until 2008, although most production now involves HFC-134a). (p 297)	improved containment, avoided emissions could be significant—especially in the future, as the number of MVACs in developing countries continues to grow. In 2003 alone, 63,000 tonnes of CFC-12 and 74,000 tonnes of HFC-134a were emitted from MVACs.  [SROC §6.2.2 p 300]	development and expected to be commercialized in the near future.	HFC-134a systems is roughly \$40 per system. (p 306)	emissions of GHGs (as well as ODS, if applied to CFC-12 systems). Improved HFC-134a systems are also expected to be more energy efficient, reducing gasoline use to operate the system and resulting GHG emissions.		
Standards and programmes to reduce service-related emissions (recovery, recharge, leak detection, and leak repair).  [SROC §6.4.1 p 304]	Yes – Improved servicing would reduce emissions of CFC-12 and HFC-134a.	Medium/High – Although MVACs have a small charge size, their large numbers translate into high emissions, some of which occur during service. Service-related emissions can result in the release of 5–15% of the original MVAC charge—or much more if performed by unskilled technicians (i.e., do-it-yourselfers).	Low/Medium – A standardized certification method would need to be developed for checking the leak tightness of each MVAC component after it is installed. While training and technology is straightforward, getting participation from a large number of small, geographically-dispersed service stations may be a challenge. Further, ensuring compliance with agreed standards could be difficult.	Medium/High – Cost of recovery equipment is modest and should also have been already encouraged under various refrigeration management plans. Additional costs are associated with training programs to ensure best practices for recovery, as well as leak detection and repair.	Medium – CFC-12 has a high ODP and GWP, and its replacement, HFC-134a, has a high GWP.	USA	20
In El Salvador, only vehicles made before 1994 are likely to contain CFC-12, since, under a Salvadoran transportation law aimed at reducing	This regulation is important since, in the first decade of the 21st century, vehicles from the 20th century no longer enter the country and those that have air	This change in demand, which was generated by the 1994 regulation, is very important (high significance) for achieving the reduction of CFC-12-based MAC systems in El Salvador. If	Workshops in El Salvador may have to build capacity with regard to this new technology so that MACs will function properly and leakage will be controlled.	The cost effectiveness of retrofitting is very low, since the majority of imported vehicles, which, in El Salvador, is 100%, are not manufactured by us. The MAC systems of most vehicles have already been retrofitted, so this cost	The environmental impact of this measure is that, after 2010, the ozone layer will suffer very little damage, since the emissions from the MAC sector will be very low throughout the 21st century.	El Salvador	21

<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
vehicle exhaust emissions that was passed in 2001, no vehicles older than 1994 can be imported. It has also been stipulated since then that no vehicles over seven years old can be imports, and the vehicles imported this year are the first that have air conditioning systems that come from the factory carrying HFC-134a.	conditioning (not all of them have it) only use HFC-134a refrigerant. The probability of finding a vehicle model older than 1994 with CFC-12-based air conditioning is very low, which means that the mobile air conditioning (MAC) sub-sector only creates demand for HFC-134a refrigerants, which do not damage the ozone layer and create little greenhouse effect, far less than CFC.	this were done in several countries, the situation globally would move away from the trend of changing MAC systems with R-134 to R-12.		does no have an impact on the vehicle within the country.			
<b>Foams</b>							
Recover blowing agents from steel-faced building panels.  [SROC §7.5.2 pp 344]	Yes – Both CFC-11 and HCFC-141b have been used in the manufacture of these products.	Medium – In 2000, the bank estimates for CFCs were 350,000 tonnes of CFC-11 and 100,000 tonnes of HCFC-141b. Benefits will not begin to accrue until panels reach the waste-stream in 2015 or thereabouts.	Medium/High effort – Recent trials in Europe have shown that existing refrigerator recycling equipment can be used to process panels. Logistics for recovery from sites would need to be managed.	Medium – Where reasonable volumes of panels are in one place (e.g., a medium/large building), the logistics cost should be tolerable. Since the foam:metal ratio will be higher, the recovery efficiency of the plant could be affected.	Medium/High – CFC-11 has a significant GWP. The recycling of steel is also an additional environmental advantage.	Example	22
Recover blowing	Yes – Both CFC-11	Medium – In 2000, PU	Low/Medium – Recent trials	Medium – Cost effective where	Medium/High – CFC-11 has a	USA	22

<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
agents from steel-faced building panels.  [SROC §7.5.2 p 344]	and HCFC-141b have been used in the manufacture of these products.	panel bank estimates for CFCs were 350,000 tonnes of CFC-11 and 100,000 tonnes of HCFC-141b; however, benefits will not begin to accrue until panels reach the waste stream around 2015 [SROC §4.4 of the Technical Summary p 66]	in Europe have shown that existing refrigerator recycling equipment can be used to process panels. Logistics for recovery from each site would need to be managed.	large volumes of panels are in one place (e.g., a medium/large building). Since the foam/metal ratio will be higher, the recovery efficiency of the plant could be affected.	significant GWP. The recycling of steel is also an additional environmental advantage.		
Restrict the use of ODS in one-component foams (OCF).  [SROC §7.1.2.1 p 320]	Some – HCFC-22 is one of the blowing agents used in the OCF market. These foams are widely used in the building industry as gap fillers around doors and windows as well as in plumbing applications. This is a highly emissive application. (p 322)	Low – The amount of ODS still used in producing OCF is small.	Medium/High – There are numerous non-ODS propellants used for OCF.	Uncertain	High –OCF restriction is one of many actions that can reduce energy requirements for buildings and can have a significant impact on GHG emissions associated with reduced energy generation.	USA	23
Phase out HCFCs earlier; encourage use of alternative blowing agents or not-in-kind technologies.  [SROC §7.5 pp 326-327; 341-342]	Yes – CFCs and especially HCFCs are still used in developing countries. Some HCFCs are still used in developed countries, but phase-outs are already scheduled and in place.	Variable – Consumption of HCFCs in 2002 was 128,000 tonnes and is projected to be 50,000 tonnes in 2015.  Lower insulation value of alternatives may offset any direct emission reductions.	Medium/High – Alternatives with zero ODP and low GWP have been widely adopted in several sub-sectors. Most industrial CFC conversions financed by the Multilateral Fund can use equipment that supports non-HCFC technologies such as CO <sub>2</sub> and hydrocarbons. Further technological development will be required. However, this is not realistic until after 2010. In addition, not-in-kind technologies have limited feasibility depending on	Variable – Insulation value of alternatives may offset direct emission reductions. As long as HCFCs are available, HCs and HFCs will only be used in developing countries if the additional costs can be passed on. Specific abatement costs of each blowing agent are variable by sector – the emission abatement cost associated with major polyurethane foam and extruded polystyrene is \$25–85 per tCO <sub>2</sub> -eq and \$6–12 per tCO <sub>2</sub> -eq, respectively.	High – The use of blowing agents with reduced (or zero) GWP could have a significant impact on emissions of GHGs, assuming no significant energy penalty.  The reduction of HFC consumption can result in cumulative emissions reduction of 31,775 tonnes, 225,950 tonnes, and 352,350 tonnes by 2015, 2050, and 2100, respectively. (pp 317-318)	USA	24

<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
			sub-sector. (p 324)				
Reduce emissions during foam production and installation.  [SROC §7.5.1 p 342]	Yes – Consumption of HCFC blowing agent amounted to 128,000 tonnes in 2002 and is projected to amount to 50,000 in 2015. (p 317)	Medium – Measures of this kind are not expected to achieve a saving better than 20% on average.	Variable from process to process. It may be possible to reduce production losses in the extruded-polystyrene sector to between 17.5% and 20%. Practices that minimize process waste from block-foam measures can be introduced. However, SROC notes that emissions savings are unlikely to exceed 20%. (p 342)	Variable	Variable. As long as alternatives are chosen with GWP lower than that of HCFCs, there will be positive climate impacts associated with minimizing emissions of blowing agents.	USA	25
Improve product and building design.  [SROC §7.5.1 p 342]	Yes – Consumption of HCFC blowing agent amounted to 128,000 tonnes in 2002 and is projected to amount to 50,000 in 2015. (p 317)	Low – Losses in use are low as a proportion of total blowing agent loading and changes in technology are unlikely to have a major impact.	Low – In-use losses represent only a small portion of the emissions associated with the use of ODS in foams.	Variable – Depends on the cost of altering product and building design.	Low – Due to the small amount of in-use losses, few environmental benefits can be expected.	USA	26
Extend end-of-life management measures to all appliances.  [SROC §7.5.2 pp 343-344]	Yes – Significant banks of ODS exist in appliance foam. In 2000 bank estimates were 460,000 tonnes of CFCs, 209,100 tonnes of HCFCs, and 1,150 tonnes of HFCs. [SROC §4.4 of the Technical Summary p 66]	Potentially High – Implementing European practices for decommissioning domestic refrigerators around the world could have a significant impact on emissions of HCFCs.	High – It is anticipated that by 2010, all domestic refrigerators worldwide could be properly decommissioned.	Medium/High – The emission abatement costs associated with recovering and destroying foam from appliances are estimated to range from \$30–60 per kg of blowing agent.	High – Minimizing direct emissions of ODS and GHGs from foams could have significant climate impact. The energy requirements associated with decommissioning and recycling domestic refrigerator components will need to be considered.	USA	27
<b>Halons</b>							
Adopt appropriate management techniques to limit emissions from all	Yes – Both halons and, to a lesser extent, HCFCs are still used in fire	Low/Medium – Halons are now only in use within about 4% of current fire protection equipment.	Low/Medium effort – Strategies have already been developed in many countries and enforcement through	Low/Medium – Costs should be limited to training inputs and minor expenditure in other engineered leakage reduction	Low – Emission reduction measures are always welcome when limiting pollution. However, there is evidence to	Example	28

<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
banks of fire protection agent (halon, HCFC, HFC and other).  [SROC § 9.4 pp 375-376]	protection equipment. Good practices in bank management offer longevity of use for key applications and avoid the need for re-manufacture.	However, banks exist on the order of 39,000 tonnes for Halon 1301 and 83,000 tonnes for Halon 1211, while for HCFCs there are 3,600 tonnes in fixed systems and 2,700 tonnes in portable systems. The high ODP of halons makes them still an important target for emission prevention.	either regulation or voluntary agreement (supported by necessary standards) has been effective. The challenge remains the widespread use of fire protection equipment – particularly in the form of portable systems.	measures. Arguably, the cost of developing suitable codes of practice and regulation should also be considered. However, it is now possible to borrow from several existing and successful schemes.	suggest that halons can act as significant “global coolers” [Figure TS-6]. The GWP of HCFC-123 (used in portable equipment) is also relatively low. However, a reduction in emission of HCFC-22 (used significantly in fixed systems) could make a valuable contribution to climate protection. Fire prevention in itself, of course, is an act of environmental protection.		
Adopt appropriate management techniques to limit emissions from all banks of fire protection agent (halon, HCFC, HFC and other).  [SROC §9.4 pp 375-376]	Yes – Halons, HCFCs, and HFCs are used in fire protection equipment. Good practices in bank management offer longevity of use for key applications and avoid the need for re-manufacture. (p 363)	High – Halons are now only needed in about 4% of new installations that formerly used halon, but banks are estimated at 39,000 tonnes for Halon 1301 and 83,000 tonnes for Halon 1211. For HCFCs, banks are estimated to be 3,600 tonnes in fixed systems and 1,300 tonnes in portable systems. Proper management is needed to ensure that these banks are not unintentionally emitted. Emissions for 2005 were estimated by HTOC (2003) to be 1,900 tonnes and 16,000 tonnes of Halon 1301 and Halon 1211, respectively, although discharges are included in these estimates (not just leakage). (pp 364, 367-368)	Medium/High – Strategies have already been developed in many countries and enforcement through either regulation or voluntary agreement (supported by necessary standards) has been effective. However, because the use of fire protection equipment, particularly portable systems, is so widespread, it is difficult to ensure full observance with recommended practices. (p 375)	Medium/High – Costs should be limited to training inputs and minor expenditures in leak inspection activities and engineered leakage reduction measures. The cost of developing, adopting, and implementing existing codes of practice and appropriate regulations should also be considered. However, it is now possible to borrow from several existing and successful schemes. SROC notes that there is an economic incentive to properly recover halon alternatives. (pp 375-376)	Low – Emission reduction measures are always welcome and reduction in emission of halocarbons (used significantly in fixed systems) could make a valuable contribution to climate protection. Fire prevention in itself, of course, is an act of environmental protection.	USA	28
Transition to use of non-halon	Yes – halons have high ODP and are	Medium/High – Although halon consumption all but	High – There are a variety of alternatives, including clean	High – Halon alternatives are available for most fixed-system	Low – Halocarbon alternatives may have	USA	29



<b>Proposed measure</b> <i>(from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<b>ODS relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Practicality</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	<b>Other environmental benefits/impacts</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>(*)</b>
alternatives for new fixed systems.  [SROC §9.2.1-9.2.2 pp 369-370]	still used in fire protection systems. HCFCs are used in limited applications.	ceased in developing countries in 2004, recycled halon is still available for use in new systems, for many of which viable halon alternatives are available. As of 1999, only 4% of the former halon market required halon in new systems. (pp 364, 367)	agents (e.g., HFC-227ea) and not-in-kind technologies, each of which is suited to different applications. In developed countries, new systems and not-in-kind alternatives have replaced about half the applications that historically used halons. (pp 370-373)	applications, with the exception of some specialty uses (e.g., aviation, military, etc.), though capital costs may be higher. Over time, halon costs will increase and render the alternatives more competitive. (pp 371-373)	negative environmental impacts; HCFCs are ODSs and GHG and HFCs are GHGs. However, other not-in-kind technologies (i.e., water-based, total flooding, dry-chemical and aerosol systems), as well as inert gas, create no direct emissions of ODSs or GHGs. (p 370)		
Transition to use of non-halon alternatives for new portable extinguishers.  [SROC §9.3 p 373]	Yes – Halons have high ODPs. HCFCs and HFCs are used as alternatives. (p 369)	Medium – Halon consumption ceased in developing countries in 2004, so the manufacture of halon in new portable extinguishers should be low or non-existent. The re-fill of existing extinguishers continues to occur.	High – With a few exceptions (e.g., for use in military), non-halon alternatives are available for streaming applications. Options include “in-kind” alternatives (e.g., halocarbon), water and dry chemical. (pp 374-375)	Medium/High – Some halon alternatives may be less expensive than halon. Alternatives are already available so costs associated with continued research and development are not high.	Low – Halocarbon alternatives may have negative environmental impacts; HCFCs are ODSs and GHGs and HFCs are GHGs. However, other not-in-kind replacements (i.e., water, dry-chemical) create no direct emissions of ODS or GHGs. (p 370)	USA	30
The fire extinguisher sector was retrofitted in El Salvador over 10 years ago.	In the 21 <sup>st</sup> century, no atmospheric there have been no emissions of halon, one of the types of ODS that is most harmful to the ozone layer.	High significance, since the sector has been 100% retrofitted.	The practicality of retrofitting this sector and managing the refilling of extinguisher systems is very high, since the businesses that manage this activity are very efficient and highly professional.	During the retrofitting process, the extinguishers were retrofitted in factories in El Salvador and imported, so the cost effectiveness of reducing damage to the atmosphere is very high.	High environmental impact because, in El Salvador, as in many Article 5 countries, the systems have been 100% retrofitted, meaning that halons, the ODS that is most harmful for the ozone layer, will have been reduced by almost 100%.	El Salvador	30
Proper handling of end-of-life equipment	Yes – Halons and HCFCs as well as HFCs are used in fixed systems and portable fire extinguishers.	High – Emissions are likely to occur at this stage without sufficient knowledge and skills to handle ODS as well as appropriate equipment. A considerable amount of ODS is still in systems and equipment which are near	Medium/high – Recovery should be performed by a trained technician with proper equipment. Reclamation and/or destruction require special facilities.	High – Halon's positive market value provides a financial incentive to minimize emissions.	High – Recovery of substances with high ODP and GWP prevent their emissions and thus their impact on ozone depletion and climate change.	EC	31

<i>Proposed measure (from IPCC/TEAP SROC &amp; TEAP supplementary report)</i>	<i>ODS relevance</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Practicality</i>	<i>Cost effectiveness</i>	<i>Other environmental benefits/impacts</i>	<i>Proponent</i>	<i>(*)</i>
Handle fixed systems and extinguishers at end of life properly.  [SROC §9.4.3 p 375]	Yes – Halons, HCFCs, and HFCs are used in fixed systems and portable extinguishers. (p 363)	the end of their service life.  High – Considerable amounts of halon are still present in existing systems; if halon is not recovered from these systems and properly reclaimed or destroyed, ODS emissions will be very significant. Moreover, banks of HCFC and HFC will continue to increase as halon is phased out, and it is critical that remaining agent not be vented at end of life. (pp 363-364, 367)	Medium/High – Because only properly trained technicians tend to deal with total flooding systems, proper end-of-life treatment of such systems can be monitored and controlled. However, ensuring proper recovery/treatment of extinguishing agent at the end of life of portable extinguishers may be more difficult.	High – The existence of a halon market and the high market value of halons provides a financial incentive for properly recovering and recycling halons at end of life. Similarly, HCFC and HFC replacements are also being recovered and recycled due to their market values. (p 376)	High – Recovering high ODP/GWP agents will prevent emissions of ODS and GHGs.	USA	31

## **Annex II**

### **List of participants**

## **PARTIES**

### **AFGHANISTAN**

Mr. Zahid Ullah Hamdard  
Ozone Officer/Consultant  
National Ozone Unit  
National Environmental Protection Agency  
Darulaman Road, Afghanistan  
Kabul  
Afghanistan  
Tel: +93 79 46 54 58  
EMail: zahidhamdard1@yahoo.com,  
zahidhamdard@yahoo.com

### **ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA**

Ms. Corah Charmaine Hackett  
Communications Coordinator  
Assistant Ozone Officer  
Industry & Commerce Division  
Ministry of Finance and Economy  
P.O. Box 1550, Redcliffe St reet  
St. John's, Antigua W.I.  
Antigua and Barbuda  
Tel: +1 268 562 1609  
Fax: +1 268 462 1625  
EMail: odsunit@candw.ag

### **ARGENTINA**

Ms. Marcia Levaggi  
Oficina del Representante Especial para  
Negociaciones Ambientales Internacionales  
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores  
Comercio Internacional y Culto  
Esmeralda 1212, piso 14, Of. 1408  
Buenos Aires 1007  
Argentina  
Tel: +5411 4819 7414  
Fax: +5411 4819 7413  
EMail: mle@mrecic.gov.ar

Dr. Laura Berón  
Technical Coordinator OPROZ  
Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo  
Sustentable  
San Martín 459 - oficina 69 - entrecorreo  
Buenos Aires 1038  
Argentina  
Tel: +54 11 4348 8413  
Fax: +54 11 4348 8274  
EMail: lberon@medioambiente.gov.ar

### **ARMENIA**

Mrs. Asya Muradyan  
Head  
Ozone Focal Point  
Land and Atmosphere Protection Division  
of the Environmental Protection  
Department  
Ministry of Nature Protection  
3 Government Blvd.  
Republic Square  
Yerevan 375010  
Armenia  
Tel: +374 10 541 182  
Fax: +374 10 541 183/ 585 469  
EMail: as.muradyan@mail.ru/asozon

### **AUSTRALIA**

Mr. Patrick McInerney  
Director  
Ozone and Synthetic Gas Team  
Department of Environment and Heritage  
G.P.O. Box 787  
Canberra ACT 2601  
Australia  
Tel: +61 2 6274 1035  
Fax: +61 2 6274 1610  
EMail: patrick.mcinerney@deh.gov.au

### **AUSTRIA**

Mr. Paul Krajnik  
Chemicals  
Ministry of Environment  
Stubenbastei 5  
Vienna A-1010  
Austria  
Tel: +43 1 515 22 23 50  
Fax: +43 1 515 22 73 34  
EMail: paul.krajnik@lebensministerium.at

Mr. Johann Steindl  
Chemicals  
Ministry of Environment  
Stubenbastei 5  
Vienna A-1010  
Austria  
Tel: +43 1 515 22 23 39  
Fax: +43 1 515 22 73 34  
EMail: johann.steindl@lebensministerium.at

**AZERBAIJAN**

Mr. Maharram Mehtiyev  
 Director  
 Climate Change and Ozone Center  
 Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources  
 100A B. Agayev Str.  
 Baku AZ1073  
 Azerbaijan  
 Tel: +994 12 598 2795  
 Fax: +994 12 441 5865  
 EMail: climoz@online.az

**BANGLADESH**

Dr. Khandaker Rashedul Haque  
 Director General  
 Department of Environment  
 Ministry of Environment and Forest  
 Dhaka 1207  
 Bangladesh  
 Tel: +88 02 8112461  
 Fax: +88 02 9118682  
 EMail: krh@doe-bd.org

Dr. Satyendra Kumar P. Purkayastha  
 Senior Officer  
 Ozone Cell  
 Department of Environment  
 Ministry of Environment & Forest  
 Dhaka 1207  
 Bangladesh  
 Tel: +88 02 9124005  
 Fax: +88 02 9118682  
 EMail: Purkayastha@doe-bd.org

**BELARUS**

Mr. Aleksander Bambiza  
 Head of Department  
 Department of State Control for  
 Protection of Atmospheric Air and  
 Ozone Layer  
 Ministry of Natural Resources and  
 Environmental Protection  
 10 Kollektornaya Street  
 Minsk 220048  
 Belarus  
 Tel: +37517 200 6261/200 5113  
 Fax: +37517 200 7454  
 EMail: ozon@minpriroda.by

**BELGIUM**

Mr. Jozef Buys  
 Charge de Mission  
 Multilateral Cooperation  
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
 Karmelietenstraat 15  
 Brussels B-1000  
 Belgium  
 Tel: +322 5190897  
 Fax: +322 5190570  
 EMail: jozef.buys@diplobel.fed.be

Mr. Alain Wilmart  
 Ozone and F-Gas Officer  
 Climate Change  
 Environment  
 Federal Public Service for Environment  
 Place Victor Horta, 40 B 10  
 Brussels B-1060  
 Belgium  
 Tel: +32 2 524 9 543  
 Fax: +32 2 524 9 601  
 EMail: alain.wilmart@health.fgov.be

**BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA**

Dr. Senad Oprasic  
 Head of Department  
 Department of Environmental Protection  
 Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic  
 Relations  
 Musala 9  
 Sarajevo 71000  
 Bosnia and Herzegovina  
 Tel: +387 33 55 23 65  
 EMail: senad.oprasic@mvteo.gov.ba

**BOTSWANA**

Mr. Balisi Gopolang  
 Senior Meteorologist  
 National Ozone Office  
 Department of Meteorological Services  
 P.O. Box 10100  
 Gaborone  
 Botswana  
 Tel: +267 395 6281  
 Fax: +267 395 6282  
 EMail: bgopolang@gov.bw

## **BRAZIL**

Mr. Paulo Jose Chiarelli  
Secretary  
Division of Environmental Policy and  
Sustainable Development  
Department of Environment  
Ministry of External Relations  
Brasilia  
Brazil  
Tel: +55 61 3411 9289  
EMail: paulo@mre.gov.br

Mrs. Magna Leite Ludovice  
Ozone Unit Coordinator/Environmental  
Analyst  
Ministry of the Environment  
Secretariat for Environmental Quality  
Brazilian Ozone Unit  
Esplanada dos Ministerios, bloc b- 8 Andar  
Sala 832  
Brasilia 70.068-900  
Brazil  
Tel: +55 61 4009/1017  
Fax: +55 61 4009/1796  
EMail: magna.ludovice@mma.gov.br

Mr. Washington Luis Pereira de Sousa  
Ambassador/Consul-General  
Consulate General of Brazil  
1 Westmount Square, Suite 1700  
Montreal H32 2P9  
Canada  
Tel: +514 499 3963  
EMail: geral@consbrasmontreal.org

## **BULGARIA**

Ms. Irina Tsanova Sirashka  
Senior expert  
Global Atmospheric Processes Department  
Ministry of Environment and Water  
22, Maria Luiza Blvd  
Sofia 1000  
Bulgaria  
Tel: +359 2940 6640  
Fax: +359 2980 3926  
EMail: sirashka@moew.government.bg

## **BURKINA FASO**

Mr. Victor Yameogo  
Coordonnateur du Programme de Pays Ozone  
Bureau Ozone  
Direction Générale del' Environnement  
Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre  
de Vie  
03 B.P. 7044  
Ouagadougou 7044  
Burkina Faso  
Tel: +226 70 20 64 84  
Fax: +226 50 31 81 34  
EMail: yam.t.v@fasonet.bf

## **BURUNDI**

Mr. Gabriel Hakizimana  
Coordonnateur National  
Bureau Ozone  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
B.P. 1365  
Bujumbura  
Burundi  
Tel: +257 234426/932099  
Fax: +257 228 902  
EMail: bozone@cbinf.com

## **CAMBODIA**

H.E. Muth Khieu  
Secretary of State  
Ministry of Environment  
48 Samdech Preah Sihanouk  
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmon  
Phnom Penh  
Cambodia  
Tel: +855 2321 9287  
Telex: +855 2321 9287  
EMail: moe@online.com.kh

## **CAMEROON**

Mr. Patrick Akwa  
Permanent Secretary  
Ministry of Environment and Nature  
Protection  
Yaounde  
Cameroon  
Tel: +237 7684 544  
Fax: +237 2236 016  
EMail: patakwa@yahoo.com

Mr. Enoh Peter Ayuk  
 Chief of Brigade for Environmental  
 Inspection  
 and Coordinator National Ozone Office  
 Department of Norms and Controls  
 Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection  
 Cameroon  
 Tel: +237 222 1106  
 Fax: +237 222 1106  
 EMail: enohpeter@yahoo.fr

#### **CANADA**

Mr. Angus Fergusson  
 Science Advisor  
 Stratospheric Ozone Depletion  
 Science Assessment Integration, Science  
 and Technology Branch  
 Environment Canada  
 4905 Dufferin Street  
 Downsview  
 Ontario M3H 5T4  
 Canada  
 Tel: +1 416 739 4765  
 EMail: Angus.Fergusson@ec.gc.ca

Mr. Philippe Chemouny  
 Manager, Montreal Protocol Program  
 Multilateral Affairs Division  
 International Affairs Branch  
 Environment Canada  
 10 Wellington St., 4th floor  
 Gatineau K1A 0H3  
 Canada  
 Tel: +1 819 997 2768  
 Fax: +1 819 953 7025  
 EMail: philippe.chemouny@ec.gc.ca

Mrs. Amanda Garay  
 Environmental Law Section JLOB  
 Lester B. Pearson Building  
 125 Sussex Drive  
 Ottawa, Ontario k1A 0G2  
 Canada  
 Tel: +1 613 992 6479  
 Fax: +1 613 992 6483  
 EMail: amanda.garay@international.gc.ca

Mr. Gordon T. Owen  
 Director General  
 Air Pollution Prevention Directorate  
 Environmental Protection Service  
 Place Vincent Massey  
 351 St. Joseph Blvd., 10th Floor  
 Gatineau K1A 0H3  
 Canada  
 Tel: +1 819 997 1298  
 Fax: +1 819 953 9547  
 EMail: gord.owen@ec.gc.ca

#### **CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC**

Mr. Jean-Claude Bomba  
 Directeur General de  
 l'Environnement/Directeur des Eaux,  
 Forets, Chasse, Peche  
 Rue Ambassadeur Guerillot  
 Bangui  
 Central African Republic  
 Tel: +236 50 8279/ 61 7890  
 Fax: +236 61 7921  
 EMail: jcbomba@hotmail.com

#### **CHAD**

Mr. Oumar Mahamat Gadji  
 Directeur Controle Financier et Engagement  
 Ministère/Economie & Finances  
 Ministère de l'Environnement  
 P.O Box 144 N'djamena Ministere des Finances  
 N'djamena  
 Chad  
 Tel: +235 6240683

#### **CHILE**

Ms. Ana Zuñiga  
 Ozone Program Coordinator  
 Pollution Control  
 National Commission for the Environment  
 Teatinos 254  
 Santiago  
 Chile  
 Tel: +56 2405700  
 Fax: +56 2 2411824  
 EMail: azuniga@conama.cl

Mr. Gonzalo Miranda  
 999 University Street, Suite 1445  
 Montreal  
 Canada  
 Tel: +1 514 954 5764  
 Fax: +1 514 954 6684  
 EMail: chile.rep@icao.int

## CHINA

Mr. Jianhung Meng  
Second Secretary  
Department of Treaty and Law  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Beijing 100701  
China  
Tel: +86 10 65 963 251  
Fax: +86 10 65 963 257

Mrs. Mengheng Zhang  
Senior Programme Officer  
Department of International Cooperation  
State Environmental Protection  
Administration (SEPA)  
115 Xizhemennei Nanziaojie  
Beijing 100035  
China  
Tel: +86 10 6655 6515  
Fax: +86 10 6655 6513  
EMail: Zhangmh@sepa.gov.cn

Mr. Xiayu Duan  
Institute of Plant Protection  
Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences  
2 Yuan Ming Yuan Xilu  
Beijing 100084  
China  
Tel: +86 10 62815946  
Fax: +86 10 62894863  
EMail: xyduan@ippcaas.cn

Mr. Yuejin Wang  
Deputy Director General  
Institute of Inspection Technology and  
Equipment  
Chinese Academy of Inspection and  
Quarantine  
Bld. 241  
Huixinci, Choyang District  
Beijing 100020  
China

Mr. Zhuyun Wang  
Department of Science and Education  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Nong Zhan Nan Li 11  
Beijing  
China  
Tel: +86 10 6419 3031  
Fax: +86 10 6419 3031

## COLOMBIA

Dr. Javier Ernesto Camargo Cubillas  
Profesional Especializado del Grupo de  
Asuntos Internacionales  
Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y  
Desarrollo Territorial  
Calle 37  
Bogota B-40  
Colombia  
Tel: +571 3323604  
Fax: +571 3323426  
EMail: [jecamargo@minambiente.gov.co](mailto:jecamargo@minambiente.gov.co)

Mrs. Martha Ligia Perez Garzon  
Grupo de Asuntos Ambientales  
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores  
Calle 10-0-5-51  
Bogota  
Colombia  
Tel: +571 566 7077  
Fax: +571 566 6081

Dr. Jorge Enrique Sanchez  
Coordinador de la Unidad Tecnica de Ozono  
Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y  
Desarrollo Territorial  
Bogota  
Colombia  
Tel: +571 3323638  
Fax: +571 3323638

## COMOROS

Mr. Said Hachim Oussein  
Coordinateur et Point Focal Ozone  
Direction de l'Environnement  
B.P. 41  
Moroni  
Comoros  
Tel: +269 332 302  
Fax: +269 735 236  
EMail: [ozone.comores@comorestelecom.km](mailto:ozone.comores@comorestelecom.km)

## COSTA RICA

Ms. Enid Chaverri-Tapia  
Director  
National Montreal Protocol Focal Point  
Cooperation and Foreign Affairs  
Ministry of Environment and Energy  
3788-1000  
San José, Costa Rica  
Tel: +506 2532596  
Fax: +506 2532624  
EMail: [enid.chaverri@gmail.com](mailto:enid.chaverri@gmail.com)



**CÔTE D'IVOIRE**

Mr. N'guessan N'cho  
 Coordinnateur du Projet Ozone  
 Ministère de l'Environnement, des Eaux et  
 Forets  
 20 B.P. 650  
 Abidjan 20  
 Côte d'Ivoire  
 Tel: +225 0704 4979  
 Fax: +225 2021 0495  
 EMail: nchov3@yahoo.fr

**CROATIA**

Mrs. Snježana Ilicic  
 Ozone Officer  
 Department of Atmosphere Protection  
 Ministry of Environmental Protection  
 Physical Planning and Construction  
 Republike Austrije 20  
 10 000 Zagreb  
 Croatia  
 Tel: +385 1 3782 110  
 Fax: +385 1 3782 157  
 EMail: snjezana.ilicic@mzopu.hr

**CUBA**

Dr. Nelson Espinosa Pena  
 Director  
 Oficina de Ozono de Cuba  
 Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnologia y Medio  
 Ambiente  
 La Habana 10200  
 Cuba  
 Tel: +537 2025543  
 Fax: +537 2044041  
 EMail: espinosa@ama.cu

**CZECH REPUBLIC**

Mr. Jakub Achrer  
 Technical Protection of the Environment  
 Air Protection  
 Ministry of the Environment  
 Vrsoviccka 65  
 Prague 10 100 10  
 Czech Republic  
 Tel: +420 267 12 2505  
 Fax: +420 267 12 6505  
 EMail: Jakub\_Achrer@env.cz

**DOMINICAN REPUBLIC**

Mr. Juan T. Filpo  
 Ozone Unit Chief  
 Secretaria de Estado de Medio Ambiente y  
 Recursos Naturales  
 Dominican Republic  
 Tel: +1 809 472626/5695560  
 Fax: +1 809 4720691

**EUADOR**

Mr. Quimico Santiago Salguero  
 Subsecretario  
 Ministerio de Comercio Exterior,  
 Industrializacion  
 Quito  
 Ecuador

**EGYPT**

Dr. Ezzat Lewis Hannalla Agaiby  
 Director  
 National Ozone Unit  
 Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency  
 Ministry of State for Environmental  
 Affairs  
 30 Misr Helwan El- Zyrae Rd  
 P.O BOX 11728  
 Cairo  
 Egypt  
 Tel: +202 0122181424  
 Fax: +202 817 6390  
 EMail: unit\_ozone@yahoo.com

**ESTONIA**

Mr. Margus Kort  
 Environmental Research Center  
 Marja 4d  
 Tallinn 10107  
 Estonia  
 Tel: +3726112900  
 Fax: +3726112901  
 EMail: margus.kort@klab.ee

Mrs. Valentina Laius  
 Senior Officer  
 Environmental Management And Technology  
 Ministry of Environment  
 NARVA mnt 7A  
 Tallinn 15172  
 Estonia  
 Tel: +372 6262978  
 Fax: +372 6262801  
 EMail: valentina.laius@envir.ee

**EUROPEAN COMMUNITY**

Mrs. Laurence Graff  
Deputy Head of Unit  
Unit C4  
DG Environment  
European Commission  
1049 Brussels  
Brussels  
Belgium  
Tel: +32 2 2960518  
Fax: +32 2 2988868  
EMail: laurence.graff@cec.eu.int

Mr. Peter Horrocks  
Policy Officer  
Industrial Emissions & Protection of  
Ozone Layer  
Directorate General Environment  
Commission  
BU-5 2/178, 5 Ave de Beaulieu  
Brussels 1160  
Belgium  
Tel: +32 2 295 7384  
Fax: +32 2299 8764  
EMail: peter.horrocks@cec.eu.int

Ms. Kalina Lewanska  
Assistant policy officer  
Env. C.4. Industrial Emissions &  
Protection of the Ozone Layer  
Directorate General Environment  
European Commission, Directorate General  
Environment  
Brussels 1049  
Belgium  
Tel: +32 2 298 82 73  
Fax: +32 2 292 06 92  
EMail: kalina.lewanska@cec.eu.int

Dr. Philippe Tulkens  
Environmental Directorate-General  
Industrial Emissions and Protection of  
the Ozone Layer  
European Commission  
BU-5 02/180-BE 1049 Brussels  
Brussels 1049  
Belgium  
Tel: +32 2 298 63 23  
Fax: +32 2 298 88 68  
EMail: philippe.tulkens@ec.europa.eu

Mr. Marcus Wandinger  
Detached National Expert  
Environment Directorate-General  
European Commission  
BU-5 02/51  
Avenue de Beaulieu/Beaulieu laan 5, B -1160  
Bruxelles 1049  
Belgium  
Tel: +32 2 29 87391  
Fax: +32 2 29 98764  
EMail: Marcus.Wandinger@cec.eu.int

**FIJI**

Mr. Shakil Kumar  
National Coordinator (NOU)  
Ministry of Environment  
National Ozone Unit  
Ministry of Environment  
G.P.O. Box 2109, Government Building  
Suva  
Fiji  
Tel: +679 3311069  
Fax: +679 3312879  
EMail: ozonefiji@connect.com.fj/  
shaqkumar@yahoo.com

**FINLAND**

Mr. Jukka Uosukainen  
Deputy Director General  
UN and Multilateral Cooperation  
International Affairs Unit  
Ministry of the Environment  
P.O. BOX 35  
Helsinki FIN-00023  
Finland  
Tel: +358 50 5829685  
Fax: +358 9 16039602  
EMail: jukka.uosukainen@ymparisto.fi

Mr. Leif Backman  
Research Scientist  
Middle Atmospheric Research  
Earth Observation  
Finnish Meteorological Institute  
P.O.Box 503  
Helsinki FIN-00101  
Finland  
Tel: +358 504050752  
Fax: +358 919293146  
EMail: leif.backman@fmi.fi

Ms. Else Peuranen  
Senior Adviser  
Environmental Protection  
Ministry of the Environment  
PO Box 35// Government  
Helsinki FIN-00023  
Finland  
Tel: +358 9 160 39732  
Fax: +358 9 160 39716  
EMail: else.peuranen@environment.fi

Ms. Tuulia Toikka  
Planner  
Chemicals Division  
Expert Services  
Finnish Environment Institute  
P.O. Box 140  
Helsinki FIN-00251  
Finland  
Tel: +358 9 40300534  
Fax: +358 9 40300591  
EMail: tuulia.toikka@environment.fi

#### FRANCE

Mr. Vincent Szleper  
Chargé de Mission Protection de la Couche  
d'Ozone  
Ministère de l'Ecologie et du  
Développement Durable  
20 Avenue de Ségur  
Paris 75007  
France  
Tel: +331 4219 1544  
Fax: +331 4219 1468  
EMail: vincent.szleper@ecologie.gouv.fr

#### GABON

Mr. Albert Rombonot  
Point Focal Ozone et Conseiller du  
Vice-Premier Ministre  
Ministre en Charge de l'Environnement et,  
de la Protection de la Nature  
Libreville  
Gabon  
Tel: +241 07391053/06970613  
Fax: +241 730 148  
EMail: albert\_rombonot@yahoo.fr ,  
prozone.gabon@internetgabon.com

#### GERMANY

Mr. Rolf Engelhardt  
Fundamental Aspects of Chemical Safety,  
Chemicals Legislation - Division IG II 1  
Federal Ministry for the Environment  
P.O. Box 120629  
Bonn 53048  
Germany  
Tel: +49 228 305 2751  
Fax: +49 228 305 3524  
EMail: rolf.engelhardt@bmu.bund.de

Dr. Volkmar Hasse  
Proklima Program Manager  
GTZ (German Technical Cooperation)  
Private Bag 18004, Klein Windhoek  
Windhoek 00000  
Namibia  
Tel: +264 61 273 500  
Fax: +264 61 253 945  
EMail: volkmar.hasse@proklima.org

Mr. Janos Mate  
Political Consultant  
Climate Campaign  
Green Peace International  
5106 Walden St.  
Vancouver V5W 2V7  
Canada  
Tel: +1 604 327 0943  
EMail: jmate@telus.net

#### GHANA

Mr. J.A. Allotey  
Executive Director  
Environmental Protection Agency  
P.O. Box MB.326  
Accra  
Ghana  
Tel: +233 021 662 693/ 664 697/8  
EMail: epaed@africaonline.com.gh ,  
jallotey@epaghana.org

## **GUATEMALA**

Mr. Erwin Enrique Gomez Delgado  
Unidad Tecnica Especializada de Ozono  
Ministerio de Ambiente y Recursos  
naturales  
20 Calle 28-58 Zona 10  
San Rafael 18  
Guatemala  
Tel: +224 242 30500 Ext. 2204/2205  
EMail:  
egomez@marn.gob.gt/erwingomezdelgado@ya  
hoo.com

## **GUINEA**

Mr. Nimaga Mamadou  
Directeur National  
Prevention et Lutte Contre les  
Pollutions et Nuisances  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
Conakry 3118  
Guinea  
Tel: +224 60294301  
EMail: nimmag2003@yahoo.fr

## **GUINEA-BISSAU**

Mr. Injai Quecuta  
Coordinateur  
Point Focal National d'Ozone  
Bureau National d'Ozone  
399  
Bissau  
Guinea-Bissau  
Tel: +245 660 5183  
Fax: +245 201 753  
EMail: quecutainjai@yahoo.com.br

## **HAITI**

Dr. Fritz Nau  
Ozone Officer  
National Ozone Unit  
Cadre de Vie  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
181 Haut de Turgeau  
Port-au-Prince  
Haiti  
Tel: +509 2447643/ 5517052  
Fax: +509 2457360  
EMail: fritznau@hotmail.com ,  
fritznau@yahoo.fr

## **HUNGARY**

Mr. Robert Toth  
Department for Air Pollution and Noise  
Control  
Ministry of Environment and Water  
FO U-44-50  
Budapest H-1011  
Hungary  
Tel: +3614973300  
Fax: +3612013056  
EMail: tothr@mail.kvvm.hu

## **INDIA**

Mr. Yusuf Azad  
General Manager Production  
Factory and R&D Centre  
B-27/29  
MIDC Dombibili (E) 421 203  
India  
Tel: +91 224 40005  
Fax: +91 2512430 581  
EMail: yazad@gharda

Dr. A. Duraisamy  
Director (Ozone Cell)  
Ministry of Environment and Forests  
India Habitat Centre  
Core- IV B, 2nd Floor  
Lodhi Road  
New Delhi 110003  
India  
Tel: +91 11 2464 2176/2338 9939  
Fax: +91 11 244 2175  
EMail: ozone@del3.vsnl.net.in

Dr. Sachidananda Satapathy  
SPPU, Ozone Cell  
Core IVB2nd Floor  
India Habitat Centre, New Delhi, 2nd Floor, IHC  
Lodi Road  
New Delhi 110003  
India  
Tel: +91 11 2464 1687  
EMail: drsatapathy@sppu-india.org

Mr. Vijay Dua  
Assistant Manager, ITDC  
Jeevan Vihar, 3rd Floor,  
3 Sansad Marg  
New Delhi 110001  
India  
Tel: +91 11 23361607  
Fax: +91 11 23343167  
EMail: vijaydua@tourismarms.com

Mr. Rajiv Makin  
 General Manager  
 India Tourism Development Corporation  
 Jeevan Vihar, 3rd Floor, 3 Sansad Marg  
 New Delhi 110001  
 India  
 Tel: +91 11 23364415  
 Fax: +91 11 23343167; ; +91 11 23747793  
 EMail: reservation@theashokgroup.com//  
 rmakin@theashokgroup.com

## **INDONESIA**

Mr. Didi Sumedi  
 Deputy Director for Hazardous Goods and  
 Waste  
 Ministry of Trade  
 Directorate General of Foreign Trade  
 Directorate of Import  
 Jl. M.I. Ridwan Rais No.5  
 Gedung II Lt.9  
 Jakarta 10110  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: +62 21 3858171 ext 1176  
 Fax: +62 21 3858194  
 EMail: didismd@yahoo.com

Ms. Widayati Tri  
 Head of Sub-Section Ozone Layer  
 Protection for Manufacturing Sector  
 Ministry of Environment  
 J.L. Di. Panjaitan Kav. 24, A Building, 6th Floor  
 Jakarta 13410  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: +62 21 851 7164  
 Fax: +62 21 859 2521  
 EMail: tri-wadayah@menlh.go.id

Mrs. Kusmul Yani  
 Ministry of Environment  
 Jl-D1-Panjaitn Kav. 24  
 Jakarta 3410  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: +62 21 851 7164  
 Fax: +62 21 851 7164

## **IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)**

Mr. Fereidoun Rostami-Nasfi  
 Director  
 Office of the Ozone Layer Protection  
 Department of Environment  
 Ozone Office, Pardisan Park, Hemmad Highway  
 Tehran  
 Iran (Islamic Republic of)  
 Tel: +9821 88261116  
 Fax: +9821 88261117  
 EMail: ozone@accir.com

## **ITALY**

Ms. Giuliana Gasparri  
 Director  
 V. Division  
 Department for Environmental Research and  
 Development  
 Ministry of The Environment and Territory  
 Via Cristoforo Colombo 44  
 Rome 00154  
 Italy  
 Tel: +39 06 57228150  
 Fax: +39 06 57228172  
 EMail: gasparri.giuliana@minambiente.it

Mr. Alessandro Peru  
 Adviser  
 V Division  
 Department for Environmental Research and  
 Development  
 Ministry of The Environment and Territory  
 Via Cristoforo Colombo 44  
 Rome 00154  
 Italy  
 Tel: +39 06 57228166  
 Fax: +39 06 57228178  
 EMail: peru.alessandro@minambiente.it

Mr. Riccardo Savigliano  
 Adviser  
 V Division  
 Department for Environmental Research and  
 Development  
 Ministry of The Environment and Territory  
 Via Cristoforo Colombo 44  
 Rome 00154  
 Italy  
 Tel: +39 06 57228124  
 Fax: +39 06 57228178  
 EMail: savigliano.riccardo@minambiente.it

Mr. Leonardo Totaro  
Adviser  
V Division  
Department for Environmental Research and  
Development  
Ministry of The Environment and Territory  
Via Cristoforo Colombo 44  
Rome 00154  
Italy  
Tel: +39 06 57228176  
Fax: +39 06 57228172  
EMail: totaro.leonardo@minambiente.it

#### **JAMAICA**

Ms. Nicol Walker  
Manager  
National Ozone Unit  
National Environment and Planning Agency  
Ministry of Local Government and  
Environment  
10 Caledonia Avenue  
Kingston 5  
Jamaica  
Tel: +876 7547540  
Fax: +876 7547599  
EMail: nwalker@nepa.gov.jm

#### **JAPAN**

Ms. Yuko Yaguchi  
Deputy Director  
Global Environment Division  
Global Issues Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo 104 6021  
Japan  
Tel: +81 3 5501 8245  
Fax: +81 3 5501 8244  
EMail: yuko.yaguchi@mofa.go.jp

Mr. Yuki Okada  
Official  
Global Environment Division  
Global Issues Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo  
Japan  
Tel: +81 3 5501 8245  
Fax: +81 3 5501 8244  
EMail: yuki.okada@mofa.go.jp

Mr. Hitoshi Yoshizaki  
Official  
Office of Fluorocarbons Control Policy,  
Global Environment Bureau  
Ministry of Environment  
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo 100 8975  
Japan  
Tel: +81 3 5521 8329  
Fax: +81 3 3581 3348  
EMail: hitoshi\_yoshizaki@env.go.jp

#### **JORDAN**

Mr. Ghazi Odat  
Minister Adviser  
Ministry of Environment  
Amman 14100  
Jordan  
Tel: +962 6 552 1931  
Fax: +962 6 556 0288  
EMail: odat@moenv.gov.jo

Mr. Issa Alshbool  
Minister Advisor  
Ministry of Environment  
Amman  
Jordan  
Tel: +962 6 551 6822  
EMail: issaalshbool@xaho.com

#### **KAZAKHSTAN**

Mr. Syrym Nurgaliyev  
Project Assistant  
NOU  
Climate Change Coordination Centre  
Ministry of Environment Protection  
48 Abay str., Room 102  
Astana 10000  
Kazakhstan  
Tel: +7 3172 580152/53  
Fax: +7 3172 324738/322696  
EMail: snurgaliev@climate.kz

#### **KENYA**

Dr. David M. Okioga  
Coordinator  
National Ozone Unit  
P.O. Box 247-00618  
Nairobi 247-00618  
Kenya  
Tel: +254 20 7228 67651/ 0512123  
Fax: +254 20 7512 123  
EMail: dmokioga@wananchi.com

**KUWAIT**

Mr. Saud A. Aziz Al-Rashied  
 Director of Noise and Air Pollution  
 Chairman of National Ozone Committee  
 Monitoring Department  
 P.O. Box 24395 safat, no.13104  
 Khaldyia 72545  
 Kuwait  
 Tel: +965 4821278  
 Fax: +965 4820599

Mrs. Zainab Saleh  
 ODS Officer  
 Gaseous Section  
 Air Pollution  
 Environmental Public Authority  
 P.O. Box 24395  
 Safat 13104  
 Kuwait  
 Tel: +965 4821278  
 Fax: +965 4820599  
 EMail: zains@epa.org.kw

**KYRGYZSTAN**

Mr. Amanaliev Mars  
 Ozone Center Coordinator  
 Ozone Center  
 Ministry of Emergency Situations  
 2/1 Toktonaliev Str., Room 109  
 Bishkek 720055  
 Kyrgyzstan  
 Tel: +996 312 588 852  
 Fax: +996 312 548 853  
 EMail: ecoconv@elcat.kg

**LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC  
REPUBLIC**

Mrs. Keobang A Keola  
 Deputy Director General of Cabinet/ODS  
 Officer  
 Science Technology and Environment Agency  
 Prime Minister's Office  
 P.O. Box 2279  
 Vientiane  
 Lao People's Democratic Republic  
 Tel: +856 21 213 470  
 Fax: +856 21 213 472  
 EMail: keobanga@stea.gov.la

**LEBANON**

Mr. Mazen Hussein  
 Project Manager  
 Institutional Strengthening for the  
 Implementation of the Montreal Protocol  
 Ozone Office  
 Ministry of Environment  
 Lazarieh Bldg. P.O. Box 11  
 Beirut 2727  
 Lebanon  
 Tel: +961 1 976555 (Ext. 432)/ 204318  
 Fax: +961 1 418 910  
 EMail: mkhussein@moe.gov.lb

**MALAYSIA**

Ms. Kalsom Abdul Ghani  
 Air Division Director  
 Department of Environment  
 Level 1-4, Podium Block 2 & 3,  
 Lot 4G3, Precinct 4  
 Federal Government Administrative Centre  
 Putrajaya 62574  
 Malaysia  
 Tel: +603 8871 2317/2318  
 Fax: +603 8888 4151  
 EMail: kag@doe.gov.my

**MALI**

Mr. Modibo Sacko  
 Coordinateur  
 National Ozone  
 Ministere de L'Environnement et de  
 L'Assainissement  
 BPE 3114, Bamako, Rue 415  
 Porte 191 Dravela Bolibana  
 Mali  
 Tel: +223 229 3804/2410  
 Fax: +223 229 5090  
 EMail: ozone@afribonemali.net

**MAURITIUS**

Mr. Yahyah Pathel  
 Divisional Environment Officer  
 Ministry of Environment and National  
 Development Unit  
 4th Floor, Ken Lee Tower  
 Barracks Street  
 Port Louis  
 Mauritius  
 Tel: +230 212 4385  
 Fax: +230 210 0865  
 EMail: ypathel@mail.gov.mu

## MEXICO

Mr. Augustin Sanchez  
Ozone Unit Coordinator  
Air Quality General Direction Ozone Unit  
Environment and Natural Resources  
Secretariat  
Av Revolucion, No.1425// Col. Tlacopac, Sn.  
Angel  
Mexico D.F 01040  
Mexico  
Tel: +52 55 5624 3552  
Fax: +52 55 5624 3583  
EMail: [augustin.sanchez@semarnat.gob.mx](mailto:augustin.sanchez@semarnat.gob.mx)

Mr. Ives Gomez  
Director of the Gray Agenda  
Ministry of Environment and Natural  
Resources  
4209 Blvd Adolfo Ruiz Cortinez Piso 1, Ala A.  
Franc. Jardines de la Montana  
Mexico City  
Mexico  
Tel: +52 55 5490 2100  
Fax: +52 55 5624 3583  
Telex: [ives.gomez@semarnat.gob.mx](mailto:ives.gomez@semarnat.gob.mx)

Ms. Pilar Sequeiros Valdes  
Consul Legal Affairs  
Consulate General of Mexico  
2055 Peel, Suite 1000  
Montreal, Quebec H3A IV4  
Canada  
Tel: +1 514 288 2502  
Fax: +1 514 288 8287  
EMail: [psequeiros@consulmex.qc.ca](mailto:psequeiros@consulmex.qc.ca)

## MOLDOVA (REPUBLIC OF)

Mrs. Marina Mindru  
Ozone Office Assistant  
Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources  
9, Cosmonautilor Str.  
Chisinau MD 2005  
Moldova (Republic of)  
Tel: +373 22 204507  
Fax: +373 22 226858  
EMail: [egreta@mediu.moldova.md](mailto:egreta@mediu.moldova.md)

## MOROCCO

Mr. Abderrahim Chakour  
Chef de Division  
Departement du Commerce et de l'Industrie  
Quartier Administratif-Chellah  
Rabat 10000  
Morocco  
Tel: +212 37 660020  
Fax: +212 37 660021  
EMail: [abderrahimc@mcinet.gov.ma](mailto:abderrahimc@mcinet.gov.ma)

Mr. Rachid El Bouazzaoui  
Ministère de l'Industrie, du Commerce et  
de la Production Industrielle  
Division des Industries Chimiques et  
Parachimiques  
Quarter Administratif  
Rabat Chellah 1000  
Morocco  
Tel: +212 37660020  
Fax: +212 37660021  
EMail: [elbouazzaoui@mcinet.gov.ma](mailto:elbouazzaoui@mcinet.gov.ma) /  
[rachide@mcinet.gov.ma](mailto:rachide@mcinet.gov.ma)

Mr. Chouibani Mekki  
Chef de Division  
Agriculture  
DPVCTRF  
B.P. 1308  
Rabat 10000  
Morocco  
Tel: +212 37 299 931  
Fax: +212 37 297 844  
EMail: [chouibani@yahoo.fr](mailto:chouibani@yahoo.fr)

## MOZAMBIQUE

Mr. Leonardo Manuel Sulila  
National Focal Point to Vienna Convention  
and its Montreal Protocol  
Av. Acordo de Lusaka,  
2115 P.O. Box 2020  
Maputo  
Mozambique  
Tel: +258 21 462680  
Fax: +258 21 464151  
EMail: [leonardosulila@yahoo.com.br](mailto:leonardosulila@yahoo.com.br)



**NAMIBIA**

Mr. Petrus Uugwanga  
 Ozone Officer  
 Ministry of Trade and Industry  
 Namibia  
 Tel: +264 61 2837278  
 Fax: +264 61 221729  
 EMail: uugwanga@mti.gov.na

**NEPAL**

Mr. Lok Darshan Regmi  
 Joint Secretary; Chief  
 Environment Division  
 Ministry of Environment, Science and  
 Technology  
 Kathmandu  
 Nepal  
 EMail: ldregmi7@hotmail.com

**NETHERLANDS**

Ms. Marjan Van Giezen  
 Policy Coordinator  
 Ministry of Environment  
 P.O. Box 30G45 2500 GX  
 The Hague 30945  
 Netherlands  
 Tel: +31 6 295 644 04  
 EMail: marjan.vangiezen@minvrom.nl

**NEW ZEALAND**

Mr. Lesley Woudberg  
 Senior Policy Officer  
 Environment Division  
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
 195 Lambton Quay Wellington  
 Private Bag 18 901  
 Wellington  
 New Zealand  
 Tel: +64 4 439 8000/ +027 274 3389  
 Fax: +64 4 439 8517  
 EMail: lesley.woudberg@mfat.govt.nz

**NICARAGUA**

Ms. Hilda Espinoza U.  
 Directora Nacional del Proyecto  
 Directora General de Calidad Ambiental  
 Programa de las Naciones Unidas Para el  
 Desarrollo  
 Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos  
 Naturales  
 Km. 12 1/2 Carretera Norte  
 Apartado 5123  
 Managua  
 Nicaragua  
 Tel: +233 1504/+263 2830/+263 2832  
 Fax: +263 2354/2620  
 EMail: hespinoza@marena.gob.ni

**NIGER**

Mr. Sani Mahazou  
 Chef  
 Division Lutte contre les Pollutions et  
 Nuisances a la Direction de  
 l'Environnement  
 Ministere de l'Hydraulique, de  
 l'Environnement et de la Lutte Contre  
 la Desertification  
 Niger  
 Tel: +227 20733329  
 Fax: +227 20732784  
 EMail: smaliazore@intnet.ne

**NIGERIA**

Prof. Oladapo A. Afolabi  
 Director  
 Pollution Control  
 Federal Ministry of Environment  
 Plot 444, Aguiyi Ironsi Way,  
 Maitama  
 Abuja  
 Nigeria  
 Tel: +234 09 4136317  
 Fax: +234 09 4136317  
 EMail: oladapoafolabi@yahoo.com

Mr. A.K. Bayero  
Assistant Director  
National Ozone Officer  
Pollution Control Department  
Federal Ministry of Environment  
Plot 444, Aguiyi Ironsi Way,  
Maitama  
Abuja  
Nigeria  
Tel: +234 9 413 6317  
Fax: +234 9 413 5972  
EMail: kasimubayero@yahoo.com

Mr. Collins Gardner  
Executive Chairman/CEO  
Presidential Implementation Committee on  
Clean Development Mechanism  
Room 1.49, Wing 3B (1st Floor)  
Federal Secretariat Complex, Phase 1  
Shehu Shagari Way  
Abuja  
Nigeria  
Tel: +234 9 523 5963  
EMail: piccdm@yahoo.com

#### **NORWAY**

Mr. Torgrim Asphjell  
Senior Executive Officer  
Section for Climate and Energy  
Department of Industry  
Norwegian Pollution Control Authority  
P.O. Bpx 8100 Dep  
Oslo 0032  
Norway  
Tel: +47 22 57 36 52  
Fax: +47 22 67 67 06  
EMail: torgrim.asphjell@sft.no

Mrs. Alice Gaustad  
Head of Section for Climate and Energy  
Norwegian Pollution Control Authority  
P.O. Box 8100 Dep  
Oslo 0032  
Norway  
Tel: +47 22 573643  
Fax: +47 22 676106  
EMail: alice.gaustad@sft.no

Dr. Sophia Mylona  
Senior Adviser  
Section for Climate and Energy  
Department of Industry  
Norwegian Pollution Control Authority  
PO. Box 8100 Dep  
Oslo 0032  
Norway  
Tel: +47 22 573761  
Fax: +47 22 676706  
EMail: sophia.mylona@sft.no

#### **OMAN**

Ms. Moza Al-Mawali  
Ministry of Regional Municipalities,  
Environmental, and Water Resources  
Muscat  
Oman  
Fax: +968 24692928  
EMail: zuhaira39@hotmail.com ,  
mzalmawali@yahoo.com

#### **PAKISTAN**

Mr. Maqsood Muhammad Akhtar  
Deputy Programme Manager  
Ozone Cell  
Ministry of Environment  
Enercon Building, Sector G-5/2  
Islamabad 4400  
Pakistan  
Tel: +92 51 920 5884  
Fax: +92 51 920 5883  
EMail: ozoncell@comsats.net.pk

#### **PAPUA NEW GUINEA**

Mr. Gregory Lenga  
National Ozone Officer  
National Ozone Unit  
Environment and Conservation  
Government  
P.O.Box 6601, BOROKO. NCD  
Port Moresby  
Papua New Guinea  
Tel: +675 325 8166  
Fax: +675 3230847  
EMail: glenga@datec.net.pg

**PERU**

Ing. Carmen Rosa Mora Donayre  
 Directora, Jefa  
 Asuntos Ambientales de Industria  
 Oficina Tecnica de Ozono  
 Ministerio de la Produccion  
 San Isidro  
 Peru  
 Tel: +511 6162222 ext.102 / 104 / 106  
 Fax: +511 6162222 ext. 103

**PHILIPPINES**

Ms. Donna Gordove  
 Program Manager  
 Philippine Ozone Desk  
 Environmental Management Bureau  
 Dept. of Environment & Natural Resources  
 2nd Fl. HRDS Bldg., DENR Compound //  
 Visayas Ave., Diliman  
 Quezon City 1100  
 Philippines  
 Tel: +63 2 9252344  
 Fax: +63 2 9281244  
 EMail: dmgor dove@denr.gov.ph

**POLAND**

Mrs. Monika Czarnecka  
 Senior Expert  
 Ministry of Economy  
 3/5 Trzech Krzyzy Square  
 Warsaw 00-502  
 Poland  
 Tel: +48 22693 52 25  
 Fax: +48 22 693 40 25  
 EMail: monika.czarnecka@mg.gov.pl

Mr. Janusz Kozakiewicz  
 Head of Ozone Layer Protection Unit  
 Director's Plenipotentiary for Ozone  
 Layer Protection Affairs  
 Ozone Layer Protection Unit  
 Industrial Chemistry Research Institute  
 Warszawa, Rydygiera Street 8  
 Warsaw  
 Poland  
 Tel: +48 2 2568 2845  
 Fax: +48 2 2633 9291  
 EMail: kozak@ichp.pl

Mr. Ryszard Purski  
 Ministry of Environment  
 Warszawa, Waweiska Str. 5254  
 Warsaw  
 Poland  
 Tel: +48 2 2579 2425  
 Fax: +48 2 2579 2795

**QATAR**

Mr. Waleed Alemadi  
 Ozone Office Manager  
 Technical Affairs Dept.  
 Supreme Council for Environment  
 P.O. Box 7634  
 Doha  
 Qatar  
 Tel: +974 437171  
 Fax: +974 415246  
 EMail: wmemadi@qatarenv.org.qa

**REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

Mr. Sang-Woo Lee  
 Assistant Manager  
 Fund Administration  
 Korea Specialty Industry Association  
 FKI Bldg 17th, 28-1, Yoido-Dong,  
 Youngdeungpo-Gu  
 Seoul  
 Republic of Korea  
 Tel: +82 2 3775 2040(320)  
 Fax: +82 2 3775 2045  
 EMail: sangwoo@kscia.org.kr

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

Mr. Eugeny Gorshkov  
 Head of Division  
 Department for International Cooperation  
 Ministry of Natural Resources  
 Bolshaya Gruzinskaya Street, 4/6  
 Moscow 123995  
 Russian Federation  
 Tel: +7495 252 0988  
 Fax: +7495 254 82 83  
 EMail: gorshkov@mnr.gov.ru

Dr. Yakov Shatrov  
 Chief Expert  
 Roskosmos  
 Shepkina 42 Mockev  
 Moscow  
 Russian Federation  
 Tel: +7495 513 5325  
 Fax: +7495 513 5346

Mr. Evgeny F. Utkin  
First Secretary  
International Organizations Department  
Department of International Organizations  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
32/34 Smolenskaya-Sennaya Sq  
Moscow 119200  
Russian Federation  
Tel: +7495 244 49 71  
Fax: +7495 244 24 01  
EMail: eutkin@mid.ru

Mrs. Mariya Volosatova  
Chief Expert of Ecology Politic Department  
Ministry of Natural Resources  
B. Gruzinskaya Street. 4/6  
Moscow 123995  
Russian Federation  
Tel: +7495 7180230  
Fax: +7495 1242811

#### **RWANDA**

Ms. Juliet Kabera  
Focal Point of the Montreal Protocol  
Rwanda Environment Management Authority  
P.O. Box 7436  
Kigali  
Rwanda  
Tel: +55100053  
EMail: julietkabera@yahoo.co.uk ,  
rema@minitere.gov.rw

#### **SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS**

Ms. June Hughes  
Conservation Officer; National ODS Focal  
Point  
Department of Physical Planning and  
Environment  
P.O. Box 597  
Bladen Commercial Development  
Basseterre  
Saint Kitts and Nevis  
Tel: +869 465 2521 ext.1055  
Fax: +869 465 5842

#### **SAINT LUCIA**

Ms. Donnalyn Charles  
Sustainable Development and Environment  
Officer  
Sustainable Development and Environment  
Section  
Min. of Physical Development, Environment  
& Housing  
P. O. Box 709  
Castries  
Saint Lucia  
Tel: +1 758 451 8746/ 459 0492  
Fax: +1 758 453 0781  
EMail: doncharles@planning.gov.lc

#### **SAINT VINCENT & GRENADINES**

Ms. Janeel Miller  
National Ozone Officer  
Environmental Services Unit  
Ministry of Health and the Environment  
Ministerial Complex  
Kingstown  
Saint Vincent & Grenadines  
Tel: +784 4856992  
Fax: +784 4572584  
EMail: svgenv@vincysurf.com ,  
mytwoGuys@yahoo.com

#### **SENEGAL**

Mr. Ndiaye Cheikh Sylla  
Directeur  
Adjoint de l'Environnement  
Ministère de l'Environnement et de la  
Protection de la Nature  
Senegal  
Tel: +221 8210725  
Fax: +221 8336213

#### **SERBIA**

Mr. Miroslav Spasojevic  
Assistant Director  
Division for International Coop. & EU  
Integration  
Directorate for Environment Protection  
Ministry of Science and Environment  
st. Bul. Omladinskih Brigada 1  
Belgrade 11.070  
Serbia and Montenegro  
Tel: +381 11 31 31 355  
Fax: +381 11 31 31 356

**SLOVENIA**

Mr. Irena Malesic  
Undersecretary  
Air Quality Sector  
Environmental Agency of the Republic of  
Slovenia  
Vojkova 1b  
Ljubljana  
Slovenia  
Tel: +386 1 478 4455  
Fax: +386 1 478 4052  
EMail: irena.malesic@gov.si

**SOMALIA**

Dr. Hassan Haji Abukar  
Acting Permanent Secretary  
Ministry of Environment and Disaster  
Management  
Baidoa  
Somalia  
Tel: +2521 986 343 / 2525 528 838  
EMail: hassanhaji@hotmail.com/  
banadarlinks114@hotmail.com/  
abaayoow@yahoo.com

**SOUTH AFRICA**

Mr. Samuel Manikela  
Acting Director  
Air Quality Management: Ozone Layer  
Protection  
Department of Environmental Affairs and  
Tourism  
Private Bag X 447  
Pretoria 0001  
South Africa  
Tel: +27123103911  
Fax: +27123222682

**SPAIN**

Mr. Alberto Moral Gonzalez  
Technical Expert  
SDG Calidad Del Aire y Prevencion De  
Riesgos  
DG Calidad y Evaluacion Ambiental  
Ministerio De Medio Ambiente  
Plaza San Juan De La Cruz S/N  
Madrid 28071  
Spain  
Tel: +34 91 597 68 49  
Fax: +34 91 597 59 55  
EMail: amoral@mma.es

**SRI LANKA**

Mr. Chandana Amaratunga  
Director (Lab Services)  
Environmental Pollution Control  
Central Environmental Authority  
104 Denzil Kobbekadula Mawatha  
Battaramulla  
Sri Lanka  
EMail: ck@cea.lk

Dr. W. L. Sumathipala  
Director  
Coordinator of Montreal Protocol  
National Ozone Unit  
Ministry of Environment and Natural  
Resources  
"Parisara Piyasa" 104, Robert Gunawardena  
Road  
Battaramulla  
Sri Lanka  
Tel: +9411 2871764  
Fax: +9411 2887455  
EMail: sumathi2@sri.lanka.net

**SUDAN**

Dr. Abdel Ghani A. Hassan  
National Ozone Coordinator  
Ministry of Industry  
Khartoum  
Sudan  
Tel: +2491 83765601/83 78 7617  
Fax: +2491 83761468  
EMail: sudanozone@yahoo.com/  
abdelghanihassan@hotmail.com

**SURINAME**

Mr. Cedric Nelom  
Director/National Ozone Officer  
Office of Environmental Monitoring &  
Enforcement  
National Institute for Environment and  
Development in Suriname (NIMOS)  
Onafhankelijkheidsplein no.2  
Paramaribo  
Suriname  
Tel: +597 520 043/045  
Fax: +597 520042  
EMail: info@nimos.org , cnelom@nimos.org

## SWAZILAND

Mr. Mboni Dlamini  
Senior Environmental Officer  
Focal Point  
Vienna Convention and the Montreal  
Protocol  
Ministry of Tourism, Environment, and  
Communications  
P.O. Box 2652  
Mbabane  
Swaziland  
Tel: +268 404 6420/404 7893  
Fax: +268 404 1719  
EMail: seabiodiv@realnet.co.sz ,  
mboni\_dlamini@yahoo.co.uk

## SWEDEN

Dr. Husamuddin Ahmadzai  
Principal Executive Officer  
Department of Enforcement and  
Implementation  
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency  
SE-106 48  
Stockholm  
Sweden  
Tel: +468 698 1145/ +46708166945  
Fax: +468 698 1602/ 1345  
EMail:  
Husamuddin.Ahmadzai@naturvardsverket.se

Mrs. Sofia Tingstorp  
Desk Officer  
Ecological Management and Chemicals  
Ministry of Sustainable Development  
S-103 33 Stockholm  
Stockholm 10333  
Sweden  
Tel: +46 8 405 21 76  
Fax: +46 8 613 30 72  
EMail: sofia.tingstorp@sustainable.ministry.se

Ms. Maria Ujfalusi  
Senior Administrative Officer  
Department of Enforcement and  
Implementation  
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency  
SE-106 48  
Stockholm  
Sweden  
Tel: +46 8 698 1140  
Fax: +46 8 698 1222  
EMail: maria.ujfalusi@naturvardsverket.se

## SWITZERLAND

Mr. Blaise Horisberger  
Biocides et Produits Phytosanitaires  
Office Federal de l'Environnement  
Bern 3003  
Switzerland  
Tel: +41 31 322 9024  
Fax: +41 31 324 7978  
EMail: blaise.horisberger@bafu.admin.ch

## SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. Khaled Klaly  
Coordinator  
National Ozone Unit  
Ministry of Local Administration and  
Environment  
Syrian Arab Republic  
Tel: +963 11 3314393  
Fax: +963 11 3314393  
EMail: syrozu@mail.sy

Mrs. Najah Al Hamwwi  
Ministry of Local Administration and  
Environment  
Mazrra Street  
Damascus  
Syrian Arab Republic  
Tel: +963 11 331 4393  
Fax: +963 11 331 7393  
EMail: syro3u@mail.sy

## TAJIKISTAN

Dr. Abdukarim Kurbanov  
NOU Coordinator  
Department of Hydrometeorology  
Ozone Programme of the State Committee on  
Environment Protection and Forestry  
50, Dehoti Street  
Dushanbe 734055  
Tajikistan  
Tel: +992 372 341 207/992 372 254 193  
Fax: +992 372 252 818  
EMail: abdu\_karim@rambler.ru

## THAILAND

Ms. Peeraphan Buranasomphob  
Department of Industrial Works  
Ministry of Industry  
75/6 Rachatawee Rd.  
Bangkok 10400  
Thailand

Mrs. Sumonman Kalayasiri  
Deputy Permanent Secretary  
Office of Permanent Secretary  
Ministry of Industry  
Rama 6 Road, Phya Thai, Rachathewe  
Bangkok 10400  
Thailand  
Tel: +662 202 3221  
Fax: +662 202 3222  
EMail: sumonman@dinigo.th

Ms. Puangpaka Komson  
Director Export Plant Quarantine Service  
Department of Agriculture  
50 Paholyothin Road, Chatuchak, 1  
Bangkok 10900  
Thailand  
Tel: +662 9406007  
Fax: +662 5793576  
EMail: puangpaka\_koms@yahoo.com

Ms. Wassana Leksomboon  
Scientist  
Department of Industrial Works  
Ministry of Industry  
75/6 Rama Vird, Rajthevee  
Bangkok  
Thailand  
Tel: +66 2 202 4207  
Fax: +66 2 202 4015  
EMail: wassana@diw.go.th

Mrs. Somsri Suwanjaras  
Director  
Ozone Layer Protection Division  
Treaties and International Strategies  
Bureau  
Department of Industrial Works  
Thailand  
Tel: +662 202 4228  
Fax: +662 202 4015  
EMail: ozone@ozonediw.org

## **THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA**

Mr. Marin Kocov  
Manager  
Ozone Unit  
Ministry of Environment and Physical  
Planning  
Drezdenska 52  
Skopje 1000  
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia  
Tel: +389 2 3066 929  
Fax: +389 2 3066 929  
EMail: ozonunit@unet.com.mu

## **TOGO**

Mr. Bougonou K. Djeri-Alassani  
Juriste Specialise en Gestion des  
Ressources Naturelles et de  
l'Environnement  
Directeur de l'Environnement  
Ministere de l'Environnement et des  
Ressources Forestieres  
B.P. 12877  
Lome  
Togo  
Tel: +228 2213321/89181315  
Fax: +228 2210333/214604  
Telex: +228 2215197  
EMail: bdjeri@yahoo.fr

## **TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO**

Ms. Marissa Gowrie  
National Ozone Officer  
National Ozone Unit  
Environment Management Authority  
#8 Elizabeth Street St. Clair  
Port of Spain  
Trinidad and Tobago  
Tel: +1 868 628 8042 ext.2266  
Fax: +1 868 628 9122  
EMail: mgowrie@ema.co.tt

## **TUNISIA**

Dr. Hassen Hannachi  
Chef du Département Technique  
Agence Nationale de Protection de  
l'Environnement  
Ministère de l'Environnement et du  
Développement Durable  
Centre Urbain Nord immeuble ICF 2080 Ariana  
Tunisie  
Tel: +216 71 231813  
Fax: +216 71 231960  
EMail: dt.dep@anpe.nat.tn

## **TURKEY**

Mrs. Hatice Rezzan Katircioglu  
Air Management Department  
Ministry of Environment and Forestry  
Sogutozu Cad. No:14/E Bestepe  
Ankara 6560  
Turkey  
Tel: +90312 2076295  
Fax: +90312 2076446  
EMail: rezzank@yahoo.com

## **TURKMENISTAN**

Mrs. Pursiyanova Marianna  
Secretary  
National Ozone Unit  
Ministry of Nature Protection  
75 Azadi Street  
Ashgabat 744000  
Turkmenistan  
Tel: +99 312 357 091  
Fax: +99 312 357 493  
EMail: vverveda@online.tm

## **UGANDA**

Ms. Margaret Aanyu  
Environment Impact Assessment Officer  
Ozone Desk Officer  
National Environment Management Authority  
(NEMA)  
NEMA-House, Plot 17/19/21 Jinja Road  
P.O. Box 22255  
Kampala  
Uganda  
Tel: +256 41 251064/342785/9  
Fax: +256 41 257521/232680  
EMail: maanyu@nemaug.org ,  
magaanyu@hotmail.com

## **UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND**

Mr. Stephen Reeves  
Policy Advisor  
GA3-Ozone Layer Protection and  
Fluorinated Greenhouse Gases  
DEFRA  
Zone 3A3 Ashdown House  
123 Victoria Street  
London SW1E 6DE  
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern  
Ireland  
Tel: +4420 7082 8168  
Fax: +4420 7082 8143  
EMail: stephenreeves@defra.gsi.gov.uk

## **UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA**

Mr. Julius Enock  
Industrial Engineer  
Division of Environment  
Vice President's Office  
P.O. Box 5380  
Dar es Salaam  
United Republic of Tanzania  
Tel: +255 22211 3983  
Fax: +255 222125 297  
EMail: juliuse@hotmail.com

## **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Mr. Daniel A. Reifsnyder  
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for  
Environment  
Department of State(COES/E)  
Environmental Protection Agency (EIA)  
D.C. 20520-7818  
Washington D.C. 2201  
United States of America  
Tel: + 1 202 647 2232  
Fax: +1 202 647 0217  
EMail: reifsnyder@state.gov

Mr. John Thompson  
Division Director  
U. S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW.  
Washington, D.C. 20520  
United States of America  
Tel: +202 647 9799  
EMail: thompsonje2@state.gov



Mr. Tom Land  
 Manager International Programs  
 Stratospheric Protection Division  
 Office of Atmospheric Programs  
 U.S. EPA  
 Mail Code 6205J, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue  
 Washington DC 20460  
 United States of America  
 Tel: +202 343 9185  
 Fax: +202 343 2362  
 EMail: land.tom@epa.gov

Mr. Jeffrey Klein  
 Attorney-Adviser  
 Office of the Legal Adviser  
 U. S. Department of State  
 2201 C St., NW  
 Washington, D.C. 20520  
 United States of America  
 Tel: +202 647 1370  
 Fax: +202 736 7115  
 EMail: kleinjm@state.gov

Mr. Burleson Smith  
 Director, Pest Management Policy  
 Office of the Secretary  
 United States Department of Agriculture  
 14th and Independence Avenue SW  
 Washington, DC 20250  
 United States of America  
 Tel: +202 720 2889  
 Fax: +202 720 9622

Mr. Jeff Cohen  
 Stratospheric Protection Division  
 Office of Atmospheric Programs  
 U.S. EPA  
 Mail Code 6205J, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue  
 Washington D.C. 20460  
 United States of America  
 EMail: cohen.jeff@epa.gov

Ms. Hodayah Finman  
 Team Leader  
 Stratospheric Protection Division  
 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW (6205J)  
 Washington 20009  
 United States of America  
 Tel: + 202 343 9246  
 Fax: + 202 343 2338  
 EMail: finman.hodayah@epa.gov

Ms. Cindy Newberg  
 US EPA  
 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. 6205J  
 Washington 20460  
 United States of America  
 Tel: +202-343-9729  
 Fax: +202-343-2337  
 EMail: newberg.cindy@epa.gov

Dr. Christine Augustyniak  
 Economist  
 Environmental Protection Agency  
 1200 Pennsylvania Ave NW  
 Washington 20460  
 United States of America  
 Tel: +703 308 8091  
 Fax: +703 308 8091

Mr. Steve Bernhardt  
 Honeywell  
 101 Columbia Road  
 Morristown, NJ 07962  
 United States of America  
 Tel: +973 455 6294  
 Fax: +973 455 3222  
 EMail: steven.bernhardt@honeywell.com

Mr. Tony Digmanese  
 York International Corporation  
 631 S. Richland Avenue, MC 361P  
 York 17403  
 United States of America  
 Tel: +717 771 7017  
 Fax: +717 771 6820  
 EMail: tony.digmanese@york.com

Mr. John Mandyck  
 Vice President  
 Government and International Relations  
 1 Carrier Place  
 Farmington 6034  
 United States of America  
 Tel: +860 674 3006  
 Fax: +860 674 3139  
 EMail: john.m.mandyck@carrier.utc.com

Mr. Mack McFarland  
 DuPont Fluoroproducts  
 Chestnut Run Plaza 702-2330A // 4417  
 Lancaster Pike  
 Wilmington, DE 19805  
 United States of America  
 Tel: +302 999 2505  
 Fax: +302 999 2816  
 EMail: Mack.McFarland@usa.dupont.com

Mr. Jeff Moe  
Trane  
2701 Wilma Rudolph Blvd.  
Clarksville, TN 37040  
United States of America  
Tel: +931 221 3770  
Fax: +931 648 5901  
EMail: Jeff.Moe@trane.com

Ms. Holly Stevens  
Manager  
Federal Relations  
Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric  
Policy  
Halotron, Inc. American Pacific  
Corporation  
1806 Main Street  
Georgetown 78626  
United States of America  
Tel: +512 863 2579  
Fax: +512 863 3415  
EMail: hstevens@texas.net

Mr. Tom Werkema  
Arkema  
2000 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
United States of America  
Tel: +215 419 7851  
Fax: +215 419 7057  
EMail: tom.werkema@arkemagroup.com

Mrs. Suzanne Werkema  
Arkema  
2000 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
United States of America  
Tel: +215 419 7851  
Fax: +215 419 7057  
EMail: tom.werkema@arkemagroup.com

Mr. James Wolf  
American Standard  
1501 Lee Highway, Suite 140  
Arlington, VA 22209  
United States of America  
Tel: +703 525 4015  
Fax: +703 525 0327  
EMail: asdwolf@aol.com

Mr. Dave Stirpe  
Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric  
Policy  
2111 Wilson Building 8th Floor, Arlington,  
Virginia 22201  
United States of America  
Tel: +1 973 456 6294  
Fax: +1 703 242 2874

Mr. Julian deBullet  
Director of Industry Relations  
McQuay  
479 Baldwin Road  
Front Royal, VA 22630  
United States of America  
Tel: +1 703-395-5054  
Fax: +1 540-636-4992  
EMail: julian.debullet@mcquay.com

Ms. Danielle Grabiell  
Campaigner  
Environmental Investigation Agency, Inc.  
P.O. Box 53343  
Washington 20009  
United States of America  
Tel: +202 483 6621  
Fax: +202 986 8626  
EMail: daniellegrabiell@eia-international.org

Mr. David D. Donniger  
Policy Director  
Natural Resources Defence Council  
Climate Center  
1200 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: +202 289 2403  
Fax: +202 789 0859  
EMail: ddoniger@nrdc.org

Mr. Alexander Von Bismarck  
Campaigns Director  
Environmental Investigation Agency, Inc.  
P.O. Box 53343  
Washington 20009  
United States of America  
Tel: +202 483 6621  
Fax: +202 986 8626  
EMail: saschavonbismarck@eiainternational.org

Mr. Jerry Kestenbaum  
REFRON, Inc.  
38-18 33rd Street  
Long Island City, NY 11101  
United States of America  
Tel: +718 392 8002  
Fax: +718 392 8006  
EMail: jerry@refron.com

Mr. Richard Marcus  
Rem Tec International  
1100 Haskins Road  
Bowling Green, OH  
Holland, Ohio 43402  
United States of America  
Tel: +1 419 867 8990  
Fax: +1 419 867 3279  
EMail: richard.marcus@remtec.net

#### **URUGUAY**

Ing. Luis Santos  
Coordinator  
National Ozone Unit  
National Environment Directorate  
Ministry of Environment  
Galicia 1133, Piso 3  
Montevideo 11100  
Uruguay  
Tel: +598 2 917 0710, Ext. 4306  
Fax: +598 2 917 0710, Ext. 4321  
EMail: lsantos@cambioclimatico.gub.uy

#### **UZBEKISTAN**

Mrs. Nadejda Dotsenko  
Chief  
Main Department of Air Pollution  
State Committee for Nature Protection  
99, A. Temura Street  
Tashkent 00084  
Uzbekistan  
Tel: +99871 1449116  
Fax: +99871 1207129/+99871 1357920  
EMail: ozon@tkt.uz

#### **VIET NAM**

Mr. Tan Pham Van  
Assistant of Vice Minister  
Ministry of Natural Resources and  
Environment  
83 Nguyen Chi Thanh  
Hanoi  
Viet Nam  
Tel: +849 12287998  
Fax: +844 8359221  
EMail: pvtan@monre.gov.vn

#### **ZAMBIA**

Mr. Mathias Banda  
National Ozone Coordinator  
National Ozone Unit  
Environmental Council  
PO Box 35131  
Corner Suez / Church Road  
Lusaka 10101  
Zambia  
Tel: +2601 254130 / 1/+254023/59  
Fax: +2601 254164  
EMail: mbanda@necz.org.zm

#### **ZIMBABWE**

Mr. George Chaumba  
Ozone Project Manager  
National Ozone Unit  
Environment  
Ministry of Environment and Tourism  
P. Bag 7753, Causeway // Harare, Zimbabwe  
Harare  
Zimbabwe  
Tel: +263 4 701681 3  
Fax: +263 4 252673/ 701551  
EMail: ozone@ecoweb.co.zw

## ADVISORS

### TECHNOLOGY AND ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT PANEL

Dr. Stephen O. Andersen  
Co-Chair TEAP  
Climate Protection Partnerships Division  
Director of Strategic Climate Projects  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
6202J 1200 Penn. Ave. N.W.  
Washington DC 20460  
United States of America  
Tel: +202 343 9069  
Fax: +202 343 2379  
E-Mail: andersen.stephen@epa.gov

Dr. Lambert Kuijpers  
Co-Chair TEAP  
Senior Scientist  
Co-Chair Refrigeration, Air-conditioning and  
Heat-pump  
TOC  
Sustainable Technology  
Technical University Pav O24  
P.O. Box 513  
Eindhoven 5600MB  
Netherlands  
Tel: +31 49 2 47 63 71  
Fax: +31 40 2 46 66 27  
E-Mail: lambermp@planet.nl

Mr. Ian Rae  
Co-Chair Chemical TOC  
16 Bates Drive  
Williamstown 3016  
Australia  
Tel: +61 3 9397 3794  
Fax: +61 3 9397 3794

Mr. Masaaki Yamabe  
Co-Chair, Chemical TOC  
Research Coordinator  
AIST (Nat'l Inst. of Advanced Ind. Sci. & Tech.)  
Umezono 1-1-1, AIST Central 2,  
Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8568  
Japan  
Tel: +81 29 862 6032  
Fax: +81 29 862 6048  
E-Mail: m-yamabe@aist.go.jp

Mr. Nick Campbell  
Member of Chemicals TOC  
Arkema SA  
Environment Manager  
4-8 Cours Michelet La Defense 10  
Paris 92091  
France  
Tel: +3314900 8476  
Fax: +3314900 5307

Mr. Paul Ashford  
Co-Chair Foams TOC  
Caleb Management Services  
Principal Consultant  
The Old Dairy, Woodend Farm Cromhall,  
Wotton-under-Edge  
Gloucestershire GL 12 8AA  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 1454 269 330  
Fax: +44 1454 269 197  
E-Mail: Paul@Calebgroup.net

Mr. Miguel Quintero  
Co-Chair Foams TOC  
Chemical Engineering Department  
Universidad de los Andes  
Calle 19 No. 1-37 Else  
Bogota  
Colombia  
Tel: +595 952 1500  
Fax: +595 952 1500  
E-Mail: miquinte@uniades.edu.co

Dr. Daniel Verdonik  
Co-Chair Halons TOC  
Environmental Programs  
Director  
3610 Commerce Drive # 817  
Baltimore, Maryland 21227  
United States of America  
E-Mail: danv@haifire.com

Mr. Ian Porter  
Co-Chair Methyl Bromide TOC  
Primary Industries Research Victoria  
Department of Primary Industries  
Knoxfield Centre 612 Burwood Highway,  
knoxfield  
Australia  
Tel: +61 3 9210 9222  
Fax: +61 3 9800 3521  
E-Mail: j.porter@dpi.vic.gov.au

**RESOURCE UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES OR PROGRAMMES****UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)**

Dr. Suely Carvalho  
Chief  
Montreal Protocol Unit, UNDP  
304 East 45th Street, FF -974  
New York 10017  
United States of America  
Tel: +1 212 906 6687  
Fax: +1 212 906 6947  
E-Mail: [suely.carvalho@undp.org](mailto:suely.carvalho@undp.org)

Mr. William Kwan  
Deputy Chief  
Montreal Protocol Unit, UNDP  
304 East 45th Street, FF -974  
New York 10017  
United States of America  
Tel: +1 212 906 5150  
Fax: +1 212 906 6947  
E-Mail: [william.kwan@undp.org](mailto:william.kwan@undp.org)

Mr. Anil Bruce Sookdeo  
Programme Specialist/Regional Coordinator  
Montreal Protocol Unit, UNDP  
Regional Centre in Bangkok, 3rd Floor United Nations  
Service Building,  
Bangkok 10200  
Thailand  
Tel: +66 2 288 2718  
Fax: +66 2 288 3032  
E-Mail: [anil.sookdeo@undp.org](mailto:anil.sookdeo@undp.org)

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)  
DIVISION OF TECHNOLOGY, INDUSTRY AND ECONOMICS**

Mr. Atul Bagai  
Regional Network Coordinator for South Asia  
Regional Office for Asia/Pacific  
Compliance Assistance Programme  
UN Building, Rajdamnern Avenue  
Bangkok 10200  
Thailand  
Tel: +662 288 1662  
Fax: +662 280 3829, 288 3041  
E-Mail: [bagai@un.org](mailto:bagai@un.org)

**UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE**

Mr. Stelios Pesmajoglou  
Programme Officer  
Adaptation, Technology and Science Programme  
UNFCC  
P.O. Box 260 124,  
D-53153  
Bonn  
Germany  
Tel: +49 228 815 1000  
Fax: +49 228 815 1999

**UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANISATION (UNIDO)**

Mr. Sidi Menad Si Ahmed  
Director  
Multilateral Environmental Agreements Branch, UNIDO  
C/O Vienna International Center  
P.O. Box 300, Wagramerstre. 5, A-1400  
Vienna A-1400  
Austria  
Tel: +43 1 26026 3782  
Fax: +43 1 26026 6804  
E-Mail: [s.si-ahmed@unido.org](mailto:s.si-ahmed@unido.org)

**WORLD BANK**

Mr. Viraj Vithoontien  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
Environment Department, The World Bank  
Montreal Protocol Operations  
1818 H Street, N.W.  
Washington DC 204333  
United States of America  
Fax: +202 522 3258  
E-Mail: [vvithoontien@worldbank.org](mailto:vvithoontien@worldbank.org)

## MULTILATERAL FUND SECRETARIAT

Ms. Maria Nolan  
Chief Officer  
Multilateral Fund Secretariat  
1800 McGill College Avenue, 27th Floor  
Montreal, Quebec H3A 3J6  
Canada  
Tel: +514 282 1122  
Fax: +514 282 0068  
E-Mail: [maria.nolan@unmfs.org](mailto:maria.nolan@unmfs.org)

Mr. Stephan Sicars  
Senior Programme Officer  
Multilateral Fund Secretariat  
1800 McGill College Avenue, 27th Floor  
Montreal, Quebec H3A 3J6  
Canada  
Tel: +1 514 282 1122  
Fax: +1 514 282 0068

## SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT PANEL (SAP)

Prof. Ayite-Lo Ajavon  
Member, Regional Committee  
Regional Office for Africa  
International Council for Science (ICSU)  
Pretoria 13252  
South Africa  
Tel: +228 225 5094  
Fax: +228 221 8595  
E-Mail: [noajavon@tg.refer.org](mailto:noajavon@tg.refer.org)

## OZONE SECRETARIAT

Mr. Marco Gonzalez  
Executive Secretary  
Ozone Secretariat  
United Nations Environment Programme  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi 00100  
Kenya  
Tel: +254 20 7623885  
Fax: +254 20 7624691/2/ 3  
E-Mail: [Marco.Gonzalez@unep.org](mailto:Marco.Gonzalez@unep.org)

Ms. Megumi Seki  
Senior Scientific Officer  
Ozone Secretariat  
United Nations Environment Programme  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi 00100  
Kenya  
Tel: +254 20 7623452  
Fax: +254 20 7624691/2/ 3  
E-Mail: [Meg.Seki@unep.org](mailto:Meg.Seki@unep.org)

Mr. Gerald Mutisya  
Database Manager  
Ozone Secretariat  
United Nations Environment Programme  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi 00100  
Kenya  
Tel: +254 20 7624057  
Fax: +254 20 7624609/1/2/ 3  
E-Mail: [Gerald.Mutisya@unep.org](mailto:Gerald.Mutisya@unep.org)

Ms. Martha Leyva  
Communications Officer  
Ozone Secretariat  
United Nations Environment Programme  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi 00100  
Kenya  
Tel: +254 20 7625129  
Fax: +254 20 764691/2/ 3  
E-Mail: [Martha.Leyva@unep.org](mailto:Martha.Leyva@unep.org)