

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro.3/Bur/2/3  
22 November 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

BUREAU OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE  
PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Second meeting  
Copenhagen, 21 November 1992  
Agenda item 5

REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE THIRD  
MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The second meeting of the Bureau of the Third Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol was held at the Bella Center, Copenhagen, on 21 November 1992, to review the terms of reference for the assessment panels and to consider various reports by working groups and committees established under the Montreal Protocol, as well as the documents for the Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

A. *Opening of the meeting*

2. In the absence of the President of the Third Meeting, Mr. Ojwang K'Ombudo (Kenya), the meeting of the Bureau was opened by the Vice-President of the Third Meeting, Mr. Eduardo Lopez (Venezuela), who also acted as Chairman of the meeting.

B. *Attendance*

3. The meeting was attended by:

(a) The following members of the Bureau of the Third Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol:

Vice-Presidents: Mr. Peter Chin Fah Kui (Malaysia)  
Mr. Ryszard Purski (Poland)  
Mr. Eduardo Lopez (Venezuela)

Rapporteur: Mr. John A. Whitelaw (Australia)

(b) The following officer of an organ established by the Contracting Parties:

Mr. Omar El-Arini, Chief Officer, Fund Secretariat, Interim Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

(c) Ms. Laura Campbell (Deputy Coordinator, Ozone Secretariat), who also acted as Secretary of the Meeting.

## II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

4. The following agenda, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.3/Bur/2/1, was adopted:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Adoption of the agenda.
3. Substantive matters:
  - (a) Terms of reference of the assessment panels;
  - (b) Reports of the seventh and eighth meetings of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties;
  - (c) Report of the fourth meeting of the Implementation Committee;
  - (d) Report of the eighth meeting of the Executive Committee of the Interim Multilateral Fund;
  - (e) Documents for the Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.
4. Other matters.
5. Adoption of the report.
6. Closure of the meeting.

## III. SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS

### A. *Terms of reference of the assessment panels*

5. The Secretariat said that the terms of reference of the assessment panels were discussed in its note prepared for the Bureau meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.3/Bur/2/2, paras. 2-13) and were also the subject of a number of draft decisions to be submitted to the Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (UNEP/OzL.Pro.4/L.1 and Add.1, draft decisions IV/12 and IV/22 to 25).

6. The Chairman pointed out that, because of its mandate, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel had had a great deal of work to accomplish and expressed the hope that it would continue to discharge its task in the way that it had been doing.

7. The Chief Officer of the Interim Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol said that the Fund Secretariat had not been called upon to take part in the peer reviews of the assessment panels' reports. Pointing to the errors concerning the Fund contained in those texts, he expressed the hope that the Fund Secretariat would be included in future peer reviews.

8. Agreeing with the Chief Officer that the Fund Secretariat should be included in the peer-review process for the assessment panel reports, the Chairman said that the Fund report on meeting the needs of Article 5 Parties for controlled substances during the grace and phase-out periods (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/8/25 and Add.1) should be given due consideration.

9. One Vice-President sought clarification regarding the source of

authority for the panels' work and the reason why, according to the note by the Secretariat (UNEP/OzL.Pro/Bur/2/2, para. 3), the panels were to update their 1991 reports for the Seventh Meeting of the Parties, even before they had been considered by the Fourth Meeting. He also asked whether, in the three years between the Fourth and Seventh Meetings, there would be any other reports produced that might have a bearing on the Parties' decisions. He suggested that it would be useful for the Parties to know in advance what reports were expected and over what timeframe.

10. Another Vice-President said that, in view of the deteriorating state of the ozone layer, it was essential that interim reports be made available. He proposed that such reports prepared under the auspices of the Montreal Protocol would be particularly useful in explaining the situation to an anxious public that might be sceptical of assurances given by its national Government.

11. The Rapporteur said that it would be helpful if the Secretariat made available the schedule of work of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on a year-by-year basis. He also sought clarification on how the dates in the assessment panels' terms of reference had been arrived at: the first two major review meetings had been held at two-year intervals, while the next was to be in three years' time.

12. The Chief Officer of the Interim Multilateral Fund noted that if the Fund Secretariat had to wait three or four years for the report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, it would have only outdated information available to it and would find it impossible to prepare credible project proposals for submission to the Executive Committee of the Fund.

13. Replying to the points raised by one Vice-President, the Chairman said that the assessment panels' mandate derived from two sources. First, under Article 6 of the Protocol, the assessment panels were to provide information and advice to the Parties, at least every four years, for possible adjustments and amendments to the Protocol. The previous two reports had shown a need to shorten the intervals, but it was up to the Parties to decide when they wanted them. The second source of the assessment panels' mandate lay in decisions adopted by the Parties calling for additional information and requesting the panels to prepare new studies or update existing ones. Some of these studies could be prepared for the next Meeting, while others requiring a long period of time had to be requested well in advance.

14. The Secretariat agreed that the publication of a schedule would be a good idea to show the panels' workload and help clarify matters. With regard to the three-year lapse between assessment reports, the overall Chairman of the Assessment Panels had indicated that he did not currently anticipate that the pace of development of new scientific data would necessitate the issuance of a new report in less than three years. If, however, additional data emerged, the Scientific Assessment Panel could issue an earlier report.

15. On the proposal of the Chairman, the Bureau decided:

(a) To take note of the terms of reference of the assessment panels;

/...

(b) To request the Secretariat to issue for Meetings of the Parties periodic schedules of the work of the assessment panels;

(c) That consideration should be given to the possibility of preparing interim reports for all assessment panels, which could serve as a basis for decisions of the Executive Committee of the Interim Multilateral Fund.

*B. Reports of the seventh and eighth meetings of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties*

16. The Chairman said that the report of the seventh meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol was before the Bureau as document UNEP/OzL.Pro/WG.I/7/4. The report of the eighth meeting was not yet available but would be submitted to the Group upon completion of its substantive work.

17. On the proposal of the Chairman, the Bureau decided to take note of the report of the seventh meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol and to request the Secretariat to submit the report of the eighth meeting to the Bureau when it next met. Emphasizing that it had not had the opportunity to consider the completed report of the eighth meeting, the Bureau also decided to approve its transmittal to the Fourth Meeting of the Parties.

*C. Report of the fourth meeting of the Implementation Committee*

18. The Secretariat drew the attention of the Bureau to the report of the fourth meeting of the Implementation Committee (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/4/2), which had been held in Geneva on 10 September 1992 to consider, *inter alia*, the report of the Secretariat on the reporting of data by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (UNEP/OzL.Pro.4/6 and Corr.1). One concern expressed by the Committee was the number of Parties not reporting complete data: only 27 had done so for all three years (1986, 1989 and 1990). It was also evident that a number of countries operating under Article 5 of the Protocol were encountering difficulties in gathering and reporting data. Indeed, one of the purposes of the meeting had been to bring together representatives of the Fund Secretariat and the implementing agencies of the Interim Multilateral Fund to seek ways of helping to improve the data-reporting capabilities of Parties to the Protocol. Turning to the data reported, the Secretariat pointed out that, for Parties not operating under Article 5, there had been a decline of more than 33 per cent in consumption of the controlled substances in Group I of Annex A, while there had been an overall increase in consumption of controlled substances by Parties operating under that Article. That increase was, however, allowed under the Protocol.

19. On the proposal of the Chairman, the Bureau took note of the report of the fourth meeting of the Implementation Committee.

*D. Report of the eighth meeting of the Executive Committee of the Interim Multilateral Fund*

20. On the proposal of the Chairman, the Bureau took note of the report of the eighth meeting of the Executive Committee of the Interim Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/8/29).

21. The Rapporteur, supported by all other members of the Bureau, said that the clarity and value of the reports of the Secretariat of the Interim Multilateral Fund should be recognized, along with the commendable and worthwhile efforts deployed by its Chief Officer.

E. *Documents for the Fourth Meeting of the Parties  
to the Montreal Protocol*

22. The Chairman stressed the usefulness of the documentation in the preparation of the Fourth Meeting of the Parties and expressed his appreciation to the Secretariat for the early distribution of many documents, which was a most positive development.

23. On the proposal of the Chairman, the Bureau decided to take note of the documents for the Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

IV. OTHER MATTERS

24. There were no other matters.

V. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

25. The Secretariat said that, as in the past, it would send the draft report to the members of the Bureau for their comments and would finalize it in the light of the comments made.

VI. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

26. The Chairman declared the second meeting of the Bureau of the Third Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol closed at 3.10 p.m. on Saturday, 21 November 1992.

-----