2nd Session

United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/WG.69/10
1 February 1982

Original: ENGLISH

Ad Hoc Working Group of Legal and Technical Experts for the Elaboration of a Global Framework Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer

Stockholm, 20-28 January 1982

Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Legal and Technical Experts for the Elaboration of a Global Framework Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer on its First Session

Rapporteur: Dr. R.E. Silva Y Silva (Peru)

A. INTRODUCTION

1. By its decision 9/13 B of 26 May 1981, the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) decided to initiate work aimed at the elaboration of a global framework convention for the protection of the ozone layer and to this end to establish an ad hoc working group of legal and technical experts nominated by interested Governments and intergovernmental organizations, which is to report, through the Executive Director, to the Governing Council on the progress of its work. The fifth preambular paragraph of the decision stressed the desirability of a convention that would cover monitoring, scientific research and the development of the best available and economically feasible technologies to limit and gradually reduce emissions of ozone-depleting substances, as well as the development of appropriate strategies and policies. At the same time the Governing Council requested the Executive Director:

"(a) To ensure that in the work so initiated, all relevant information and related work currently under way in other forums, as well as the results of any discussions on this subject at the Ad Hoc Meeting of Senior Government Officials Expert in Environmental Law, are taken into account,

(b) To invite the Co-ordinating Committee on the Ozone Layer, as part of its activities under its mandate:

(i) To contribute to the work of the ad hoc working group,

(ii) To compile all relevant information, including statistical and technical data, on the implementation of the recommendations contained in decision 8/7 B of 29 April 1980, in particular that relating to reduction in the use of chlorofluorocarbons 11 and 12, as well as to production capacity on the basis of an agreed definition,..."

In the same decision the Governing Council welcomed the offer of the Swedish Government to host the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

2. In pursuance of the above decision, the Ad Hoc Working Group of Legal and Technical Experts for the Elaboration of a Global Framework Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer met in Stockholm from 20 to 28 January 1982. Experts from the following States participated in the Meeting: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Congo, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Observers from Iran, Mexico and the USSR were also present. In addition, representatives of the following international organizations participated in the Meeting: WHO, OECD, WMO, EEC. The list of participants is attached to this report as Annex I.

3. The Meeting was opened by Dr. Mostafa K. Tolba, Executive Director of UNEP. Mr. Anders Dahlgren, the Swedish Minister for Agriculture and the Environment, welcomed, on behalf of the Swedish Government, participants to Stockholm and to the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group. He recalled that 1982 was the tenth anniversary year of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held in Stockholm. UNEP had been established as a direct result of that Conference. Sweden had been an active supporter of UNEP since its inception and the fact that the Meeting was being held in Stockholm was a reflection of Sweden's continued commitment to UNEP and to global environmental co-operation. The international community had been alerted as early as in the mid 1970s to the potentially serious hazards to mankind resulting from depletion of the stratospheric ozone layer. In Sweden, as well as in some other countries, the use of chlorofluorocarbons had been banned as a propellant in spray-cans. Other countries had agreed on limitations affecting production and production capacity of such substances. Sweden had been very gratified by the decision by the Governing Council at its 9th Session in 1981 to initiate work aimed at the elaboration of a global framework convention for the protection of the ozone layer. The serious hazards to all manking and to the biological production capacity of the earth, which would result from a depletion of the ozone layer, were a truly global threat and must therefore be a matter of global concern. If and when a global convention for the protection of the ozone layer came into force, it would represent a major break-through in international environmental co-operation, in the sense that the world community would have declared its determination to take action before a serious global environmental threat materialized, i.e. preventive global action instead of the remedial action taken hitherto. Sweden was fully aware of the fact that the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group was a modest first step in a time-consuming and perhaps cumbersome process. It was Sweden's sincere hope that the meeting would result in a solid foundation being laid for the future work required.

4. Dr. Mostafa K. Tolba, Executive Director of UNEP, stressed in his opening statement that all the most reliable scientific evidence pointed to the fact that the earth's protective ozone layer was being and, more importantly, would continue to be depleted by chlorofluorocarbons and other chemicals, unless the international community took preventive action. The urgent task now before the Meeting was to create a framework that would make that action effective. Dr. Tolba expressed his gratitude for the Swedish initiative, which would provide a test of UNEP's effectiveness in a catalytic role. After describing the history of UNEP's efforts to deal with the question of protecting the ozone layer, which should continue in the future as well, he stressed the need for developing and preparing the ground so that - should it become necessary - a concerted and co-operative effort could be mounted to ensure that the present problem was not aggravated by further indiscriminate and unnecessary pollution of the atmosphere. In order to achieve that goal the Governing Council had decided at its ninth session in May 1981 that work aimed at the elaboration of a global framework convention for the protection of the ozone layer should be started. To that end it had decided to establish an ad hoc working group of legal and technical experts nominated by interested governments and inter-governmental organizations. The group now meeting in Stockholm was to report, through him, to the Governing Council on the progress it had made. He then described the preparatory work requested of him by the Governing Council and he drew the attention of participants to the documents prepared for the Meeting. He added that the Meeting also had before it a draft text of a framework convention prepared jointly by Finland, Norway and Sweden. He thanked the three Governments for their initiatives. He then offered his preliminary views on the structure and certain general provisions of the draft. He welcomed the flexibility involved in the development of a framework convention with annexes and/or protocols. With regard to the general provision of the draft, he commented upon institutional arrangements possibly involving UNEP that: (i) the existing mechanisms should be fully utilized to support the Contracting Parties in the sound implementation of the convention; (ii) it was necessary to obtain the widest possible co-operation of States and competent international bodies and organizations; (iii) with regard to the possible role of UNEP as the secretariat of the proposed convention there was a range of financial and administrative requirements which UNEP would be prepared to provide information on, if and when appropriate. He then suggested to the Meeting the adoption and use of the Governing Council's rules of procedure, mutatis mutandis, which the meeting accepted.

5. The Group elected the following Officers for the Bureau:

Chairman - Mr. G. Svenson (Sweden)
Vice-Chairman - Dr. D.R. King (USA)
Rapporteur - Dr. R.E. Silva y Silva (Peru)

6. The elected Chairman, Ambassador G. Svenson, emphasized in his acceptance speech the major objectives that the Meeting would try to fulfill. Firstly, he voiced his conviction that the Meeting should lay down the foundation for the elaboration of a global framework convention for the protection of the ozone layer. Such a basis should, as a minimum requirement, include basic agreement on the structure and format of a framework convention, possibly also including agreement on the institutional arrangements and the scientific

components regarding monitoring and assessment. He was also of the opinion that it would be instructive to have an informal discussion on the content and format of the technical annexes. Secondly, he felt that the report must include recommendations on the agenda and venue of the next meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group and the preparations for the meeting. In conclusion, he suggested the method of work of the Group.

7. The Group adopted its agenda, which appears in Annex II to this report. It was agreed that an informal committee of the whole should be established to deal with agenda item 5 in order to facilitate a preliminary exchange of views. In that connexion it was also noted that the experts participated in the discussion in their individual capacity and that the views and opinions expressed did not represent any formal commitments on the part of their Governments.

B. DELIBERATIONS OF THE GROUP ON THE ELABORATION OF A GLOBAL FRAMEWORK CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE OZONE LAYER

8. The Group then proceeded to the consideration of technical and legal aspects of the problem of ozone depletion. Concerning technical aspects, special presentations were made by experts on the following topics:

- "Ozone monitoring, trend analysis and possible climatic effects" by Dr. R. Bojkov,
- "Chemical and atmospheric modelling" by Dr. R.G. Derwent,
- "Alternative technologies and socio-economic aspects" by Dr. S. Weil,
- "Biological effects of ozone depletion" by Prof. J.C. van der Leun.

These presentations demonstrated that considerable activities aimed at clarifying various aspects of the ozone question had been undertaken by a number of States and member organizations. In addition, participants benefited from written information from the UNEP Co-ordinating Committee on the Ozone Layer (CCOL), WMO and WHO relating to the ozone issue.

9. Following the technical presentations, the Group considered informally general policy objectives and approaches with regard to the elaboration of an international convention for the protection of the ozone layer. It was stressed that a global convention should be proposed, as the problem of ozone depletion was truly of a global nature and would thus require co-operation on the part of a large number of States. This was the reason why invitations to nominate experts to participate in the present meeting had been extended to all member States of the United Nations. It was considered essentialy, therefore, to encourage wider participation by government appointed experts in the work of the Group. It was accepted that there is uncertainty about effects on the ozone layer of a number of substances and about the extent to which the earth's shield against UV-B radiation may be depleted and the extent to which climatic

effects may result. Nonetheless there was agreement that precautionary action is necessary for the sake of man and the environment. Some experts thought that the present evidence of risk warranted early regulatory and preventative measures at the international level relating to certain specific aspects of the problem. Other experts considered that the evidence did not point to the need for such action and the present international co-operation should therefore mainly relate to improving the assessment of sources, trends and effects of ozone perturbation. It was noted that the benefits of some substances which may deplete the ozone layer should be taken into account.

10. The flexible approach involved in the development of a framework convention, possibly with annexes and/or protocols, was supported by the Group and considered necessary in order to allow the accomodation of scientific knowledge and policy alternatives as they became available. Possible technical annexes and/or protocols would contain provisions aimed at controlling specific types of actions or substances where scientific assessment justified the need for such measures and where reasonable alternative technologies existed. In that connexion, several experts amphasized the importance of the need to take due account of the economic impact of ozone depletion control measures. With regard to institutional arrangements, the Group expressed the view that the existing mechanisms should be taken advantage of, to the extent possible, bearing in mind financial considerations.

11. The Group agreed to discuss four main categories of provisions to be included in the convention, namely (a) specific forms of co-operation, (b) basic obligations, (c) institutional arrangements, and (d) structure, format and other provisions, using the text prepared by Finland, Norway and Sweden wherever appropriate.

(a) Specific forms of co-operation

12. The Group agreed that the convention should contain provisions for increased co-operation and the exchange of information on monitoring, research, modelling, assessment, and development. Under each of these topics, the Group listed those subjects it thought most important:

Monitoring of

(i) the status of the ozone layer, (i.e. total amount and vertical distribution) as currently measures by the WMO Global Ozone Observing System (GOOS), which included surface-based remote-sensing instruments, rocket- and balloon-borne ozone-sondes and satellite-borne instrumentation, and constant level balloon flights,

(ii) the chemical trace constituents of the atmosphere that were necessary for understanding and preparing model estimates of the status of the ozone layer, (e.g. nitrogen, hydrogen and chlorine families, CFCs, methane, CO2 and aerosol particles),

(iii) the dynamic, thermodynamic and radiative parameters necessary for an understanding of the interaction between the photochemistry and dynamics of the atmosphere (e.g. temperature, pressure and solar flux),

(iv) the solar irradiance at the earth's surface in the ultra-violet range with biological effects (UV-B) (The irradiance should best be measured as a function of wavelength and in conjunction with measurements of total ozone),

(v) the incidence of skin cancers,

(vi) the global production, release, and use of ozone-affecting substances (Some important substances at present are the chlorofluorocarbons, methyl chloroform, and carbon tetrachloride).

(vii) the quality of ozone and trace constituent measures through intercomparison of surface, balloon-, rocket- and satellite-borne instrumentation.

The Group noted the increasing requirement for the forwarding of data to appropriate data centres, for the archiving and distribution of all forms of data relating to monitoring, and for intercomparison activities as mentioned above. It was also noted that to optimize the surface-based monitoring system would require a minimum additional financial obligation. Balloon overflights required the co-operation of those countries overflown.

Research on:

(i) the effects of ultra-violet radiation on humans, agriculture, terrestrial and aquatic eco-systems, and on forests. These efforts should include studies of wavelength dependence and derivation of action spectra, as well as epidemiological studies relating effects to exposure and dosage;

(ii) improved instrumentation for dosage and for UV-B irradiance as a function of wavelength);

(iii) climate change due to ozone depletion, and the associated climatic-change effects on humans, terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, agriculture, and forestry;

(iv) the evaluation of trends in time series, in particular relating to ozone data, and methods for attributing changes in ozone data to specific causes;

(v) the chemistry and dynamics of the stratosphere, including photochemical research (It would be helpful if countries would co-operate in establishing a capability for quick response in measuring the effect of large volcanic eruptions on the ozone layer);

(vi) computational models that estimate ozone distribution using information on emissions of chemicals and on the chemsitry and dynamics of the atmosphere,

(vii) the economic and social effects of various controls and regulatory action taken.

Information Exchange

13. The meeting recognized that there were several types of information that needed to be exchanged, in particular: scientific information (including research and assessment reports), aggregated data on production, uses, and emission of chlorocarbons, technological information on substitutes and alternatives, information on national administration and law, and socio-economic information, such as cost-benefit analyses, risk assessments of alternative strategies and impacts of regulatory actions. Certain information should also be disseminated to the public in order to increase its awareness of the problem.

14. In this respect, the Group brought up several problems on information exchange that would have to be dealt with, in particular the fact that some data were confidential or proprietory, that data from some parts of the world were not presently available, and that different countries had different constraints on the disclosure of information.

15. The Group heard from its technical experts that socio-economic information included such topics as the costs of the effects of possible ozone depletion on health and agriculture, forestry and fisheries production, the costs and benefits of alternative technologies and inhibition of man's activities, energy consumption, and their international trade implications.

It was also noted that measures to reduce or limit the use of CFCs should not be adversely affected by imports.

Technology transfer

16. Some experts stated that two key points should be kept in mind, namely that:

(i) there were some technologies making it possible to replace CFCs. Whereas the cost of these technologies varied their implementation did give rise to socio-economic problems. It would therefore seem easier, especially in developing countries, to adopt new technology rather than to convert existing equipment and facilities;

(ii) it would be appropriate to consider provisions to facilitate the licensing and sale of alternate technologies to other countries.

17. It was noted that the problems of confidentiality, patents, and government constraints affecting the import and export of technology had to be considered, as well as the higher costs of alternative technologies for developing countries. It was further noted that developing countries would also need training and special manuals or guides to the technologies provided.

18. Many participants expressed the need for enabling developing countries to obtain special training for their technical staff.

(b) Basic obligations

19. There was broad agreement that the objective of the convention was to

protect man and his environment from adverse effects caused by the depletion of the ozone layer. A number of experts stated that they could accept the provision proposed in the draft text prepared by Finland, Norway and Sweden. Other experts were of the view that an objective under the fundamental obligation under the convention could be to endeavour to take appropriate measures with regard to ozone perturbing substances, as the need arose. It was also mentioned that in respect of the wording of a basic obligation it would be convenient to keep the wording that the Nordic countries had used in the Ad Hoc Meeting of Senior Government Officials Expert in Environmental Law, which read:

> "To limit, reduce and prevent activities which have or are likely to have adverse effects upon the stratospheric ozone layer." +/

20. Some experts were of the opinion that the fundamental obligation to protect man and his environment from adverse effects caused by depletion of the ozone layer should be formulated in the operative part of the convention. Some other experts thought that this obligation should find its place either in both the preamble and the body of the convention or in the annexes and/or protocols. In elaborating the fundamental obligation of the convention the terms "the ozone layer" and "adverse effects by depletion" would need be precisely defined. In this regard the relevance of principle 21 of the Stockholm Declaration was mentioned as the basis for the fundamental obligation to protect the ozone layer. It was generally agreed that in drafting a convention a clear distinction should be made between that fundamental obligation and obligations to take specific measures. There was also broad agreement that appropriate relevant legislative, administrative, technical and other measures should be taken, with due account of the rights and responsibilities laid down in principle 21 of the Stockholm Declaration.

(c) Institutional arrangements

21. There was general agreement that the secretariat function would be provided within the framework of UNEP. It was mentioned, however, that that undertaking should be in conformity with UNEP's catalytic and co-ordinating role. Concerning the functions of the secretariat it was considered that they should be restricted to administrative functions. It was also suggested that the undertaking of scientific and technical studies should be left to CCOL, or, as the case may be, to a scientific-technological committee.

22. The question of the institutional arrangements in the field of science and technology received much attention. There was a consensus on the desirability of using, as far as possible, the expertise of CCOL and on the need to avoid duplication of work between CCOL and any proposed new scientific-technological committee or other bodies. Several possible alternatives were proposed: (i) the merger of the two bodies, with the amendment of CCOL's mandate so that it could serve as the scientific advisory body to the convention, supplemented by an extended bureau for proposing policy recommendations to meetings of the Conference of the Parties, or (ii) the establishment of supplementary scientific or technological bodies in addition to CCOL, or (iii) having CCOL serve the Conference of the Parties directly. A consensus was ultimately established that the scientific activities of CCOL should be expanded to include socio-economic

---

+/ UNEP/GC.10/5/Add.2, Appendix I.

and technological aspects. While reassurance was given that CCOL could be adapted to assume the role envisaged for the scientific-technological committee, it was argued, on the other hand, that there might be some legal problems concerning the present composition of CCOL, whose members included non-State entities, whereas the proposed technical organ under the convention would consist only of the Parties to the convention. Attention was drawn to the possible precedent value of articles 9 and 10 of the ECE Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution and article 11 in the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). It was further mentioned that the rules of procedure of the Conference of the Parties might help to solve these problems. There was general agreement that the separate functions of assessment, formulation of recommendations, and policy decisions needed to be distinguished, with assessment assigned to CCOL and policy decisions to the Conference of the Parties.

23. The view was expressed that the role, under the convention, of the United Nations specialized agencies, other inter-governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations should be determined more clearly. The outstanding role of WMO in the field of monitoring and research of the ozone layer was particularly emphasized.

24. The Group agreed that there should be a Conference of the Parties. It was proposed that the convention should provide for the convening of the first meeting of the Conference at a determined time after the convention's entry into force and that the Conference itself should decide on the convening of further meetings. Some experts proposed that an interim institutional mechanism should be devised before the entry into force of the convention.

(d) Structure, format and other provisions

25. With regard to provisions for the settlement of disputes it was also accepted that some sort of provision on this matter was needed. Some experts proposed that all disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the convention should be settled by negotiations, good offices, or mediation by a third Contracting Party, but if the parties concerned could not settle their dispute by these means, the dispute should, by common agreement, be referred to an ad hoc tribunal, to an arbitrator, or to the International Court of Justice. On the other hand, many experts expressed the view that it was premature to discuss provisions on the settlement of disputes at the present stage. Many experts felt that Article 13 of the ECE Convention on Transboundary Air Pollution was more succinct and appropriate as a model. Other experts held the view that analogous provisions on the settlement of disputes in the following instruments should be used as a model in elaborating such provisions: Article 279 of the Draft Convention on the Law of the Sea, Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations and Article 10 of the London Ocean Dumping Convention.

26. It was stressed by several experts that there was a need to provide for annexes and/or protocols which would contain specific provisions on regulatory measures to be adopted under the convention. Some experts felt that such provisions should be regarded as an integral part of the convention and included in one or more annexes to it. Some experts noted, however, that it would be more appropriate to adopt protocols which would enable the Contracting Parties to the convention to decide whether they wished to become parties to those

protocols as well. Mention was made of the procedures adopted in the Barcelona Convention on the Protection of the Mediterranean against Pollution, which might offer a precedent. There was agreement in the Group, however, that, whichever approach was adopted, it would be necessary to leave some flexibility to individual countries in deciding on the concrete national measures to be adopted and that it was also important to ensure that the basic objectives of the convention could not be thwarted.

27. The Group was informed that an informal group of some experts had already considered the contents of possible annexes and/or protocols to the Convention based on measures already being implemented in some countries.

28. The view was also expressed that reservations to the convention should not be permitted. Others felt, however, that it would be difficult to exclude reservations altogether. It was agreed that it would be difficult to be precise concerning reservations till such time as the final content of a Convention became clear.

29. As regards the question of amendments to a convention and possible annexes and/or protocols thereto, many experts were of the opinion that these should be adopted by consensus, rather than by a two thirds majority which was favoured by a number of other experts. One expert mentioned the possibility of non-CFC producing countries amending a convention against the will of all the CFC producing countries, if no more than a two thirds majority were required. Another expert pointed out that amendments would only come into force for a contracting party if it accepted them.

30. It was suggested by some experts that tacit consent procedure for amendments should be included in a convention. A number of experts, however, considered that this expedited procedure could not be acceptable, save for matters of a formal, technical character.

31. Some experts pointed to the need for any amendments to be subject to a requirement to take due account of relevant scientific and technical considerations.

32. Furthermore, the view was expressed that special provisions may be required in a convention for amendments or entry into force of possible protocols, or in adoption of or amendment to, possible annexes, in order to reflect the special interests of Contracting Parties who might assume major obligations under protocols and/or annexes.

33. Concerning the entry into force of amendments and possible new annexes, an interval of 90 rather than 60 days was suggested.

34. One expert, speaking on behalf of the experts from the European Economic Community, outlined relevant EEC activities in the field of the protection of the ozone layer and suggested that the future convention should be open for signature not only to States but also to regional economic integration organizations which have competence in respect of this subject. One expert was of the opinion that such a provision would require careful study. Other experts stressed that the organizations in question should only include inter-governmental integration organizations.

C. FUTURE WORK

35. With reference to future work, the Group considered possible steps to be taken in preparation of its second session, should the Governing Council decide that such a meeting should be held, and adopted the following recommendations to be submitted to the Executive Director:

Recommendations for the future work of the Ad Hoc Group

36. During its first meeting the Ad Hoc Group recommended that the following tasks should be undertaken by the secretariat in preparation of the next meeting of the Group:

(i) Preparation of a new text of a draft framework convention based on comments and proposals made during the first meeting on the structure, format and elements of the convention and containing alternative provisions and commentaries as required.

(ii) The new draft convention together with the report of the first session of the Group should be sent by UNEP to all member States of the United Nations along with invitation to a second session of the Group.

(iii) The new draft should also be sent to the members of CCOL for comments on scientific and technical aspects and on institutional aspects and machinery for scientific/technical input to the convention. These should be returned by a date to be determined by the Secretariat.

(iv) A special paper should be prepared by UNEP on the institutional arrangements of a convention, in particular on the role and functions of UNEP, should that arrangement be preferred. Financial, logistical and practical implications for UNEP should be highlighted.

(v) A discussion paper on alternative structures and formats for technical annexes and/or protocols should be prepared, indicating the respective implications of each.

(vi) Provision of a discussion paper on the procedures and limitations of assessing socio-economic impact of alternative strategies for protection of man and the environment from adverse effects of depletion of the ozone layer. If it is not possible to introduce this document at a second session of the Group, it should be ready for a subsequent meeting.

(vii) Provision of a discussion paper on the need for and difficulties relating to the transfer, between countries, of technology and knowledge relating to activities concerning production, use and emissions which may affect the ozone layer.

(viii) Future meetings of the Group should be provided for as necessary. The next meeting of the Group should be arranged, if feasible, in the early autumn of 1982, at a place to be decided upon. The main objective of the next meeting would be to elaborate further a draft convention, in the light of additional information and comments received, and also to discuss

strategies for supplementing the draft convention through technical annexes and/or protocols.

(ix) Special efforts should be made to encourage participation by more countries in the work of the Group."

The Group noted that the above recommendations would have financial implications but it felt that their consideration fell outside its terms of reference.

D. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

37. The expert from Switzerland informed the Group that if it was decided to hold a further session of the Special UNEP Working Group, Switzerland would be prepared to make the Centre International de Genève available free of charge, as was customary, between 18 September and 3 October 1982. The Group took note with gratitude of the generous offer by the Swiss Government to host its second session.

38. At the closing of the meeting, the representative of the Executive Director, speaking on behalf of the Executive Director, thanked the Government of Sweden for hosting the first session of the Ad Hoc Working Group in such excellent conditions. After customary exchange of courtesies, the Chairman declared the session closed.

Annex I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

EXPERTS

ALGERIA

Kemal Ilés
Ministre Conseiller
Embassy of Algeria

ARGENTINA

Roberto Bianchi
First Secretary
Embassy of Argentina

AUSTRALIA

Kevin Michael Rudd
Third Secretary
Embassy of Australia

AUSTRIA

Ernst Bobek
Director
Bundersministerium für Gesundheit
und Umweltschutz

BELGIUM

Dirk Lettens
Counsellor
Embassy of Belgium

CANADA

Alexander James Chisholm
Director
Atmospheric Environment Service

D.W. Smith
Head, Environmental and
Fisheries Law Section
Department of External Affairs

Mohan A. Prabhu
Senior Counsel
Department of Environment

James B. Kerr
Research Scientist
Atmospheric Environment Service

CONGO

G. Mabouana
Présidence de la République

C. Moka
Ministère des Affaires Etrangés

DENMARK

Jakob Rytter
Head of Department
The Ministry for Foreign Affairs

Jörgen Hartnack
Counsellor
Ministry for Foreign Affairs

Henri Heron
Chemical Engineer
Agency of Environmental Protection

Gert Birnbacher
Head of Section
Miljøstyrelsen

FINLAND

Antti Kulmala
Director of Department
Finnish Meteorogolical Institute

Holger Rothkirch
Assistant Director
Legal Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Seppo Sarkkinen
Planner
Department of Environmental Protection
Ministry of Interior

Martti Koskenniemi
Attaché
Legal Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Esa Tommila
Counsellor
Environmental Protection
Confederation of Finnish Industries

FRANCE

Helene Dubois
Conseiller des Affaires Etrangés
Ministeře des Relations extérieur

Jean Delamain
Chargé de mission
Ministère de l'Environnement

Jean Luc Florent
Secretaire Ad Joint des Affaires Etrangés
Ministère des Relations extérieur

GERMANY, Federal Republic of

Hermann Wentker
Charge d'Affairs a.i.
Embassy of Germany, Federal Republic of

Rüdiger von Lukowitz
Counsellor
Embassy of Germany, Federal Republic of

Roland Schulze
Director
Bundersministerium für Wirtschaft

Ralf Schaaf
Scientific Counsellor
Umweltbundesamt

Thomas Bunge
Scientific Counsellor
Umweltbundesamt

ITALY

Stefano Rasterlli
Counsellor
Embassy of Italy

Maurizio Cignitti
Research Scientist
Istituto Superiore di Sanita

Mario Gatta
Research Scientist
Ministry of Scientist Research

JAPAN

Kenji Nakai
Public Prosecutor
United Nations Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Kazuaki Mori
Head of Section
Environmental Health Department, Environment Agency

Tetsuo Nishide
Head of Section
Chemical Products Division, Basic Industries Bureau
Ministry of International Trade and Industry

Shuishi Nakamura
Second Secretary
Embassy of Japan

KUWAIT

A.R. AL-Naser
Head of Department
Kuwait University
Physics Department

M.Y. Abdul Raheem Ali
Head of Division of Environmental Pollution

THE NETHERLANDS

Willem Kakebeeke
Deputy Director International Affairs
Ministry of Health and Environmental Protection

Jan C. van der Leun
Professor of biophysics
State University of Utrecht

Vokert Keizer
Ministry of Health and Environmental Protection

NIGERIA

O.A. Ashiru
Counsellor
Embassy of Nigeria

NORWAY

E. Lykke
Director General
Ministry of Environment

Richard Pedersen
Counsellor
Ministry of Environment

PERU

Rosa Esther Silva y Silva
Counsellor
Embassy of Peru

PHILIPPINES

O.G. Valenzuela
Charge d'Affairs a.i.
Embassy of Philippines

Orlando B. Medrano
Chief Legal Officer
National Environmental Protection Council
Ministry of Human Settlements

SENEGAL

Babacar Mbaye
Counsellor
Embassy of Senegal

SWEDEN

Göte Svenson
Ambassador
The County of Administration of Östergötland

Olof Köhl
Chief Legal Officer
Ministry of Agriculture

Lars Björkbom
Deputy Director
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Bertil Hägerhäll
Head of Section
Ministry of Agriculture

Ingrid Jedvall
Head of Section
Environment Protection Board

Ingrid Kökeritz
Head of Division
Environment Protection Board

Kaj Mannheimer
Head of Section
Ministry or Foreign Affairs

Per Olding
Assistant justice of appeal
Ministry of Agriculture

Sture Persson
Counsellor
Swedish Embassy, Nairobi

Henning Rodhe
Professor
University of Stockholm

Bertil Roth
Head of Section
Ministry for Foreign Affairs

I. Svanström
Head of Section
Ministry of Agriculture

SWITZERLAND

P. Duerst
Deputy Director
Federal Office for Environmental Protection

Thomas Wernly
Counsellor
Embassy of Switzerland

Christoph Rentsch
Scientific Counsellor
Federal Office for Environmental Protection

Peter Soland
Representative Swiss Aerosol Association

UNITED KINGDOM

Peter Burgess
Central Directorate on Environmental Pollution
Department of the Environment

Richard Derwent
Environmental and Medical Sciences Division
AERE Harwell

Patrick Széll
Legal Directorrate
Department of the Environment

USA

Donald R. King
Director
Office of Environmental and Health Affairs

Scott Alan Hajost
Attorney-Adviser
Oceans, International Environmental and Scientific Affairs
Department of State

Judith A. Nelson
Special Assistant
Office of Pesticides and Toxic Substances
EPA

Judy Kosovich
Chemical Engineer
EPA

EEC

Erwan Fouéré
Commission of the European Communities
Directorate General for Environment,
Consumer Protection and Nuclear Safety

George Strongylis
Commission of the European Communities
Directorate General for Environment,
Consumer Protection and Nuclear Safety

H. Schmidt-Ohlendorf
Director
Council of the European Communities
Secretariat General

Francois Baron van Hövell tot Westervlier
Council of the European Communities
Secretariat General

WHO

Eugene Komarov
Medical Officer

OECD

Stephen R. Weil
Administrator

WMO

Rumen D. Bojkov
Chief, Meteorological Research Programme
World Climate Programme

UNEP

Mostafa K. Tolba
Executive Director

Francesco Sella
Director, GEMS PAC

Rudolf Engelmann
Deputy Director, Environment Assessment Service

Borut Bohte
Chief, Environmental Law Unit

Sachiko Kuwabara
Programme Officer, Environmental Law Unit

Iwona Rummel-Bulska
Consultant

Carmen Barros
Conference Affairs Officer

OBSERVERS

IRAN

Saghafi-Ameri Nasser
First Secretary
Embassy of Iran

MEXICO

Fernando Escamilla
Counsellor
Embassy of Mexico

USSR

Vladimir Gordeev
Second secretary
Embassy of USSR

Annex II

Agenda

1. Opening of the meeting

2. Election of officers

3. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

4. Presentation of technical aspects of ozone layer depletion and its impact and general debate

5. Initiation of work aimed at the elaboration of a global framework convention for the protection of the ozone layer

6. Other business

7. Adoption of the report

8. Closure of the meeting.