



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: General
13 October 2008

Original: English



**Eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the
Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer**

**Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the
Montreal Protocol on Substances that
Deplete the Ozone Layer**

Doha, 16–20 November 2008

Items 4–5 of the provisional agenda of the preparatory segment*

**Issues for discussion by and information of the Conference of the
Parties to the Vienna Convention at its eighth meeting and the
Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol**

Note by the Secretariat

Addendum

Introduction

1. Chapter I of the present addendum summarizes further work related to the forthcoming joint meeting completed after the preparation of the Secretariat's note (UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/2-UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/2) and prior to 17 October 2008. This includes the supplemental work of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on replenishment and methyl bromide, in addition to work undertaken by the Secretariat on essential uses. The note also includes updates on the agenda items related to essential uses, projected regional imbalances of halons and Technology and Economic Assessment Panel administrative issues. Additional information expected from the Panel on essential uses, special hydrochlorofluorocarbon (HCFC) uses and carbon tetrachloride, together with any new proposals received from the Parties, will be posted on the Secretariat's website and transmitted to the Parties as soon as possible following receipt.

2. Chapter II to the present addendum also includes additional information on matters that the Secretariat would like to bring to the attention of the Parties, including Secretariat missions, administrative matters and Montreal Protocol matters that relate to other forums.

* UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/1-UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/1

A. Agenda item 4 (a) (i): Presentation and consideration of the supplemental report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel replenishment Task Force

3. After considering the report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on replenishment, the Open-ended Working Group at its twenty-eighth meeting requested the Panel to investigate a number of specific issues and to present its findings in the form of a supplemental report. That report was made available on the Secretariat's website on 1 October 2008 and sent to Parties soon thereafter. It includes a separate chapter on each of the issues that the Open-ended Working Group requested the Panel to investigate. Its executive summary summarizes the discussions and findings in chapters 3–12 of the report and has been made available in its entirety in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/6.

B. Agenda item 4 (b): Environmentally sound disposal of ozone-depleting substances (proposals by Argentina, the European Community, the Federated States of Micronesia and Mauritius)

4. At the previous meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, the contact group on destruction and banks submitted a report that reviewed the discussions that had taken place in that group and presented a proposal by its co-chairs for the consideration of the Parties. The contact group report also contained requests for comments on the proposal and for information from Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 on the level of contaminated or confiscated chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and halons that those Parties had stored in banks and ready for destruction. As regards the request for data on banks of CFCs and halons, the Secretariat received responses from 30 Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5, all of which were sent to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel for its consideration in the context of the Parties' request on destruction and replenishment.

5. As regards the proposal of the co-chairs, the Secretariat received comments from a regional economic integration organization and five Parties. Those submissions touched on a wide range of issues, such as whether chemicals in addition to CFCs and halons might be considered for early destruction; the need to ensure that action on destruction did not serve as a perverse incentive for more production or as a disincentive for recycling; the need to consider redeployment of contaminated and confiscated ozone-depleting substances, the need to follow international rules in the transport of contaminated ozone-depleting substances; the need to clarify whether the current mandate of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol was fully compatible with the funding action contained in the co-chairs' proposal; the need to consider other specific options for funding destruction and to acquire further information on which options might be the most cost-effective; the need to ensure close cooperation with the secretariats of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal; the need to acquire further information on the amount of unwanted ozone-depleting substances and the reasons why they were unwanted; and the need to consider a working group with appropriate expertise to review possible funding options.

6. The Secretariat has passed the comments received to the co-chairs of the contact group, and, to the extent that it has received the approval of those Parties submitting comments, has made the submissions available on the Secretariat's website for the direct consideration of all Parties as UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/INF/6.

C. Agenda item 4 (c) (i): Use of CFC-113 in the aerospace industry in the Russian Federation

7. Further to the Parties' request to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to prepare a report on possible alternatives to the use of CFC-113 in aerospace applications that were the subject of the Russian Federation's exemption request for 2009, the Panel has

assembled a team of two experts who are scheduled to travel to the Russian Federation from 6 to 10 October. The Panel will present a report on the findings of this mission to the Parties in Doha.

D. Agenda item 4 (c) (ii): Nominations for 2009 and 2010 for essential-use exemptions

8. Subsequent to the essential-use exemption presentation made by the Medical Technical Options Committee at the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, the Committee held discussions with nominating Parties and others on the nominations. After further deliberations, the European Commission submitted a revision that lowered its nomination from 38 tonnes to 22 tonnes and provided additional information justifying its remaining request. In addition, the United States of America submitted a revision of its initial nomination withdrawing 90 tonnes of requested exemptions for two CFC-based metered-dose inhaler formulations and submitted additional information in support of its request for an exemption of 92 tonnes of CFCs for the over-the-counter use of CFC-based epinephrine inhalers. The Panel is considering the newly submitted material.

E. Agenda item 4 (c) (iii): Essential uses and campaign production of CFCs for metered-dose inhalers

9. During the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, the contact group established to consider essential-use issues requested the Secretariat to review all relevant decisions on essential uses to extend their applicability to essential-use nominations submitted by Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5. The Secretariat's efforts to fulfil this request are detailed in document UNEP.OzL.Pro.20/8. The contact group also invited Parties to submit comments on the issues raised in the contact group report to the Secretariat by 15 August. In that regard, the Secretariat received a comment from one Party, which was passed on to the co-chairs of the contact group, and posted on the Secretariat's website for the Parties' consideration.

F. Agenda item 4 (d) (i): Nominations for 2009 and 2010 for critical-use exemptions

10. During the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee presented its initial recommendations on the new nominations that it had received for critical-use exemptions for 2009 and 2010. Following a discussion of those nominations in plenary, the Committee met bilaterally with nominating Parties to exchange views and further information related to the nominations. Through an iterative process the Committee received the further information that it required to carry out its second round of evaluation.

1. Nominations for soil applications

11. Japan submitted new information to the Committee that was used to reassess nominations for cucumbers, peppers, melons and watermelons. New information was presented by the United States of America, including on the continuing work on re-registration of iodomethane and revision to the amounts in nominations for peppers, ornamentals, strawberries and tomatoes. The nominations made by Japan and the United States were reassessed at the second meeting of the Soils Subcommittee.

12. In the 2008 round, 31 nominations were submitted by five Parties (Australia, Canada, Israel, Japan and the United States): 12 nominations totalling 697.048 tonnes for 2009 and 19 nominations totalling 3,485.298 tonnes for 2010. In the final assessment, the Subcommittee has recommended 608.454 tonnes for 2009 and 3,297.8 tonnes for 2010.

2. Nominations for application in structures and commodities

13. Further information was received from Australia on its nomination for rice, Canada for its pasta manufacturing and the United States for its commodities and mills and processors. The Quarantine, Structures and Commodities Subcommittee reassessed the relevant nominations, together with Canada’s nomination for flour mills and parts of the commodities nomination of the United States that could not be assessed during the interim evaluation.

14. In the 2008 round, 10 nominations were submitted by five Parties (Australia, Canada, Israel, Japan and the United States): three for 2009 totalling 7.14 tonnes and seven totalling 270.606 tonnes for 2010. In the final assessment, the Quarantine, Structures and Commodities Subcommittee recommended 7.14 tonnes for 2009 and 269.436 tonnes for 2010.

2008 round of nominations by Parties and final Committee recommendations

Party	Nominations		Final Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee recommendations	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
Australia		37.610		36.44
Canada	4.740	30.340	4.74	30.34
Israel	699.448		610.554	
Japan		288.500		267.000
United States		3 399.490		3 233.456
Total	704.188	3 755.940	615.594	3 567.236

3. Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee 2009 workplan

15. In addition to reviewing the critical-use nominations, the final report on critical-use nominations includes on pages 73–75 the Committee’s proposed 2009 workplan, together with a request for Parties to consider providing additional funding to enable the effective operation of the Committee in carrying out the evaluation of critical use nominations.

G. Agenda item 4 (g) (ii): Regional imbalances in respect of halons

16. No further submissions have been received to date by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, its Halons Technical Options Committee or the Secretariat since the previous meeting of the Open-ended Working Group that would warrant any changes to the report on this issue presented at that meeting. As a result, if new information should come to light, the Panel will tackle the issue in its 2009 report to the Parties.

H. Agenda item 4 (h): Technology and Economic Assessment Panel administrative issues

17. In accordance with paragraphs 2.2 and 2.3 of the terms of reference of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, decisions on co-chairs of the technical options committees must be approved by a Meeting of the Parties. The Panel is recommending the selection of Mr. Sergey Kopylov of the Russian Federation as a co-chair of the Halon Technical Options Committee. The proposal to name Mr. Kopylov, who has extensive experience in related matters, has been shared with the Russian Federation. The Parties may wish to consider taking action on this selection, which, if approved, should take the form of a decision of the Meeting of the Parties.

18. As mentioned in paragraph 15 above, the final report on critical-use nominations included an indicative budget for consideration by the Parties for additional funding of \$24,500 for activities related to critical-use nominations. The Panel also mentioned at the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, when reporting on its progress in the preparation pursuant to decision XIX/8 of a report on a scoping study addressing alternatives to HCFCs in the refrigeration and air-conditioning sectors, that its ability to finish the task in good time was partly impeded by the fact that many experts were working without funding. That problem also

applies to other areas of the Panel's work. The Parties may wish to request the budget committee to take up this matter.

I. Other issues that the Secretariat would like to bring to the attention of the Parties

A. Montreal Protocol issues in other forums

1. Global Environment Facility

19. Over the years, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) has been of invaluable service to the Parties to the Montreal Protocol since its support for countries with economies in transition has helped all of those Parties to comply with the Protocol's requirements. Furthermore, its support for other activities that would be ineligible under the Fund, including activities related to methyl bromide in South Africa, and its support of monitoring activities in the Southern Cone, have bolstered the Protocol's efforts significantly. GEF is currently initiating activities related to its next replenishment. The purpose of this section of the note is to review the status of Parties that historically have been supported by GEF and to seek the Parties' guidance on whether and how the Secretariat should engage with GEF regarding the upcoming replenishment.

20. As noted above, GEF work in the ozone field has primarily focused on providing support to countries with economies in transition that would not otherwise be eligible for funding from the Multilateral Fund. Over time, many countries with economies in transition have been reclassified under the Protocol as Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5. As a result of such reclassifications, the Multilateral Fund now covers every country previously categorized as a country with an economy in transition except for six: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. Accordingly, and assuming that GEF will continue to provide support as in the past, only those latter six Parties would be eligible for assistance from GEF.

21. Where those countries are concerned, Azerbaijan, Belarus and Uzbekistan have already phased out all chemicals except HCFCs. For HCFCs, each Party has already reduced their historic baseline levels of consumption by between 95 and 99 per cent, which means that they are well in advance of the 2015 milestone for a 90 per cent reduction. The remaining three countries with economies in transition have also phased out all ozone-depleting substances except HCFCs, of which, Kazakhstan consumes 60 tonnes and Tajikistan 3.8 tonnes. As both of those Parties have not ratified the Copenhagen Amendment, however, past GEF guidelines would suggest that they are currently ineligible for support. The remaining country with an economy in transition, Ukraine, consumes 93.5 tonnes of HCFCs. While it is currently in compliance with its HCFC control obligation, it may need assistance to meet its 2010 target of 57 tonnes.

22. The Ozone Secretariat has traditionally striven to attend the meetings of the GEF Council, where it has endeavoured to provide support and information related to proposed Montreal Protocol projects, and to keep the Council abreast of activities under the Montreal Protocol that might be of interest to GEF. The Fund Secretariat is also often in attendance at GEF meetings and its interaction with the GEF secretariat and evaluation team has proved useful to the latter in undertaking its reviews. Lastly, it is noteworthy that, at the fifty-fifth meeting of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund, the Fund secretariat was requested to reach out to GEF and other mechanisms to investigate the scope for future cooperative efforts.

23. The Ozone Secretariat believes that a specific effort needs to be made to express a desire for GEF to consider both the continuing needs of countries with economies in transition and possible needs related to synergistic collaboration between GEF and the Fund, so that replenishment discussions under GEF may take ozone into account. In the light of the emerging discussions on the next GEF replenishment, the Ozone Secretariat is seeking guidance from the Parties as to whether they would like to consider a decision on this issue, and whether they would like the Ozone Secretariat to engage with GEF on related matters.

II. Destruction of ozone-depleting substances and cooperation with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

24. The Parties to the UNFCCC met in Accra in August. During that meeting the issue of destruction of stocks and potential emissions of ozone-depleting substances was raised and the Convention secretariat was requested to provide that forum with technical information on stocks and potential emissions of CFCs and HCFC banks. The Ozone Secretariat would respond to any forthcoming request on this matter by providing any factual information that it has to support as accurate a response as possible.

25. The Ozone Secretariat has also invited the Convention secretariat to attend its forthcoming meetings to discuss possible avenues of further cooperation and to enhance cooperation with the Parties to the Montreal Protocol and the Ozone Secretariat.

A. “Centrum”

26. The Secretariat would like to thank the many Parties who have provided feedback on the first edition of its new e-newsletter, “Centrum”, and wishes to apologize for the limited range of views included. Having set a final date of Ozone Day for publication, the Secretariat did not feel that it could delay the edition any longer while awaiting outstanding contributions. The Secretariat will endeavour to ensure that future editions include a fuller range of views on issues at the time of their initial dissemination. In the meantime, the Secretariat would like to thank the Parties and welcome further feedback and ideas for future topics.

B. Secretariat missions

27. In September 2008, the Secretariat held meetings with representatives of the Holy See in the Vatican City and with representatives of Iraq in Beirut to discuss and provide advice on the obligations of the two new Parties to comply with the Montreal Protocol as soon as the Protocol entered into force for each. Issues discussed included data and information reporting requirements under the Protocol, implementation of phase-out schedule of ozone-depleting substances and establishing licensing systems for controlling the import and export of ozone-depleting substances. Other meetings in which the Secretariat participated were the meeting of the ozone officers network for South Asia in Tokyo and the joint meeting of the ozone officers network of the English-speaking and French-speaking Africa in Cotonou, Benin, both of which took place in September 2008, together with the joint network meeting of ozone officers of South America, Central America and the Caribbean that was held in San Juan, Dominican Republic, in October. These three meetings reviewed the remaining 2010 compliance challenges and looked to move ahead on matters related to HCFC phase-out. The Secretariat also participated in the UNEP-organized review of the fourth Programme for the Development and Periodic Review of Environmental Law (Montevideo Programme IV) and the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Mercury, which were held in Nairobi in September and October 2008.
