



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.: General  
27 November 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**

**Report of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna  
Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Twentieth Meeting of  
the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone  
Layer**

**Introduction**

1. The combined eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol was held at the Sheraton Doha Resort and Convention Hotel in Doha from 16 to 20 November 2008. It consisted of a preparatory segment, held from 16 to 18 November, and a high-level segment, held on 19 and 20 November.
2. The present report reflects the deliberations under the respective items of the single agenda for the combined meeting; any references to the current meeting should be understood to denote the combined meeting of the two bodies.

**Part one: Preparatory segment**

**I. Opening of the preparatory segment**

3. The preparatory segment was opened by its Co-Chair, Mr. Mikkel Aaman Sorensen (Denmark), on 16 November 2008 at 10.15 a.m.
4. Opening statements were delivered by Mr. Abdulla Mubarak al-Moadhadi, Minister of Environment, Qatar, and Mr. Marco González, Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat. In his opening statement, Mr. al-Moadhadi said that the current meeting represented an opportunity to tackle current global threats, given that it was humankind's responsibility to hand over the planet to future generations, just as it had been bequeathed to the present generation. While recognizing the progress made in protecting the ozone layer, he warned that phasing out ozone-depleting substances remained a significant challenge. He also welcomed the Parties' agreement to make history by conducting a paperless meeting and said that the Government of Qatar had donated the computer equipment and paperless system used during the meeting to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) so that such materials could be used to make future United Nations meetings, including meetings of the Governing Council, more environmentally friendly.

5. Mr. González welcomed participants and thanked the Qatari Government for its support for the paperless meeting initiative and, in particular, its donation of the computer equipment used for the meetings. He pointed out that the paperless meeting afforded an unprecedented opportunity to spread the idea throughout the United Nations system and urged Parties to embrace it, thereby helping to preserve the environment. Noting that, in 13 months' time, the Protocol would face what some termed its "acid test" – ensuring global compliance with the 2010 requirements for the elimination of production and consumption of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), halons and carbon tetrachloride – he urged all stakeholders to focus their efforts and provide any assistance that might be required in that regard. Welcoming the assistance provided by the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, and by the secretariat of that body, he urged Parties to bear in mind the continuing importance of the Fund in meeting upcoming hydrochlorofluorocarbon (HCFC) obligations when discussing replenishment of the Fund. He also noted the role played by the assessment panels in the success of the Protocol and commended the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on having prepared its complex analysis of the replenishment issue in a short time.

6. Recalling the importance of certain elements of the Protocol established at previous meetings, such as its adjustment provision and the indicative list of categories of incremental costs, he welcomed the flexibility shown by Parties in enabling evolution throughout the Protocol, as demonstrated by the Secretariat through the innovation of its e-newsletter *Centrum*, its participation in the UNEP multilateral environmental agreement senior management team and its outreach to other convention secretariats. He noted that the agenda of the current meeting was particularly future-oriented and placed before the Parties significant proposals on the future of the ozone-depleting substance phase-out and the destruction of ozone-depleting substances, among other things. Warning that there could be serious gaps in satellite monitoring in the near future, he expressed the hope that Parties would renew their commitment to work in that area and consider the actions required for the launch of gap-filling satellite missions and the commissioning of new ground-based monitoring stations. Recalling that the Ozone Secretariat was available to assist wherever possible, he wished the representatives fruitful discussions.

## II. Organizational matters

### A. Attendance

7. The combined eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the two instruments: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Community, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

8. The representatives of the League of Arab States and Palestine attended the meeting as observers.

9. Representatives of the following United Nations bodies and specialized agencies also attended: Global Environment Facility, Secretariat of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme,

United Nations Industrial Development Organization, World Bank, World Intellectual Property Organization, World Meteorological Organization.

10. The following intergovernmental, non-governmental and industry bodies were also represented: AGRAMKOW / RTI Technologies, Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy, Alliant International, Arysta Life Science North America Corporation, Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., California Cut Flowers, California Strawberry Commission, Canon Spa (Bono Sistemi), Carbon Reduction Technologies AS, Chemtura Corporation, secretariat of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, Crop Protection Coalition, DG Regulation and Enforcement, Dow AgroSciences LLC, DuPont Fluoroproducts, Energy and Resources Group, Environmental Investigation Agency, Florida Tomato Exchange/Crop Protection Coalition, German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ), Global Investment House, Greenpeace International, Institute for Governance and Sustainable Development, ICF International, Industrial Estate Authority of Thailand, Industrial Technology Research Institute, Japan Industrial Conference for Ozone Layer and Climate Protection, Legal Advice and Legislation Council of Ministers, Kuwait Economic Society, Middle East Industrial Fire and Safety, Natural Resources Defense Council, Nordiko Quarantine Systems Pty Ltd, Palestine, Qatar Petroleum, Qatar Science and Technology Park, Regency Group, Teijin Twaron, Trical, TouchDown Consulting, Thompson's Specialities Middle East, Trans-Mond Environment Ltd., University of Qatar.

## **B. Officers**

11. The preparatory segment of the combined meeting was co-chaired by Ms. Judy Francis Beaumont (South Africa) and Mr. Mikkel Aaman Sorensen (Denmark).

## **C. Adoption of the agenda of the preparatory segment**

12. The following agenda for the preparatory segment was adopted on the basis of the provisional agenda contained in document UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/1-UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/1, as orally amended:

1. Opening of the preparatory segment:
  - (a) Statement by representative(s) of the Government of Qatar;
  - (b) Statement by representative(s) of the United Nations Environment Programme.
2. Organizational matters:
  - (a) Adoption of the agenda of the preparatory segment;
  - (b) Organization of work.
3. Consideration of Vienna Convention and combined Vienna Convention and Montreal Protocol issues:
  - (a) Presentation and discussion of the report of the seventh meeting of the Ozone Research Managers of the Parties to the Vienna Convention;
  - (b) Status of the General Trust Fund for Financing Activities on Research and Systematic Observations Relevant to the Vienna Convention;
  - (c) Financial reports and budgets of the trust funds for the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol;
  - (d) Status of ratification of the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and amendments to the Montreal Protocol.
4. Discussion of Montreal Protocol-related issues:
  - (a) Replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol;
    - (i) Presentation and consideration of the supplemental report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel Replenishment Task Force;
    - (ii) Proposal on extension of the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism;
  - (b) Environmentally sound disposal of ozone-depleting substances (proposals by Argentina, the European Community, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mauritius and Mexico);

- (c) Issues related to essential uses:
    - (i) Use of CFC-113 in the aerospace industry in the Russian Federation;
    - (ii) Nominations for 2009 and 2010 for essential-use exemptions;
    - (iii) Essential uses and campaign production of CFCs for metered-dose inhalers;
  - (d) Consideration of methyl bromide-related issues:
    - (i) Nominations for 2009 and 2010 for critical-use exemptions;
    - (ii) Adjustment to the Montreal Protocol on allowances for production of methyl bromide to meet basic domestic needs of Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 (proposal by Kenya and Mauritius);
    - (iii) Quarantine and pre-shipment uses of methyl bromide (proposal by the European Community);
  - (e) Application of trade provisions to HCFCs (proposal by Australia);
  - (f) Process agents;
  - (g) Update reports by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel:
    - (i) Carbon tetrachloride emissions and opportunities for reduction (final report);
    - (ii) Regional imbalances in respect of halons;
    - (iii) Scoping study on alternatives to HCFCs for mines and very high temperature conditions;
  - (h) Technology and Economic Assessment Panel administrative issues;
  - (i) Compliance and reporting issues considered by the Implementation Committee, including non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol that may be attributable to CFC consumption for production of metered-dose inhalers in certain Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 (decision XVIII/16 paragraphs 3–5);
  - (j) Consideration of membership of Montreal Protocol bodies for 2009:
    - (i) Members of the Implementation Committee;
    - (ii) Members of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund;
    - (iii) Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group.
5. Other matters.

13. The following issues were included for discussion under agenda item 5, “Other matters”: release by Nepal of stocks of confiscated chlorofluorocarbons; difficulties faced by Iraq as a new Party; Doha Declaration; high-global warming potential substitutes for ozone-depleting substances; and the new electronic publication of the UNEP Division of Technology, Industry and Economics *Who’s Who in the Montreal Protocol*.

#### **D. Organization of work**

14. The Parties agreed to take up the agenda items in the order in which they were listed on the agenda. They also agreed to continue the contact group on replenishment that had been formed at the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, with the understanding that it would be co-chaired by Ms. Laura Berón (Argentina) and Mr. Jozef Buys (Belgium). They also requested the other contact groups that had been set up at that meeting to continue their deliberations at the current meeting under the same chairs. Specifically, those groups were on the environmentally sound disposal of ozone-depleting substances, co-chaired by Mr. Martin Sirois (Canada) and Mr. Agustín Sánchez (Mexico), and on metered-dose inhalers, co-chaired by Mr. Paul Krajnik (Austria) and Mr. Arumugam Duraisamy (India).

### **III. Consideration of Vienna Convention and combined Vienna Convention and Montreal Protocol issues**

#### **A. Presentation and discussion of the report of the seventh meeting of the Ozone Research Managers of the Parties to the Vienna Convention**

#### **B. Status of the General Trust Fund for Financing Activities on Research and Systematic Observations Relevant to the Vienna Convention**

15. The Parties took up sub-items 3 (a) and 3 (b) together.

16. Mr. Michael Kurylo (United States of America), Chair of the seventh meeting of the Ozone Research Managers of the Parties to the Vienna Convention, gave a presentation on the work of the seventh meeting, held in Geneva from 18 to 21 May 2008. He began by explaining the complementary but distinct purposes of Ozone Research Managers' reports and scientific assessments prepared by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and UNEP. The seventh meeting, he said, had begun with presentations on the state of the global ozone layer and plans for the 2010 scientific assessment, and updates on international monitoring programmes with a special focus on satellite research and monitoring. The reports of the six WMO regions that had followed had informed the drafting of recommendations in the four principal areas of research needs, systematic observations, data archiving and capacity-building. Those recommendations were set out in the report of the seventh meeting, alongside the national reports.

17. He said that, as detailed in the report of the meeting, more research was needed on ozone recovery; the relationship of ozone depletion and climate change; and emissions, banks and atmospheric evolution of ozone-depleting substances, substitutes and other climate-related trace gases. Systematic observations were critical to understanding and monitoring long-term changes in ozone and surface ultraviolet radiation, which implied a continuing need for better surface networks in some regions and actions to fill the anticipated gap in satellite monitoring capacity. Data archiving and quality assurance were also crucial, implying a need to implement fully the recommendations of the Research Managers at their sixth meeting; to use historical data more effectively; to standardize data quality assurance procedures; to establish better links among data centres; and to archive data from regional process studies. Lastly, he noted that there were insufficient regional centres for research, calibration and training, particularly in developing countries, for effective capacity-building. Responses could include encouraging monetary and in kind contributions to the Trust Fund for Observation and Research, establishing a procedure for submitting requests for Trust Fund support and including capacity-building support in ozone work under the UNEP Compliance Assistance Programme.

18. The representative of the Secretariat gave a presentation outlining the history of the General Trust Fund for Financing Activities on Research and Systematic Observations Relevant to the Vienna Convention, including its genesis in 2003, the extension of it to 2015 that had been approved in 2007 and the institutional arrangements agreed between the Secretariat and WMO in respect of its operation that had been approved in 2005.

19. She also detailed the administrative activities undertaken by the Secretariat under the Trust Fund, such as annual dispatch of invitations for contributions, and provided information on contributions and expenditures. In 2008, a brochure on ozone monitoring in developing countries, prepared jointly by WMO and the Secretariat, had informed Parties of the priority activities requiring financing and the estimated costs involved. To date, \$179,135, including interest accrued, had been received. The contributing Parties were the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Kazakhstan, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Total expenditure on three activities amounted to \$31,100, while further projects were in preparation for the remaining balance of \$148,035.

20. Mr. Geir Braathen, WMO, gave a presentation on the WMO Global Atmosphere Watch ozone observing system, underlining the constant emphasis on data quality assurance and data archiving. He said that three activities had so far been supported through the Trust Fund: Egypt had hosted an intercomparison and calibration of nine Dobson spectrophotometers in 2004; and Brewer instruments Nos. 116 and 176 had been calibrated in September 2006 in Nepal and Indonesia, respectively. Planned activities included an intercomparison and calibration of African Dobson spectrophotometers in South Africa and calibration of Brewer spectrophotometers in Brazil.

21. In the ensuing discussion, several representatives paid tribute to the achievements of the Ozone Research Managers and broad support was voiced for the findings and recommendations of their seventh meeting, as set out in document UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/6.
22. All speakers stressed the importance of research and information exchange in restoring the stratospheric ozone layer and responding to the special needs of developing countries. Several representatives highlighted the need to strengthen the systematic observation network, establishing more, better equipped monitoring stations and building capacity in some regions. There was also broad agreement that the possible shortage of satellite data on the ozone layer predicted in the Ozone Research Managers' report was a matter of considerable concern.
23. Several representatives drew attention to their countries' efforts to gather and analyse data on the ozone layer. One representative, speaking on behalf of a number of countries, also called for improved mechanisms to ensure better data consistency.
24. One representative noted that her Government had presented its report at the seventh meeting of the Ozone Research Managers and highlighted, in particular, its continuous and active support for the Montreal Protocol through making high-quality observations of ozone and ultraviolet radiation, providing leadership through hosting the WMO World Ozone and UV Data Centre and sustaining the Brewer Ozone Standard Triad at Environment Canada, in Toronto, producing leading scientific papers and reviews and helping to develop and train individuals through Brewer users' workshops. She also expressed her conviction regarding the importance of enhancing global capacity to monitor the long-term evolution of the ozone layer, which was the reason Canada generally supported the recommendations emanating from the seventh meeting of the Ozone Research Managers of the Parties to the Vienna Convention, including the need to recognize and address the gap in satellite observations of the ozone layer and to submit quality control data on ozone and ultraviolet radiation to the WMO World Ozone and UV Data Centre in Toronto.
25. Two representatives noted the need to strengthen stratospheric ozone monitoring capacity in the Gulf region. Responding, Mr. Braathen explained that, upon request, WMO would be happy to assist interested Parties to acquire and calibrate necessary equipment and to submit data.
26. Mr. Djibo Leity Kâ (Senegal), President of the Bureau of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention, subsequently submitted two draft decisions on behalf of the Bureaux of the seventh meeting and of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. One concerned the recommendations of the Ozone Research Managers and the other related to the Trust Fund.
27. In the ensuing discussion, Mr. Kurylo outlined some of the efforts under way to identify short- and long-term measures to offset the anticipated shortage of satellite capacity to monitor ozone and ultraviolet radiation levels. Responding to a query from one Party, he added that the Ozone Research Managers and the International Ozone Commission were working hard to publicize the satellite monitoring issue and he called upon the representatives at the current meeting to support those efforts.
28. Following informal consultations, minor amendments were agreed in the texts of both draft decisions. The Parties approved the draft decisions for further consideration during the high-level segment.

### **C. Financial reports and budgets of the trust funds for the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol**

29. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair drew attention to the proposed budgets set out in documents UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/4 and UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/4 and the financial statements set out in documents UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/4/Add.1 and UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/4/Add.1. He noted that it had been the practice of the Parties at past meetings to establish a budget committee to review budget-related documents and prepare one or more draft decisions on budgetary matters. In accordance with that practice, the Parties agreed to establish a budget committee, to be co-chaired by Mr. Alessandro Giuliano Peru (Italy) and Mr. Ives Enrique Gómez Salas (Mexico), to agree on budgets for the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol trust funds and to prepare draft decisions on financial matters for the Convention and the Protocol.
30. Mr. Peru reported back that agreement had been reached on the proposed budget allocations for both trust funds and the draft decisions. He explained that, by drawing on the reserve, the contributions for 2009 and 2010 would remain at the 2008 level. Following that report the Parties approved the draft decisions for further consideration during the high-level segment.

## **D. Status of ratification of the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and the amendments to the Montreal Protocol**

31. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair presented a brief summary of the information contained in document UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/INF/2-UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/INF/1 on the status of ratification, accession, acceptance or approval of the agreements on the protection of the stratospheric ozone layer. She noted that since the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties two additional Parties had ratified the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol, bringing the total for both instruments to 193. As to the amendments to the Protocol, three Parties had ratified the London Amendment, for a total of 189; six had ratified the Copenhagen Amendment, for a total of 184; 10 had ratified the Montreal Amendment, for a total of 167; and 12 had ratified the Beijing Amendment, for a total of 144.

32. The Co-Chair drew attention to the draft decision on the status of ratification of the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and the amendments to the Montreal Protocol contained in document UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/3-UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/3, which was a standard decision of the kind that had been taken in the past to record the status of ratifications and to encourage further ratifications.

33. The Parties agreed that the draft decision should be updated by the Secretariat for further consideration during the high-level segment.

## **IV. Discussion of Montreal Protocol-related issues**

### **A. Replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol**

- 1. Presentation and consideration of the supplemental report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel Replenishment Task Force**
- 2. Proposal on extension of the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism**

34. Mr. Lambert Kuijpers, co-chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel Replenishment Task Force, gave a presentation on the findings in the supplement to the May 2008 Panel replenishment report, published in October 2008. He noted that, as indicated in the supplemental report, on the basis of two HCFC consumption funding scenarios and two cost-effectiveness scenarios for Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 (Article 5 Parties), expected funding needs for the triennium 2009–2011 ranged from \$339 million to \$630 million. Those figures represented adjustments to the estimates set out in the Panel's May 2008 study in the light of the decisions of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund at its fifty-sixth meeting. He described the important elements of decisions XIX/6 and XIX/10, which had guided the studies undertaken for the supplemental report.

35. Ms. Shiqiu Zhang, co-chair of the Task Force, said that at its twenty-eighth meeting the Open-ended Working Group had requested the Panel to consider certain issues in more detail. She said that the Panel had considered all of those elements, with a particular focus on the triennium 2009–2011. One such issue was the further analysis of the costs of destroying ozone-depleting substances. In that context she explained that the Task Force had conducted further investigations in an effort to estimate the quantities of CFCs and halons that were ready for destruction. Analysis based on submissions from 28 Article 5 Parties indicated that, in keeping with the Panel's May 2008 report, \$27 million would cover all possible destruction costs in the next triennium.

36. Ms. Zhang then turned to costs associated with non-HCFC non-investment funding, which the May 2008 replenishment report had forecast to be \$202.7 million. She recalled that the Open-ended Working Group had requested the Panel to study the potential impact of inflation on the replenishment. Having considered the costs susceptible to inflation, the Task Force had concluded that funding requirements for the triennium 2009–2011 would increase by between \$4 million and \$9 million per percentage point rise in inflation, depending on which of the HCFC funding scenarios was considered.

37. She said that, in response to the Open-ended Working Group's requests, the Panel had re-evaluated institutional strengthening costs. On the basis of a review of the Executive Committee's work and comments submitted by some Parties, the Task Force had concluded that there was little justification to either decrease or increase funding for institutional strengthening. She noted, however, that funding included in the replenishment estimate for HCFC servicing included \$13.3 million for elements that were normally regarded as institutional strengthening activities. Such funding could, therefore, be seen as an implicit increase in institutional strengthening spending.

38. Continuing the presentation, Mr. Kuijpers turned to the Task Force's review of the funding needs implied by alternative cut-off dates (i.e., dates after which projects relating to capacities for manufacturing chemicals, products and equipment were not eligible for funding) to apply to HCFC projects. He noted that in its supplemental report the Task Force had considered cut-off dates of 2000, 2004 and 2007 and that a cut-off date of 2010 would produce the same results as a cut off date of 2007. In general, later cut-off dates implied less consumption eligible for funding and, conversely, earlier cut-off dates implied smaller eligible HCFC consumption levels and lower funding needs. In the case of HCFCs, however, analysis of the costs produced unusual results. Earlier cut-off dates necessitated more reductions in the more expensive refrigeration and air-conditioning sub-sector. On that basis, costs associated with a 2000 cut-off date, for example, were estimated to be \$16–\$105 million higher than those with a 2007 cut-off date. Early cut-off dates affected funding requirements for the first triennium (2009–2011) but also for subsequent trienniums. In addition, while several Parties might have no difficulty in identifying eligible consumption to reduce their HCFC consumption by up to 30 per cent, other Parties might struggle to locate potential reductions in consumption eligible for funding in the second or the third trienniums (2012–2017). In the long term, he said, early cut-off dates implied a lower funding requirement by the Fund but also implied the need for some funding by Article 5 Parties.

39. On the issue of second conversions (i.e., conversions by firms that the Multilateral Fund had earlier helped to make the transition to using HCFCs), he said that the Panel's supplemental report focused primarily on firms that the Fund had assisted to convert from CFC-11 to HCFC-141b. Two scenarios had been considered for the funding of second conversions, one with such conversions spread over several trienniums and one with all second conversions undertaken in the first triennium. He said that the reality would likely share elements of either scenario and would depend on Parties' choices in their HCFC phase-out management plans, which were currently being developed. He concluded with an explanation of the derivation of the cost effectiveness factors used in the study.

40. Continuing the presentation, Mr. José Pons Pons, member of the Task Force, outlined the potential climate benefits of HCFC phase-out described in the supplemental report. Using four scenarios for analysis, the Task Force had sought to identify methods to evaluate costs and benefits. It had determined, however, that the rapidly changing technological landscape made it impossible to plot reliable cost abatement curves at that stage. He stressed that the timing of the transitions would influence potential climate gains, that the concept of cost-effectiveness in decision XIX/6 was firmly anchored within the ozone criteria and that more innovative funding mechanisms were emerging but needed to be governed by appropriate methodologies.

41. In the discussion on the supplemental report of the impact of the Multilateral Fund's international trade and multinational ownership rules, Mr. Pons Pons said that in the May 2008 report the Panel had applied a 20 per cent reduction in its funding requirement calculations to take account of the two rules. He noted that exports could be larger, but that no reliable information was available. In addition, the multinational component in foam enterprises had not been considered in the May 2008 report.

42. In the case of demonstration projects, the Task Force had reconsidered the funding assumed in the May 2008 report. Based on the assumption that demonstration projects would be twice as expensive as normal projects, and assuming a regional distribution of such projects, the funding requirement of \$5.4 million that had been included in the May 2008 report had been split into two equal parts, one specifically for the demonstration aspect and the other assumed to fall under the HCFC consumption funding requirement. As a result of the new calculations, including the offset of reductions that would be achieved through the demonstration projects, the Panel estimated that those assumptions would reduce the funding requirement for the triennium 2009–2011 by \$2.7 million.

43. In conclusion, he gave a detailed overview of the funding requirement for the period 2009–2011. He considered activities for the non-HCFC consumption sector, for destruction and for supporting activities, where he mentioned that the funding requirement would be lower due to recent decisions of the Executive Committee on metered-dose inhaler conversions. He summarized the activities related to HCFCs and mentioned that the amount had increased as a result of recent Executive Committee decisions in relation to HCFC phase-out management plan preparation funding and that that would more or less balance the decrease mentioned earlier.

44. As a consequence of taking into account some of the changes noted above, he stated, that for the triennium 2009–2011 the funding requirement currently suggested by the Panel would be in the range of \$339 million–\$387 million for the baseline funding scenario and \$511 million–\$630 million for the 2012 funding scenario.



45. The ensuing discussion covered a number of aspects of the Panel's presentation. In their general comments on the activities to be funded through the replenishment, representatives urged that they should be carried out in a pragmatic and flexible manner, with one representative stating that the cost-effective operation of the Fund thus far served as an exemplary model for funding the phase-out of HCFCs. Several representatives said that it was important to maintain levels of funding to assist Article 5 Parties to meet their compliance objectives, bearing in mind the continuing need for institutional strengthening and capacity-building, the stocks of ozone-depleting substances requiring destruction and the need to develop and implement HCFC phase-out management plans. Demonstration projects and technology transfer were mentioned as important elements of the process.
46. Some representatives said that various factors, including adverse exchange rates and the increasing cost of labour, were reducing the value of programme financing. In contrast, one delegation noted the impact of inflation on levels of funding, which might be obviated by the current recession. He also expressed a belief that the assumptions in the replenishment report on the growth in HCFC consumption might be higher than would actually be experienced, given current economic conditions. Other representatives, however, said that HCFC growth would continue and that the HCFC growth assumptions in the replenishment study were overly conservative. Some representatives stressed the need to ensure that replenishment decisions took account of synergies with other instruments, particularly the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.
47. In respect of the incremental costs of second conversions, some representatives said that funding for second conversions should cover all costs, including capital costs and operating costs. Some noted that, whatever decision was taken in that regard, care should be taken to ensure that it did not have the unintended consequence of encouraging alternatives or technologies that might result in reduced environmental performance. Regarding the two HCFC funding scenarios considered in the replenishment report, one representative said that care should be taken, when developing a consensus, to avoid perverse incentives that might increase rather than reduce HCFC consumption in the short term.
48. Regarding the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism, one representative said that application of the mechanism had aided efficient operation of the Fund and that its permanent adoption could prove advantageous. While noting that the mechanism had proved effective in times of robust economic growth, one representative said that it had not had to operate under economic conditions such as those obtaining currently; accordingly, while his delegation could not support the permanent establishment of the mechanism at the current meeting, it could support its continued trial use over the next three years.
49. The Parties agreed to refer further consideration of the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism to the contact group on replenishment.
50. Following discussion in the contact group, the Parties approved the draft decision extending the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism to the period 2009–2011 for further consideration during the high-level segment.
51. Following further discussion in the contact group, the co-chair announced that the group had been able to reach consensus on the amount of the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the triennium 2009–2011. That would total \$490 million, of which \$73.9 million consisted of funds remaining from anticipated contributions due to the Fund and other sources for the 2006–2008 triennium, while \$16.1 million would be provided from interest accruing to the Fund over the period 2009–2011. The requirement for new funding would therefore be \$400 million. She thanked all the members of the group for their hard work and spirit of cooperation and observed that the agreement demonstrated the continued success of the Montreal Protocol even in the most challenging circumstances.
52. Responding to questions, the representative of the Multilateral Fund secretariat clarified that the column in the annex to the draft decision referring to the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism indicated the eligibility of Parties to use the mechanism, not whether they had actually done so or taken a decision to do so.
53. The Parties approved the draft decision on the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for further consideration during the high-level segment.

## **B. Environmentally sound disposal of ozone-depleting substances (proposals by Argentina, the European Community, the Federated States of Micronesia and Mauritius)**

54. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled the discussions during the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group in July, when the Working Group had considered a consultants' report and a series of proposals from Parties. After discussion, the chairs of the contact group established to consider the issue at the Working Group's meeting had put forward a proposal of their own; more recently a new proposal had been received from Mexico.

55. The representative of Canada, one of the co-chairs of the contact group, expressed his thanks to all participants in the group and to all those that had submitted comments subsequently. The discussions in the contact group had improved all participants' understanding of the issue and had enabled a wide range of issues to be discussed. He noted that there had been general consensus on the need for a step-by-step approach, of which the first step would be to address existing stocks of certain confiscated and contaminated substances; it was possible that the Multilateral Fund could have a role to play in that process. Issues meriting further discussion included the possibility of reusing confiscated or contaminated stocks; funding modalities; the speed of action, particularly given that the bulk of CFCs in banks would be emitted by 2015; and coordination with other multilateral environmental agreements, including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal. Achieving consensus on all remaining issues would be a challenging task, but he anticipated making good progress in the contact group that would work on the issue during the current meeting.

56. The representative of Mexico introduced a draft decision aimed at minimizing the risks of disposal of contaminated stocks in Article 5 Parties, in order to reduce both climate change and ozone depletion. The draft decision set out suggested criteria for the provision of financial support, and proposed organizing regional workshops on existing destruction technologies and available financial mechanisms. He suggested that the draft decision could be discussed by the contact group.

57. In the ensuing discussion, representatives highlighted the importance of the issue for both climate change and ozone depletion, particularly given the likely emissions from banks in the absence of any further action. Some representatives noted that the volume of some ozone-depleting substances held in banks substantially exceeded their production and consumption. In addition to the issues listed by the representative of Canada, further potential topics for discussion were raised including, in the short term, improving the management of banks and widening the scope for containment, recovery and recycling and, in the medium and long term, further work by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on cost-benefit analyses. The possibility of an intersessional working group was suggested, together with the need to work with the appropriate bodies of the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol in time for a clear message to be communicated to the fourteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, to be held in Poznań, Poland, in December 2008.

58. The Parties agreed to refer all those matters to the contact group established by the Open-ended Working Group at its twenty-eighth meeting.

59. The co-chair of the contact group subsequently reported on the group's discussions. Thanking all the participants and his co-chair for their hard work, he reported that all outstanding issues had been resolved and that he was thus able to present a consensus draft decision on the environmentally sound management of banks of ozone-depleting substances. The Parties approved the draft decision for further consideration during the high-level segment.

## **C. Issues related to essential uses**

### **1. Use of CFC-113 in the aerospace industry in the Russian Federation**

60. Mr. Stephen O. Andersen, Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, recalled that requests by the Russian Federation for essential-use exemptions for the use of CFC-113 for certain aerospace applications had been agreed at the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Meetings of the Parties. The latter Meeting, however, had only approved exemptions for 2008 and 2009 on the proviso that no alternatives were identified by the Panel that could be implemented by 2009 and on the basis that experts nominated by the Panel would meet Russian engineers to evaluate the applications and to recommend proven alternatives if possible and that the Russian Federation was ready to explore the availability of CFC-113 from global stocks.

61. The experts nominated by the Panel had visited the Russian Federation in October 2008 and had conducted extensive discussions. They had concluded that it would be possible to use HCFC-122 and HCFC-141b to replace some applications of CFC-113 but that their commercial use still required the completion of various approval processes. Successful substitution by 2010 was in theory possible but would require close cooperation between various organizations and significant research, testing and initiatives by the Russian space industry. Accordingly, the Panel was recommending the reaffirmation of essential-use exemptions for 140 tonnes of CFC-113 for 2008 and 130 tonnes for 2009 based on progress made to date and work remaining to commercialize HCFC alternatives.

62. The representative of the Russian Federation thanked the Panel for organizing the visit of experts to Moscow and for the helpful suggestions that the experts had made during their discussions with the Russian space agency and other bodies. He expressed his country's determination to fulfil the aims of the Montreal Protocol.

63. Responding to questions from representatives, Mr. Andersen explained that two experts identified by the Panel had visited Moscow for four days in October 2008. They had discussed the issues in depth with 12 experts from the Russian space agency, technical and academic institutes and component manufacturers. They had evaluated the applications of CFC-113 and had reviewed research findings on the use of possible alternatives, which they had found to be technically suitable, and had identified a number of other possible alternatives that would warrant investigation. In some cases, however, the use of the alternatives would not be permitted under the environmental regulations of the Russian Federation, which set human exposure limits for the substances at levels significantly lower than in other industrialized countries. As a consequence they had concluded that the use of CFC-113 for aerospace applications did qualify as "essential" under the Montreal Protocol. Mr. Andersen stated in conclusion that the Panel was reviewing the report of the experts, together with its comprehensive technical appendices, during the current meeting and would make the results of its review available as soon as feasible.

64. The Parties agreed to confirm the allocation in 2008 of 140 tonnes and in 2009 of the 130 tonnes agreed to by the Parties in 2007 for that use by the Russian Federation.

## **2. Nominations for 2009 and 2010 for essential-use exemptions**

65. Ms. Helen Tope, Co-Chair of the Medical Technical Options Committee, introduced the report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on requests for essential-use exemptions for CFCs for metered-dose inhalers. At the beginning of 2008, the European Community and the Russian Federation had requested 38 and 248 tonnes respectively for 2009, and the United States of America 182 tonnes for 2010. The Committee had discussed the nominations of the European Community and the United States further with the Parties after the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group in July.

66. Those discussions had led the European Community to withdraw its request for CFCs for three active ingredients, reducing its total request to 22 tonnes. Of the remaining volume, 40 per cent had been intended for CFCs for metered-dose inhalers for Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5, and 60 per cent for CFCs for combination products in Italy. The Party had supplied additional information to support the latter request. Although most members of the Committee did not consider production of those combination products to be an essential use, given that 2009 was the final year of nomination the Panel had decided reluctantly to recommend the nomination owing to progress with reformulations and the inaccessibility of available stockpiles.

67. Similarly, the United States had withdrawn its nominations for two active ingredients, allowing a reduction of its total request to 92 tonnes, and had submitted new information to support the remaining nomination, for CFCs for epinephrine. Although some members of the Committee did not consider the use of CFCs for epinephrine-based metered-dose inhalers to be an essential use, the Panel had decided reluctantly to recommend the nomination owing to anticipated progress with reformulations and the inaccessibility of available stockpiles. The Committee was, however, clear that it would not recommend CFCs for epinephrine after 2010.

68. The representatives of the United States and the European Community thanked the Medical Technical Options Committee for its hard work and willingness to discuss the issues at length. The United States had had a very positive exchange of views that had enabled that Party to determine that it could revise its original request by relying on existing inventories. The Party decided to retain only one medication in its request, epinephrine, which was subject to an existing rule-making process. The representative of the United States remained concerned, however, about the Committee's suggestion that it would not agree to recommend the use of CFCs in epinephrine metered-dose inhalers after 2010.

He stressed the importance of ensuring that the transition to non-CFC alternatives was well planned, and that adequate time was allowed for the education of patients; in the current case, the issue was complicated by the fact that epinephrine was available over the counter rather than only by prescription. He said that his delegation had prepared a proposal for a draft decision and suggested that it could be combined with the proposal of the European Community; the representative of the European Community accepted that suggestion.

69. The representative of the European Community subsequently reported that his delegation and that of the United States had consulted all interested Parties and had reached agreement on a draft decision. The Parties accordingly approved the draft decision for further consideration during the high-level segment.

### **3. Essential uses and campaign production of CFCs for metered-dose inhalers**

70. Ms. Tope introduced the report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on essential uses and campaign production of CFCs for metered-dose inhalers. The Committee had observed significant progress in the transition from CFC-based metered-dose inhalers in all Article 5 Parties, with a range of technically feasible alternatives becoming available. Many projects funded by the Multilateral Fund to convert locally-owned CFC metered-dose inhaler manufacturing remained in their early stages, however. Since continued production of small amounts of pharmaceutical-grade CFCs after 2009 was likely to be impractical, the Panel was recommending a final CFC manufacturing campaign. The date for final campaign production could be set when the timelines for project implementation were clearer and projections for CFC requirements were known; the Panel believed that 2011 was feasible, provided that there was careful planning and coordination and that conversion project implementation was not delayed further.

71. Following the presentation by the Panel, the Co-Chair recalled that at its twenty-eighth meeting the Open-ended Working Group had established a contact group to consider essential uses and campaign production of CFCs for metered-dose inhalers. Mr. Krajnik, co-chair of that contact group, summarized the group's discussions, which had included determining whether there was a need for a final campaign to produce metered-dose-inhaler-grade CFCs after the CFC final phase-out date and making the essential-use mechanism relevant to all Parties. He thanked the Secretariat for the review of essential-use decisions (UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/8), which it had prepared at the contact group's request.

72. The Parties agreed that the contact group on essential uses and campaign production of CFCs should resume its deliberations at the current meeting in the light of the Secretariat's analysis in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/8. Mr. Krajnik and Mr. Duraisamy agreed to continue as the group's co-chairs.

73. The co-chair of the contact group subsequently reported that the group had been able to reach a conclusion on its discussions on campaign production and was accordingly presenting a draft decision dealing with the needs of Article 5 Parties after 2010, their possible use of essential-use exemptions and the remaining requirements for the production of pharmaceutical-grade CFCs. The group had concluded that more information was needed on all those issues, so the draft decision requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to work on those and related topics and to present a report at the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group preceding the next Meeting of the Parties. The Parties approved the draft decision for further consideration during the high-level segment.

74. The co-chair of the contact group also subsequently reported that the group had been able to agree on a draft decision on procedures for essential-use exemptions for Article 5 Parties, which would amend 12 previous decisions of the Parties. The aim was to allow Article 5 Parties to apply for exemptions during 2009 so that they could be assessed by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and take effect from 2010. One paragraph of the draft decision specified that CFC-using metered-dose inhaler products approved after 31 December 2008 would not qualify as essential, with the exception of products in the process of registration and approved by 31 December 2009. The draft decision also requested the Ozone Secretariat to reflect the modifications to decisions in the next edition of the Montreal Protocol handbook, and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to do likewise in its handbook on essential-use nominations.

75. The Parties approved the draft decision for further consideration during the high-level segment.

## D. Consideration of methyl bromide-related issues

### 1. Nominations for 2009 and 2010 for critical-use exemptions

76. Four co-chairs of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee, Mr. Mohamed Besri, Ms. Michelle Marcotte, Ms. Marta Pizano and Mr. Ian Porter, gave a presentation on critical-use nominations, summarizing the findings set out in the report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on evaluations of 2008 critical-use nominations for methyl bromide and related matters.

77. Introducing the issue, Mr. Besri provided information on trends in global methyl bromide consumption in the period 1991–2007. By 2007, Article 5 Parties had reduced their annual consumption to 6,146 tonnes, or approximately 38 per cent of the baseline level; countries not operating under that paragraph had realized a reduction of almost 90 per cent, bringing their consumption down to approximately 6,000 tonnes. In all, 93 per cent of 2007 consumption in Article 5 Parties was scheduled for phase-out by 2015 or earlier under projects funded by the Multilateral Fund.

78. He noted that global methyl bromide output for quarantine and pre-shipment uses represented the largest remaining uncontrolled production of a controlled ozone-depleting substance. In 2006 such production stood at roughly 10,275 tonnes, 34 per cent of total methyl bromide production in that year. Concluding his part of the presentation, he outlined the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee's 2009 workplan and summarized recent communications with Parties regarding the Committee's use of its meta-analysis of certain soil uses of methyl bromide.

79. Ms. Pizano gave an overview of critical-use nominations that had been submitted to the Committee over the past six years. She noted that the total volumes of methyl bromide consumption approved or recommended for critical uses had declined over the period 2005–2010 in all countries, albeit at varying rates. Approved nominations for 2008 stood at 6,996 tonnes, recommended nominations for 2009 totalled 5,250 tonnes and recommended nominations for 2010 were 3,567 tonnes. The Committee had not accounted for existing methyl bromide stocks, which stood at 6,723.338 tonnes at the end of 2007, when evaluating critical-use nominations.

80. Mr. Porter presented the nominations received for pre-plant soil use of methyl bromide in 2009 and 2010. The Committee had received 31 nominations in total: 12 for 2009 and 19 for 2010. Ten nominations had been reassessed following the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group to take account of regulatory changes in one nominating Party that had facilitated wider use of iodomethane in place of methyl bromide. As a result, the total amount nominated by that Party had been revised downwards from 3,722.230 tonnes to 3,164.982 tonnes. The critical-use recommendation for pre-plant soil uses in another Party had been amended in the light of technical advice submitted by that Party. Taking into account those revised nominations, the Committee had recommended a total of 3,608.454 tonnes for soil use in 2009 and not recommended 88.594 tonnes; for 2010 the Committee had recommended 3,297.800 tonnes and not recommended 187.498 tonnes.

81. He recalled that, at the request of one Party at the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, the Committee had subsequently considered the economic feasibility of iodomethane in a partial budgeting analysis framework. The Committee had determined that for many crops and locations iodomethane was an economically feasible alternative. Fumigants typically accounted for a relatively small share of production costs and yields using methyl bromide and iodomethane were comparable; the cost of shifting to iodomethane could therefore be less than 2 per cent of net revenue. He concluded his part of the presentation by outlining progress in the registration of iodomethane and other alternatives to methyl bromide in several countries and identifying regulatory changes that could permit reduced critical-use nominations.

82. Ms. Marcotte summarized nominations relating to quarantine, structures and commodities. She noted several areas of progress, including the development of methyl bromide alternatives for high moisture dates, continuing commercial-scale trials on other alternatives and the imposition of regulations that had resulted in reduced demand for critical-use nominations. She provided information on each of the 10 quarantine, structures and commodities nominations for 2009 and 2010. Lastly, she summarized the efficacy and costs of adopting alternatives to methyl bromide in flour mills, which had been presented in the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's May 2008 progress report.

83. In the ensuing discussion, several representatives commended the efforts of non-Article 5 Parties to find alternatives but expressed concerns about the time frame for phasing out critical uses of methyl bromide. One representative, speaking for a number of Parties, expressed the view that the rate of transition to alternatives could be improved and reported that the delegations that he represented had

submitted a draft decision on the issue. Two representatives expressed concerns related to policies and procedures and another on the need to ensure the safety of production.

84. The representative of one non-Article 5 Party reported that the final methyl bromide phase-out date in that country had been set at 2013, notwithstanding considerable opposition from industry and local government. Support had been promised to farmers and a national project to develop alternatives, especially biological controls, was under way.

85. Another representative from a non-Article 5 Party reported on progress in his country's efforts to phase out methyl bromide, particularly by registering iodomethane as an alternative and developing a broader base of alternatives, but noted that local regulatory provisions imposed certain constraints, which needed to be taken into account in the consideration of its critical-use nominations.

86. The representative of a non-governmental organization also expressed concern at the amounts of methyl bromide for which critical-use exemptions were being sought, the slow decline in the amounts for which exemptions were being granted and the extremely large stocks of methyl bromide being held.

87. The Parties agreed to establish a contact group, co-chaired by Mr. Barry Reville (Australia) and Mr. Gabriel Hakizimana (Burundi), to prepare a draft decision on the 2009 and 2010 critical-use nominations.

88. The Co-Chair subsequently reported that the contact group had agreed on a draft decision. The Parties approved the draft decision for further consideration during the high-level segment.

**2. Adjustment to the Montreal Protocol on allowances for production of methyl bromide to meet basic domestic needs of Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 (proposal by Kenya and Mauritius)**

89. The Co-Chair recalled that Mauritius and Kenya had introduced at the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group a proposed adjustment to the Montreal Protocol that would provide for the reduction of the maximum allowance for the production of methyl bromide to meet the basic domestic needs of Article 5 Parties to 5,038 metric tonnes starting in 2010. One representative, representing 27 Parties, said that they supported the proposal and that the availability of cost-effective alternatives would aid the phase-out. The representative of Kenya briefly reviewed the status of the proposal, including its discussion by a contact group at the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. He highlighted the reduction in consumption of methyl bromide in non-Article 5 Parties, 74 per cent of whom had reported zero consumption, and a desire to align supply with demand, as the rationales behind the proposal.

90. In the ensuing discussion several representatives, while commending the initiative, said that they could not support it, largely because there was a lack of access to proven alternatives to methyl bromide and because it would have significant cost implications for agriculture in their countries. Other representatives said that, although reducing the supply of methyl bromide would increase its cost, cost-effective alternatives would also be available and that that would aid phase-out.

91. In the light of the concerns expressed, the representative of Kenya formally withdrew the proposal but said that it was possible that it would be resubmitted in 2009.

**3. Quarantine and pre-shipment uses of methyl bromide (proposal by the European Community)**

92. The Co-Chair recalled that the European Community had put forth at the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group a draft decision aimed at reducing the amount of methyl bromide used for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes. The Parties had agreed that the proponent would consult other Parties informally in the period between that meeting and the current meeting of the Parties.

93. The representative of the European Community reported that the draft decision, which was set out in section D of chapter I of document UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/3-UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/3, had been revised in the light of concerns expressed by Parties during the intersessional consultations and that consultations were continuing during the current meeting. He noted that the draft decision as it then stood provided that a workshop would be held on the availability of technically and economically feasible alternatives and technologies for reducing methyl bromide emissions.

94. In the ensuing discussion one representative commended the content of the draft decision and expressed support for holding a workshop, but said that it was premature to discuss the issue in the absence of more technical data.

95. The Parties agreed that the contact group established under sub-item 1 above would work further on the terms of a new draft decision.

96. The Co-Chair subsequently presented a draft decision, which the Parties approved for further consideration during the high-level segment.

### **E. Application of trade provisions to HCFCs (proposal by Australia)**

97. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that at the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group Australia had introduced a draft decision that would harmonize the date on which HCFC import and export bans would come into effect with the date on which production and consumption limits for HCFCs would commence in Article 5 Parties, namely, 1 January 2013. He recalled that no opposition to the proposal had been voiced during the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

98. Following the Co-Chair's introduction the Parties agreed to forward the draft decision for further approval during the high-level segment.

### **F. Process agents**

99. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that by decision XVII/6 the Parties had requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to make recommendations on process-agent use exemptions and on insignificant emissions associated with process-agent uses listed in decision X/14. He also noted that the issue of whether the list of process-agent uses needed to be amended had been raised at the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

100. One representative reported having conducted detailed investigations on the issue and having submitted a report to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel but also commented that the list of process agents had been updated in 2007 and was normally only updated every two years. The Parties agreed, in the light of that comment, to defer further consideration and that the Meeting of the Parties would take it up at its next meeting, in 2009.

### **G. Update reports by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel**

#### **1. Carbon tetrachloride emissions and opportunities for reduction (final report)**

101. Mr. Pons Pons, Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, presented an update of the findings of the Panel's task force on carbon tetrachloride emissions, further to its 2006 report produced in response to decision XVI/4. Atmospheric concentrations of carbon tetrachloride had remained high despite phase-out; there was a discrepancy between the observed concentrations and "bottom-up" estimates of emissions derived from a model developed by the Panel based on data on production, consumption, use for feedstock and destruction. The fall in emissions from controlled uses appeared to be being offset by a rapidly growing new source. The Chemical Technical Options Committee planned to investigate possible new sources; one candidate was high-growth products such as HCFC-22, which could require co-production of carbon tetrachloride with chloroform.

102. In the ensuing discussion it was acknowledged that the issue of carbon tetrachloride emissions was complex and required further study. One representative said that in continuing its investigations the Panel might bear in mind that the Executive Committee, by decision 55/45, had requested the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund to take into account information to be provided by the Panel in response to decision XVIII/10 of the Meeting of the Parties on sources of carbon tetrachloride emissions, and any decisions taken at the current meeting, in preparing a report for the fifty-eighth meeting of the Executive Committee on emission reductions and phase-out of carbon tetrachloride in both Article 5 Parties and non-Article 5 Parties. The representative of the Panel expressed his willingness to discuss the matter further with interested Parties. Another representative suggested that the Panel's continuing work on carbon tetrachloride should be incorporated into its progress reports rather than be presented under a separate agenda item.

103. Following discussion the Parties agreed that the representatives of Sweden, the United States of America and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel would hold informal discussions on the item at the current meeting.

104. It was subsequently reported that the representatives in question had agreed with the Panel that the further work of the Panel would be incorporated into its 2009 progress report and that the Panel would consult the Multilateral Fund and incorporate information on phase-out projects of carbon tetrachloride.

## 2. Regional imbalances in respect of halons

105. Mr. David Catchpole, Co-Chair of the Halons Technical Options Committee, recalled that in decision XIX/16 the Parties had requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to undertake a further study on projected regional imbalances in the availability of halons and to investigate and propose mechanisms to better predict and mitigate such imbalances in the future. Unfortunately, however, the report was not yet ready for presentation, owing to the limited availability of country data and the late start of the Multilateral Fund banking study. Additional country data had been received, however, since the twenty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, and members of the Committee had also been obtaining data through their own regional contacts. The banking study had begun in October 2008 and a peer-review draft was anticipated by the end of 2008. The Committee would meet in March 2009 to finalize the report for review by the Panel and for presentation at the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, in July 2009.

106. One representative reported that a halon bank had been established in Indonesia. She indicated that in the near future there would be difficulties in obtaining halon 1211 for important uses. Accordingly, the representative urged the Committee to finalize the study as soon as possible.

107. The Parties agreed that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel would take up the issue in 2009.

## 3. Scoping study on alternatives to HCFCs for mines and very high temperature conditions

108. Mr. Kuijpers, Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, recalled that under decision XIX/8 the Parties had requested the Panel to undertake a scoping study to assess alternatives to HCFCs in the refrigeration and air-conditioning sectors in Article 5 Parties, with specific reference to unique climatic and operating conditions, including the use of HCFCs in mines other than open pit mines. The Panel had been asked to assess alternatives available for those unique conditions and to identify areas requiring more detailed study.

109. He explained that the Panel had assembled a subcommittee of the Refrigeration Technical Options Committee comprising six experts, including two from Article 5 Parties. The study had been delayed, however, partly because of difficulties encountered in gathering commercial data, particularly from Article 5 Parties, and on the use of specialized equipment, mostly because of logistic difficulties. Nevertheless, analyses were being performed, based on both theoretical models and such commercial data as were available, on the impacts of elevated temperatures on the performance and impacts of alternative refrigerants. He anticipated that the scoping study would be open for technical review after January 2009 and would form part of the Panel's April/May 2009 progress report.

110. In the ensuing discussion representatives welcomed the study and agreed that the issue should be accorded high priority. A number of representatives of Parties subject to high temperature ambient conditions spoke of the difficulties facing their countries in finding adequate alternatives to HCFCs. Several representatives, while acknowledging the economic constraints under which the Panel and its technical options committees operated, said that they would welcome field visits by members of the Refrigeration, Air-Conditioning and Heat Pumps Technical Options Committee to assess the particular situations in their countries.

111. The representative of the Panel said that the final study would be available for consideration by the Open-ended Working Group in July 2009 and that every effort would be made to carry out field visits, subject to budgetary constraints.

112. The Parties took note of the Panel's presentation on the scoping study on alternatives to HCFCs for mines and very high temperature conditions and of the timetable for completion of the final report.

## H. Technology and Economic Assessment Panel administrative issues

113. Mr. Andersen, Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, gave a presentation on administrative issues. He explained that the Panel was requesting a budget of \$100,000 for 2009 for travel and meeting expenses, noting that actual expenditures for such purposes would require approval by the Panel Co-Chairs and the Ozone Secretariat, and would not include consulting fees or wages. Regarding membership of the technical options committees, the Panel was proposing Mr. Sergey Kopylov (Russian Federation) as a new co-chair of the Halons Technical Options Committee. Other expert positions needing to be filled included those for nutsedge control, orchard replant, forestry and nursery propagation for the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee; for aviation fire protection for the Halons Technical Options Committee; and for several refrigeration and



air-conditioning subsectors for the Refrigeration, Air-Conditioning and Heat Pumps Technical Options Committee.

114. It was agreed that the Secretariat would prepare a draft decision on the nomination of Mr. Kopylov for consideration during the high-level segment.

**I. Compliance and reporting issues considered by the Implementation Committee, including non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol that may be attributable to CFC consumption for production of metered dose inhalers in certain Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 (decision XVIII/16 paragraphs 3–5)**

115. The Co-Chair invited Mr. Hassen Hannachi (Tunisia), President of the Implementation Committee, to present a summary of the report of the forty-first meeting of the Committee, which had taken place from 12 to 14 November 2008, and the draft decisions prepared by the Committee at its fortieth and forty-first meetings, which had been circulated in a conference-room paper.

116. He observed that much of the Committee's report was good news. The rate of data reporting by Parties had improved significantly: no fewer than 188 Parties out of 191 – more than 98 per cent – had reported data for 2007, the highest rate ever achieved for Parties reporting prior to the end-of-year meeting of the Implementation Committee. Seventy-five Parties had been able to report data for 2007 by 30 June 2008, in accordance with decision XV/15, which had meant that the Committee had been able to carry out much useful work at its fortieth meeting in July. The early submission of data had been exceptionally helpful.

117. One Party, Saudi Arabia, had requested a revision of its baseline data for methyl bromide. The Committee had been satisfied with the comprehensive range of supporting information that Saudi Arabia had provided and had concluded that it had fully complied with the requirements of decision XV/19, including carrying out investigations and site visits to methyl bromide users. The Committee accordingly recommended approval of the Party's request for revision.

118. Three draft decisions dealt with issues of compliance: requests for plans of action from two Parties regarding CFC consumption (Solomon Islands and Somalia) and the approval of Ecuador's plan of action to phase out its methyl bromide consumption. The Committee had also reviewed all existing plans of action and the extent to which Parties were meeting, or, in several cases, exceeding their commitments under them; the Committee's recommendations with regard to each case were recorded in the full report of the Committee's meeting, which would be available in due course on the Secretariat's website.

119. The Committee had also considered reports on the implementation of systems for licensing imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances. All of the eight Parties that had been required to establish and operate licensing systems had either done so or were beginning to do so; the Committee looked forward at its next meeting to receiving confirmation of the completion of that process.

120. The efforts of Bangladesh to phase out its use of CFCs in the manufacture of metered-dose inhalers had occupied much of the Committee's time. In 2006 Bangladesh had notified the Secretariat that it expected to fall into non-compliance in the years 2007–2009 owing to difficulties in phasing out CFCs for that use. Bearing in mind decision XVIII/16, which had requested the Committee to give special consideration to Parties facing phase-out challenges owing to CFC consumption for metered-dose inhaler manufacture, and after extensive discussions with the representative of Bangladesh, who had attended the meeting, the Committee had decided that it was appropriate to defer further consideration of the Party's compliance status until 2010.

121. The situation of Somalia had also been discussed at length, including with a representative of the Party who had attended the meeting. Somalia's consumption data indicated that it was in non-compliance with its obligations for halon consumption for 2006 and 2007, and for CFC consumption for 2007. The Party of course faced significant challenges as a result of the extensive political and economic disruption that it faced. Nevertheless, it had succeeded in drawing up a plan of action and proposals for a licensing system. The Committee had taken due consideration of Somalia's special situation and had agreed to forward a draft decision to the Meeting of the Parties.

122. The Committee had discussed the reports submitted by Parties, under Article 9 of the Montreal Protocol, on research, development, public awareness and exchange of information. Although every Party was obliged to submit such a report every two years the number of Parties providing them had been relatively small; for example, only 18 Parties had submitted such data to the Secretariat in 2007 and 2008, of which the vast majority were Article 5 Parties. In 2005 the Committee had concluded not

only that Article 9 imposed a legal obligation but also that the reports called for by the Article had real value. In its discussion during 2008 the Committee had decided to request the Secretariat to share the reported information with all Parties through its website.

123. The Committee had also considered the reporting, presentation and review of data in respect of very small – or “*de minimis*” – quantities of ozone-depleting substances relative to compliance. A problem had arisen because the approach taken by Parties and the Secretariat to rounding off figures when reporting and presenting data had varied over the years. The Secretariat, for example, had from 2004 used three decimal places in presenting reported data while there had been no uniform approach among Parties. The Eighteenth Meeting of the Parties had agreed that the Secretariat should henceforth round to one decimal place in presenting reported data.

124. Unfortunately, however, the method adopted by the Eighteenth Meeting of the Parties raised a number of issues: data rounded to one place could, for example, serve to disguise a small level of consumption; and it could put a Party into apparent compliance when more precise figures might reveal that it was in fact not within the control limits. The matter was at the moment of particular importance given that total phase-out for several categories of ozone-depleting substances was approaching for Article 5 Parties and the final stages of phase-out could involve very small quantities. Given the complexity of the issue the Committee had agreed to bring it to the attention of the Meeting of the Parties.

125. The Committee had also discussed a paper prepared by the Secretariat on the review of decisions of the Meeting of the Parties on recurrent actions or activities which should be monitored or reviewed on a regular basis by the Implementation Committee. The paper had been prepared in response to a corresponding recommendation by the Committee. In its effort to respond to that recommendation, however, the Secretariat had found itself faced with issues necessitating legal interpretation of the Protocol, which was the sole preserve of the Parties. The Secretariat had therefore sought guidance from the Committee, which had in turn agreed to consider the issue at future meetings.

126. Lastly, the Committee had discussed the recording of destinations of exports. Decision XVII/16 had urged Parties to use the new reporting format to identify the destinations of exports (including re-exports) of all ozone-depleting substances. To enable the Committee to review the implementation of that reporting requirement, the Secretariat had been requested to identify in its regular data report to the Committee those Parties that had not reported in accordance with decision XVII/16.

127. The Secretariat had sent letters to Parties informing them of exports of ozone-depleting substances bound for their countries. In the experience of several Committee members, however, that information had proved to be inconsistent with their own import data. Committee members recognized the data uncertainties involved, which were caused by factors such as trade through free trade zones and illegal trade. Recognizing the importance of the issue, the Committee had concluded that it was not in a position to make any recommendation at the current time but expressed the hope that the issue would be discussed by the Meeting of the Parties.

128. In closing, he thanked the representatives of the Multilateral Fund secretariat and the implementing agencies and the Chair of the Executive Committee for their assistance. He also thanked the Ozone Secretariat for its support and the members of the Committee for their hard work. The international ozone community, he concluded, had helped to build a compliance system that was internationally regarded with respect and as a model to be emulated. He was confident that it would be able to cope with the challenges to be faced over the coming year, as the Parties approached the 2010 deadline for total phase-out of key ozone-depleting substances.

129. All representatives who took the floor complimented the Committee on its hard work and dedication. One representative observed that he had recently submitted information on exports. Another representative said that he believed that the Parties should retain their practice of rounding data to one decimal place. As total phase-out of various substances, particularly HCFCs, approached, Parties would find themselves dealing with smaller and smaller quantities of substances. Rounding figures to one decimal place rather than three would allow them greater flexibility in meeting their commitments.

130. The representative of Bangladesh gave a summary of his Party's situation, explaining that his delegation had come to the meeting with high hopes that the Parties would consider its non-compliance situation with due regard for the spirit of decision XVIII/16. He said that his country had been working hard to implement the Montreal Protocol ever since its accession to the agreement in 1990. In the aerosol sector, which had accounted for 50 per cent of the country's consumption of CFCs, total phase-out had been achieved in 2002. That, together with reductions in CFC consumption in the refrigeration and air-conditioning sector, had enabled Bangladesh to meet its 2005 target of a

50 per cent phase-out of CFCs. The national phase-out plan currently being implemented would see total phase-out of CFCs in refrigeration and air conditioning by 2010.

131. Phase-out in the metered-dose inhaler sector, however, posed much more difficult challenges, as metered-dose inhalers were essential for the health of the population. As set out in the Party's metered-dose inhaler transition strategy, consumption for that use was projected to increase in each year from 2007 to 2009, before reductions due to the conversion project would be seen. As an Article 5 Party Bangladesh would not be eligible for essential-use exemptions until 2010.

132. From as early as 2004, therefore, Bangladesh had been raising the issue of its potential future non-compliance at meetings of the Implementation Committee, the Open-ended Working Group and the Meeting of the Parties. A series of recommendations and decisions had been adopted, culminating in decision XVIII/16, which he regarded as a very positive development. Furthermore, progress had been made in recent months: the Government had signed agreements with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UNEP in October 2008, and was working with the implementing agencies for the implementation of the conversion project and the transition strategy. He expected the first alternative products to be launched in late 2010.

133. In conclusion, he expressed his thanks to the members of the Implementation Committee for the sympathy and concern with which they had approached that issue. Nevertheless, he also expressed reservations about some aspects of the draft decision, in particular the requirement that CFC consumption for metered-dose inhalers should not rise more than 20 per cent above its 2007 level, which he believed would be impossible to satisfy. The Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund had already approved a transition strategy that permitted higher levels of consumption, and he did not believe that two distinct bodies of the Montreal Protocol should contradict each other. He accordingly suggested a series of amendments to the text of the draft decision.

134. Expressing their support for the position of Bangladesh, a number of representatives observed that Article 5 Parties faced significant difficulties in phasing out the use of CFCs in metered-dose inhalers, not least that the technology necessary for non-CFC alternatives was usually owned by multinational companies and could not be transferred easily to domestic enterprises. It was essential to maintain the position of domestic companies and to enable them to compete in the market for such medications, which in turn would help to keep prices down for patients.

135. Several other representatives, however, while sympathizing with Bangladesh's predicament, expressed misgivings at the Committee's suggested draft decision. The proposal to defer consideration of a Party's compliance status represented a departure from established practice and did not seem likely to offer a satisfactory way of assisting the Party in question or of monitoring its progress in meeting its obligations. One reason for the success of the Montreal Protocol was its robust and effective compliance system and a decision in effect not to apply it would send the wrong signal. The "special consideration" requested under decision XVIII/16 did not require the Committee to defer its consideration of the Party's compliance status. The representatives suggested that the draft decision should not be adopted, and instead that the Implementation Committee should return to the issue at its next meeting, in 2009.

136. Responding to the discussion, the President of the Committee observed that the Committee had considered the issue of Bangladesh at great length and that the final decision had been reached with the support of all members, after discussing the issue with the representative of the Party. The Committee had considered two options and had decided to proceed with flexibility in the light of the requirements of decision XVIII/16. Nevertheless, if the Parties felt that they would prefer the Committee to consider the situation of Bangladesh further at its next meeting then it would of course do so.

137. Following their discussion the Parties agreed to forward the draft decisions recommended by the Implementation Committee, with the exception of that dealing with Bangladesh, for further consideration during the high-level segment.

138. The Parties also agreed to forward a draft decision on the numbers of Parties reporting data for consideration during the high-level segment.

**J. Consideration of membership of Montreal Protocol bodies for 2009**

1. **Members of the Implementation Committee**
2. **Members of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund**
3. **Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group**

139. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that it would be necessary at the current meeting to nominate candidates for several positions in Montreal Protocol bodies for 2009, according to the procedures set out in paragraph 10 of document UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/2. He called upon the regional groups to submit nominations to the Ozone Secretariat. The Parties subsequently agreed on the membership of the Implementation Committee and the Executive Committee and on Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group and approved draft decisions reflecting that agreement for further consideration during the high-level segment.

**V. Other matters****A. *Who's Who in the Montreal Protocol***

140. Mr. González presented a short video film introducing a new electronic publication produced by the UNEP Division of Technology, Industry and Economics: *Who's Who in the Montreal Protocol*. Explaining that it was a web-based information tool to be launched during the current meeting, he expressed the hope that it would prove useful to all participants in the Protocol.

**B. Release by Nepal of stocks of confiscated chlorofluorocarbons**

141. The representative of Nepal introduced a draft decision that would permit Nepal to release its stock of confiscated CFCs on to its domestic market, explaining that the proposal represented a departure from the terms of decision XVI/27, which had limited the release of CFCs seized when Nepal had interrupted illegal trade. That decision did not permit the release of any of the stock after 2010, which would leave Nepal with a volume that would have to be destroyed, at significant expense, even though there would be residual demand for CFCs for servicing existing equipment within the country. The proposal would permit Nepal instead to release small quantities of CFCs on to its domestic market until 2013. He observed that a similar issue arose with respect to the disposal of confiscated and contaminated ozone-depleting substances, which had been discussed at an earlier stage of the meeting.

142. Several representatives acknowledged Nepal's efforts to deal with the issue in an open and transparent manner. They said that they understood Nepal's concerns but felt that the issue needed to be considered at more length, and in concert with the discussion on destruction and disposal of ozone-depleting substances, before it could be agreed.

143. The representative of Nepal subsequently announced that, after further consideration and discussion, his delegation had decided to withdraw its draft decision. He expressed the hope that the Implementation Committee would consider the issue at its next meeting before the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group in July 2009.

**C. Difficulties faced by Iraq as a new Party**

144. The representative of Iraq introduced a draft decision on the difficulties faced by Iraq as a new Party to the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol. Thanking all those organizations and Parties that had helped Iraq to ratify the agreements and thereby become the newest Party, he said that Iraq had joined the Convention and Protocol out of its determination to create a new image and to participate fully in international institutions and agreements.

145. His country, however, faced significant challenges in meeting its obligations under the Protocol. Iraq's recent history of war and political and economic disruption made it extremely difficult to report historic data on the consumption of ozone-depleting substances, although he hoped to be able to submit outstanding data by the end of 2008. Furthermore, Iraq had ratified with only 14 months left before the deadline for total phase-out of the main categories of ozone-depleting substances. The financial assistance being made available through the Multilateral Fund and its implementing agencies, while extremely welcome, was insufficient to achieve phase-out by 2010. He therefore hoped that the Parties would support his draft decision, which took into account those circumstances.

146. Many representatives took the floor to welcome Iraq as the newest member of the ozone family, and to recognize the daunting challenges that it faced in meeting its obligations in such a short time. They urged support from all Parties for the draft decision in view of that exceptional combination of circumstances. Other representatives, while welcoming the thrust of the draft decision, requested more time to consider its implications and to suggest some amendments to its text.

147. Subsequently, the representative of Iraq introduced a revised draft decision. She explained the series of amendments that had been made to the earlier text, which provided for, among other things, encouragement for Iraq to participate in an informal prior informed consent procedure for trade in ozone-depleting substances, as referred to in decision XIX/12, and a request to the Implementation Committee to report on the compliance situation of the Party at the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group preceding the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties, during which the decision should be reconsidered. The Parties agreed to forward the draft decision for consideration during the high-level segment.

#### **D. Doha Declaration**

148. The representative of Qatar introduced a draft decision on the adoption by the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties of a Doha declaration. He explained that his country had been honoured to host the current meeting. His proposed declaration highlighted key issues in the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances which had been addressed at the current meeting, including destruction of controlled substances (which would be of benefit to efforts to combat both climate change and ozone depletion), replenishment of the Multilateral Fund and enhancement of satellite monitoring of the atmosphere. He also expressed the hope that the paperless system introduced at the meeting would serve as a model for other United Nations forums.

149. Several representatives announced their support for the declaration. A number commented that, while they supported the aims of the declaration, the exact wording, which in some cases depended on the outcomes of discussions in contact groups, needed some amendment.

150. The representative of Qatar subsequently introduced a revised draft decision, which the Parties approved for further consideration during the high-level segment.

#### **E. High-global warming potential substitutes for ozone-depleting substances**

151. The representative of the United States of America, introducing a draft decision on a workshop for a dialogue on high global-warming potential substitutes for ozone-depleting substances, said that, given the transition from ozone-depleting substances to high global-warming potential chemicals, in particular hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), there was a need for additional information on, and discussion of, substitutes with high global-warming potential. The Party had accordingly circulated a draft decision proposing various actions that would add to existing knowledge on the matter, including convening of a half-day open-ended dialogue on high global-warming potential substitutes.

152. During the ensuing discussion a number of Parties expressed broad support for the initiative, and it was agreed that informal discussions would be held on the issue among interested Parties.

153. The representative of the United States subsequently provided an interim report on the discussions that had been held with other Parties. While they had been fruitful, Parties had not been able to agree on whether the proposed workshop should be organized only between Parties to the Montreal Protocol or also jointly with Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. He hoped to be able to resolve the issue after further discussions.

154. The representative of the United States subsequently introduced a revised draft decision. It requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to update its 2005 special report on the ozone layer and climate; the Ozone Secretariat, with input, where appropriate, from the secretariat of the Framework Convention on Climate Change and Kyoto Protocol, to organize an open-ended dialogue on alternatives, with the participation of both ozone and climate experts, and to produce a summary report for the Open-ended Working Group at its twenty-ninth meeting; and the Secretariat to communicate that intention to the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol in December 2008. Although such agreement was not reflected in the text of the draft decision, he announced that it had also been agreed that the dialogue would take the form of a one-day workshop and that funding would be available to allow Article 5 Parties to play a full part.

155. The Co-Chair of the preparatory segment confirmed that the sum of \$115,000 had been set aside in the budget of the Montreal Protocol Trust Fund for the organization of the workshop, including an amount to support the participation of Article 5 Parties. On that understanding, the Parties approved the draft decision for further consideration during the high-level segment.

## **Part two: High-level segment (19 and 20 November 2008)**

### **I. Opening of the high-level segment**

156. The high-level segment of the combined meeting commenced at 10.15 a.m. on Wednesday, 19 November, with an opening ceremony facilitated by Mr. Khaled Faleh, who acted as master of ceremonies.

#### **A. Welcome by the Government of Qatar**

157. The segment was formally opened by Mr. al-Moadhadi, who welcomed the participants to Qatar, expressing pride in the achievements of the ozone family in its endeavours to find a solution to the problems threatening the ozone layer. The Qatari Government was committed to bequeathing a healthy planet to future generations and to keeping its place at the forefront of scientific progress for the benefit of its citizens. To that end, he announced, Qatar would establish an atmospheric monitoring station in the country, in cooperation with the United States National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and a research centre on applied technologies for ozone protection, in conjunction with UNEP. Wishing the participants fruitful discussions, he expressed the hope that Qatar would leave a lasting impression upon them.

#### **B. Statement by the President of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention**

158. In his opening statement, Mr. Djibo Leity Kâ (Senegal), who had replaced Mr. Thierno Lo as President of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention, recalled that since the previous meeting of the Conference significant activities to implement the Convention had been undertaken. The Ozone Research Managers had met in Geneva and had stressed the need, among other things, to build capacity in ozone-layer monitoring and observation, to find hydrofluorocarbon substitutes and to reconstitute the ozone layer. A draft decision, containing a request to Parties to provide contributions to the General Trust Fund for Financing Activities on Research and Systematic Observations Relevant to the Vienna Convention for continued research and monitoring was before the Parties. He noted that the Bureau of the seventh meeting had also met twice and that, while it had welcomed the progress made in implementing decisions, it had called for increased funding for research. He pointed out that implementation of the Protocol required cooperation and, given that the Protocol was often held up as an exemplar to be followed, he urged the participants to be guided by the spirit of compromise when discussing the items on their agenda.

#### **C. Statement by representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme**

159. In his opening statement, Mr. González, speaking on behalf of Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director, UNEP, thanked the Government of Qatar for hosting the meeting and for its creativity and leadership in piloting the paperless meeting initiative, which, he said, would be introduced in 2009 at the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. Welcoming the initiatives announced by the Government to establish an atmospheric monitoring centre and a research centre on applied technologies, he expressed the willingness of UNEP to assist in those endeavours.

160. He went on to stress the importance of greening the economy, pointing out that, in the current climate of economic hardship, investments in energy efficiency represented what he termed genuine “win-win” options. Noting that money spent in the green economy could have a multiplying effect, he urged the Parties to consider the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund to be an investment in accelerating the arrival of the twenty-first century economy. Looking ahead to the forthcoming session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which would take place in Poznań, Poland, he called for the Parties to work in the spirit of cooperation manifested in Doha so that they could achieve the cuts required to stabilize the atmosphere and find the funds to assist vulnerable countries to adapt to climate change. In conclusion, he suggested that, as the

initiatives of the Qatari Government demonstrated, both in times of crisis and in times of progress, the biggest stimulus package of them all was human creativity and ingenuity.

## II. Organizational matters

### A. Election of officers of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention

161. At the opening session of the high-level segment of the combined meeting, in accordance with paragraph 1 of rule 21 of the rules of procedure, the following officers were elected, by acclamation, to the Bureau of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention:

|                  |                              |  |
|------------------|------------------------------|--|
| President:       | Mr. Patali Champika Ranakawa | Sri Lanka (Asian and Pacific group)        |
| Vice-Presidents: | Mr. Mars Amanaliev           | Kyrgyzstan (Eastern European group)        |
|                  | Mr. Nelson Espinosa Peña     | Cuba (Latin American and Caribbean group)  |
|                  | Ms. Vincenza Galatone        | Canada (Western European and others group) |
| Rapporteur:      | Mr. Maged George             | Egypt (African group)                      |

### B. Election of officers of the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

162. At the opening session of the high-level segment, in accordance with paragraph 1 of rule 21 of the rules of procedure, the following officers were elected, by acclamation, to the Bureau of the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol:

|                  |                         |   |
|------------------|-------------------------|---|
| President:       | Mr. Róbert Tóth         | Hungary (Eastern European group)                |
| Vice-Presidents: | Mr. Djibo Leity Kâ      | Senegal (African group)                         |
|                  | Mr. Sylvester Quarless  | Grenada (Latin America and Caribbean group)     |
|                  | Mr. Philip Drost        | Netherlands (Western European and others group) |
| Rapporteur:      | Ms. Masnellyarti Hilman | Indonesia (Asian and Pacific Group)             |

### C. Adoption of the agenda of the high-level segment

163. The following agenda for the high-level segment was adopted on the basis of the provisional agenda contained in document UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/1-UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/1:

1. Opening of the high-level segment:
  - (a) Welcome by the Government of Qatar;
  - (b) Statement by representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme;
  - (c) Statement by a representative of the World Meteorological Organization;
  - (d) Statement by the President of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention;
  - (e) Statement by the President of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

2. Organizational matters:
  - (a) Election of officers of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention;
  - (b) Election of officers of the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol;
  - (c) Adoption of the agenda of the high-level segment;
  - (d) Organization of work;
  - (e) Credentials of representatives.
3. Presentations by the assessment panels on the status of their work, including latest developments.
4. Presentation by the Chair of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on the work of the Executive Committee.
5. Statements by heads of delegations.
6. Report of the co-chairs of the preparatory segment and consideration of the decisions recommended for adoption at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.
7. Dates and venues for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.
8. Other matters.
9. Adoption of decisions by the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention.
10. Adoption of decisions by the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.
11. Adoption of the report of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.
12. Closure of the meeting.

#### **D. Organization of work**

164. The Parties agreed to follow their customary procedures.

#### **E. Credentials of representatives**

165. The Bureaux of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol approved the credentials of the representatives of 95 of the 143 Parties represented. The Bureaux provisionally approved the participation of four Parties on the understanding that they would forward their credentials to the Secretariat as soon as possible. The Bureaux urged all Parties attending future meetings of the Parties to make their best efforts to submit credentials to the Secretariat as required under rule 18 of the rules of procedure. The Bureaux also recalled that under the rules of procedure credentials had to be issued either by a head of State or Government or by a minister for foreign affairs or, in the case of a regional economic integration organization, by the competent authority of that organization. The Bureaux further recalled that representatives of Parties not presenting credentials in the correct form could be precluded from full participation in the meetings of the Parties, including the right to vote.

### **III. Presentations by the assessment panels on the status of their work, including latest developments**

166. Speaking on behalf of the Scientific Assessment Panel, Mr. Akkihebbal R. Ravishankara set out the Panel's plans for the preparation of the 2010 assessment. The topics to be addressed had been listed in decision XIX/20; the key issues included levels and trends of ozone-depleting substances and their substitutes, with an emphasis on HCFCs; the level of atmospheric ozone and its trends; and understanding of atmospheric science relating to ozone layer changes. The impact of climate change on ozone layer recovery and the impact of ozone layer changes on the climate and climate change represented new areas of scientific enquiry. Urging all Parties to nominate experts to take part in the



2010 assessment, he outlined the schedule for its production; the report was expected to be completed in late 2010 and to be published in March 2011.

167. Speaking on behalf of the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel, Mr. Jan van der Leun recalled that the Parties had asked the Panel to assess the interaction of ozone depletion and climate change. The Panel's enquiry had revealed that there were several significant effects of that interaction. For example, higher levels of ultraviolet irradiation and higher temperatures both raised emissions from plants of methane, a powerful greenhouse gas, though the scale of the impact on climate change was not yet clear. Similarly, higher temperatures increased the rate of induction of skin cancer with, it was estimated, each one-degree rise in temperature increasing the rate of induction of skin cancer by some 2 per cent. More details of those and other research findings would be included in the Panel's 2008 progress report, which would soon be made available.

168. Speaking on behalf of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, Mr. Kuijpers explained that much of the work of the Panel was conducted by its six technical options committees, which published both regular (usually annual) reports and special reports in response to requests from Meetings of the Parties. He set out the schedule for production of the 2010 assessment report, which would be submitted by the end of 2010, and listed the key issues that would be covered by each technical options committee.

#### **IV. Presentation by the Chair of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on the work of the Executive Committee**

169. Mr. Albert Rombonot, Chair of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund, delivered a presentation on the Committee's activities in 2008, summarizing the report contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/7. During the year, the Executive Committee had approved about 50 new agreements with national Governments and disbursed approximately \$140 million to assist countries to implement those agreements. Projects funded by the Multilateral Fund had resulted in the permanent removal of 8,000 ODP-tonnes of ozone-depleting substances from the stratosphere.

170. Analysis by the Multilateral Fund secretariat on the potential of countries to meet their obligations showed that most Article 5 Parties would be able to complete the phase-out of CFCs by 2010. That represented a major achievement on the part of the international community.

171. The Executive Committee had responded to the decision of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties to accelerate the phase out of HCFCs by adjusting its basic policy framework for the funding of HCFC phase-out, approving detailed guidelines for the preparation of HCFC phase-out management plans, approving funding for such plans in over 100 countries; and beginning to draw up guidelines for the costing of HCFC phase-out.

172. Speaking also on behalf of the implementing agencies, he observed that during 2008 UNDP had reinforced its efforts to accelerate project implementation. With programmes in over 100 countries, by the end of 2008 UNDP would have assisted Article 5 Parties in phasing out over 62,000 ODP-tonnes of controlled substances, including CFCs for the manufacture of metered-dose inhalers in several countries, including India, one of the largest manufacturers of such inhalers. UNDP had assisted countries in setting up phase-out programmes for eliminating HCFC consumption, including large consuming countries such as Brazil, China, India and Mexico. UNDP had also developed two pilot projects to validate alternatives that were both ozone- and climate-friendly in Brazil and Mexico.

173. The core mandate of UNEP comprised targeting compliance assistance mainly at low-volume-consuming countries. Its regional networks now covered 145 Article 5 Parties and its programme to assist such Parties in raising awareness was providing significant help to national ozone units. UNEP had continued its network activities, including cooperation between developing countries over technology transfer and the prevention of illegal trade, and was cooperating with existing regional and international organizations to strengthen ozone-related policy and regulation.

174. Projects funded through the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) had phased out another 766 ODP-tonnes of ozone-depleting substances in 2008, bringing the total volume phased out to over 63,000 ODP-tonnes. In particular, UNIDO had assisted a number of countries to phase out the use of CFCs in the production of metered-dose inhalers and had begun an ambitious programme to phase out HCFCs in over 30 Article 5 Parties. UNIDO was well positioned to deliver assistance to Article 5 Parties because of its in-house technical expertise.

175. Since the inception of the Multilateral Fund the World Bank had assisted Article 5 Parties in removing over 280,000 ODP-tonnes of ozone-depleting substances from the stratosphere. During 2008, the World Bank had started to refocus its programme to assist countries in taking on the challenge of HCFC phase-out and was exploring various possibilities for co-financing. It had also commissioned a study to determine how the voluntary carbon market could be mobilized for financing the destruction of unwanted ozone-depleting substances.

176. The Chair observed that despite those achievements there remained a number of challenges for the Executive Committee to tackle in the future. By the end of October 2008, \$51 million of the pledged total contributions of \$133 million for 2008 had not yet been paid, and he appealed for the timely payment of all contributions. Work remained to be completed on various issues related to the financing of HCFC phase-out, including the permissibility of financing second-stage conversion and the definition of cut-off dates for funding eligibility. There were also complex technical and policy issues remaining to be resolved on the matter of climate, energy and further environmental impacts in accordance with the requirements of decision XIX/6.

177. In conclusion, the Chair expressed his belief that the Montreal Protocol was one of the most successful international environmental agreements, of which the Multilateral Fund was an integral part. The Montreal Protocol community could feel proud of its efforts to phase out ozone-depleting substances, which had contributed not only to the recovery of the ozone layer but also to the reduction of greenhouse gases. All participants needed to continue and reinforce that success by attending to the phase-out of HCFCs.

## V. Statements by heads of delegations

178. At the high-level segment, statements were made by heads of delegation of the following Parties, listed in the order in which they spoke: Egypt, India, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Mauritius, Iraq, Djibouti, Mauritania, Dominican Republic, United States of America, South Africa, France (on behalf of the European Union), Jordan, Lebanon, United Republic of Tanzania, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Yemen, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Burundi, United Arab Emirates, Burkina Faso, Japan, Bangladesh, Finland, Mozambique, Croatia, Serbia, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Armenia, Kenya, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Malaysia, Kuwait, China, Brazil, Trinidad and Tobago, Cuba, Afghanistan, Philippines, Pakistan, Turkey, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Myanmar, Malawi, Micronesia (Federated States of), Angola and Cameroon.

179. The representative of the Secretariat of the Basel Convention made a statement.

180. Statements were also made by representatives of Greenpeace, the International Institute of Refrigeration and the Institute of Governance and Sustainable Development.

181. All speakers expressed their appreciation to the Government and people of Qatar for hosting the current meeting and welcomed the innovation of a paperless meeting.

182. Many representatives congratulated the members of the Bureaux on their election and thanked UNEP and the Ozone Secretariat, the Multilateral Fund secretariat and implementing agencies, donor countries, international organizations and other stakeholders for their role in ensuring the success of the meeting and the successful development and implementation of the Protocol.

183. Several representatives said that the Protocol was an exemplary multilateral environmental agreement and expressed pride in its achievements, stating that in addition to protecting the ozone layer it had also helped to alleviate climate change. Some highlighted the active participation of all relevant stakeholders in the Protocol's implementation and stressed the importance of maintaining its strong scientific basis, developing strong partnerships between the public and the private sectors, involving communities and raising awareness of ozone-related issues.

184. Many representatives said that, while there were reasons to celebrate the Protocol's success, much work remained to be done and Parties needed to maintain momentum to ensure that the Protocol met its objectives. Many speakers from Article 5 Parties identified the continued use and accelerated phase-out of HCFCs as a major challenge, both technologically and financially. Several representatives said that accelerated phase-out would demand a significant input of technology for the development and application of alternatives and financial resources to compensate for the economic costs involved.

185. Numerous representatives emphasized the links between the ozone treaties and related environmental agreements such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol and suggested that the synergies between them should be developed. One representative suggested that it might be possible to expand the national centre that had been established in her country, originally under the Basel Convention and later expanded to related conventions, to deal with Montreal Protocol issues. A number of representatives of Article 5 Parties said that small island developing States were particularly vulnerable to climate change and welcomed actions under the Protocol that could mitigate its effects. One representative stressed the importance of ground measurement and commented that there were not enough regional centres and that their geographical distribution was inadequate.

186. While agreeing that it had been necessary to accelerate the schedule for phasing out HCFCs, most speakers from Article 5 Parties said that they would only be able to implement the accelerated schedule if they received adequate financial and technical assistance. Several stressed the need to provide financial and technical support to those industries that had already converted from CFCs to HCFCs and were then being asked to undertake a second conversion to other climate- and ozone-friendly technologies.

187. Some representatives expressed concern about replenishment levels in the light of the current global economic situation. All representatives of Article 5 Parties who spoke expressed the need for adequate resources to enable work under the Convention and Protocol to proceed effectively and urged a generous replenishment of the Multilateral Fund.

188. Other challenges that representatives identified included the difficulties in reducing the use of CFCs in metered-dose inhaler manufacture, taking into account possible implications for human health and the availability of feasible cost-effective alternatives for many of them. One representative pointed out that the capacity to develop alternatives was often constrained by the existence of patents and pharmaceutical regulations. Ensuring the environmentally sound management and destruction of ozone-depleting substance wastes, including those contained in banks, was said to be another challenge. Many representatives stressed the need to combat illegal trade in ozone-depleting substances, to train Customs officials, to establish effective import and export licensing systems and to continue to provide institutional strengthening.

189. Many representatives outlined the status of their countries' ratification of the ozone instruments and their efforts to fulfil their obligations under the Protocol. The latter included work to phase out controlled substances, sometimes ahead of schedule; to promote and move towards alternative technologies, including climate-friendly technologies; to combat illegal trade in ozone-depleting substances; to engage in training and capacity-building activities; and to raise awareness in industry and communities about national efforts and obligations.

190. Several representatives expressed their solidarity with Iraq as a new Party and supported its efforts with regard to the Protocol.

191. The representative of the Secretariat of the Basel Convention, recalling that one of the major challenges under discussion was the environmentally sound management and destruction of CFCs stockpiled and contained in banks, stressed the importance of the transboundary movement of wastes. Drawing attention to the synergies between the various environmental conventions, he expressed an interest in working together with Parties to the Montreal Convention and mentioned specifically the discussions under way for a joint project on the transboundary movement of waste ozone-depleting substances.

192. The representative of a non-governmental organization urged the Parties to adopt a policy barring the use of HFCs in any new or retrofit applications where technologically proven, safe, efficient, low-global warming potential HFC-free technologies existed and urged the Multilateral Fund to stop funding HFC-based projects immediately. He called for additional funding to assist developing countries in their phase-out activities and to provide incremental funding to level the playing field for climate-friendly technologies in comparison with those using HFCs. He also called upon the Parties to secure adequate funding for the establishment of a global network for the recapture and safe destruction of CFCs and HCFCs in domestic and commercial refrigeration equipment.

193. A representative of a non-governmental organization urged that a replacement calendar be drawn up for the refrigeration sector and that further efforts be made to use existing natural refrigerants and to explore new technologies such as solar refrigeration.

194. Another representative of a non-governmental organization commended the progress made by the Montreal Protocol and stated that it was beginning to acquire global recognition as the most successful of the environmental conventions. He expressed the view that the Montreal Protocol had shown that global atmospheric problems could be solved.

## **VI. Report of the Co-Chairs of the preparatory segment and consideration of the decisions recommended for adoption at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol**

195. Reporting on the preparatory segment of the meetings, the Co-Chair said that a great deal had been achieved, with four decisions under the Vienna Convention and over 20 decisions under the Montreal Protocol approved for consideration and possible adoption during the high-level segment. The paperless system, she said, had been a breakthrough in the way that United Nations meetings take place, and she hoped that it would be used for other United Nations meetings in the future. She thanked the representatives for their hard work and their spirit of cooperation; the co-chairs of the contact groups for their skill, patience and tireless efforts in preparing the draft decisions; and the Secretariat for its excellent work and professionalism.

## **VII. Dates and venues for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol**

196. The Parties accepted with pleasure the offer of the Government of Egypt to host the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt. The date of the meeting would be announced as soon as possible. The Parties also agreed to hold the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention back-to-back with the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

## **VIII. Other matters**

197. No other matters were discussed.

## **IX. Adoption of decisions by the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention**

*The Conference of the Parties decides:*

### **VIII/I: Status of ratification of the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and the London, Copenhagen, Montreal and Beijing amendments to the Montreal Protocol**

1. To note with satisfaction the large number of countries which have ratified the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer;

2. To note that, as of 15 November 2008, 193 Parties had ratified the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol, 189 Parties had ratified the London Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, 184 Parties had ratified the Copenhagen Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, 167 Parties had ratified the Montreal Amendment to the Montreal Protocol and 144 Parties had ratified the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol;

3. To urge all States that have not yet done so to ratify, approve or accede to the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol and its amendments, taking into account that universal participation is necessary to ensure the protection of the ozone layer;

## VIII/2: Recommendations adopted by the Ozone Research Managers at their seventh meeting

*Recalling* that, pursuant to the objective defined in decision I/6 of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention, the Ozone Research Managers review ongoing national and international research and monitoring programmes with a view to ensuring the proper coordination of those programmes and identifying gaps that need to be addressed,

*Recognizing* that the Ozone Research Managers at their seventh meeting emphasized the discussion of satellite research and monitoring owing to concerns among scientists that there could be serious gaps in satellite monitoring and associated data when current generation satellites and associated instruments reach the end of their useful lives in the next few years,

*Also recognizing* that the Ozone Research Managers have noted that international funding and cooperation are essential for the implementation of their recommendations, that their previous recommendations have not received sufficient attention owing to a lack of such funding and cooperation and that problems associated with the maintenance of existing instruments and networks for ozone monitoring and the development of new capabilities have been exacerbated as a result,

*Emphasizing* the need for continued monitoring of the effectiveness of the implementation of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and its adjustments and amendments, including the adjustment providing for the accelerated phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons, the impact of the increasing abundance in the atmosphere of many substitute chemicals, including hydrofluorocarbons, and the expected recovery of the ozone layer in a context of climate change,

1. To take note with appreciation of the report of the seventh meeting of the Ozone Research Managers;<sup>1</sup>
2. To endorse the recommendations adopted by the Ozone Research Managers at their seventh meeting, as set out in the report of that meeting;
3. To urge space agencies and Governments to ensure the continuation of satellite research and observations, particularly to allow for measurements that contribute to the long-term time series for both total and profile ozone and profiles of ozone-related and climate-related species and parameters, and to carry out any necessary gap-filler missions in order to avoid gaps in areas of atmospheric observation that are critical to understanding and monitoring changes in atmospheric ozone and surface ultraviolet radiation and their interrelationship with climate variability and change;
4. To request all Parties to make a renewed effort to implement the actions recommended by the Ozone Research Managers, particularly those adopted at their seventh meeting, with a view to:
  - (a) Addressing uncertainties and new questions, including actual quantification of the extent to which chemical and dynamical processes are responsible for ozone production, loss, transport and distribution as well as changes in surface ultraviolet radiation resulting from changes in ozone and other atmospheric parameters and their impact on human and biological systems;
  - (b) Maintaining and expanding surface observation networks where gaps in geographical coverage result in data deficiencies in order to ensure the continuity and improvement of ground-based in situ observations of ozone depleting substances, their substitutes and greenhouse gases as well as the networks that provide altitude profile information for ozone-related and climate-related species;
  - (c) Ensuring that data acquired through observation are of the highest possible quality and include the metadata necessary to make them valuable to users today and in the future and, to that end, that efforts are made to enhance data archiving, including through the development of appropriate data quality assurance and submission procedures and timely access by users;
  - (d) Strengthening the capacity of developing countries and countries with economies in transition to enable them to maintain existing instruments and networks, acquire new observational capabilities and increase their participation in scientific research and assessments;

---

<sup>1</sup> World Meteorological Organization/United Nations Environment Programme, Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Ozone Research Managers, WMO Global Ozone Research and Monitoring Project, Report No. 51.

### **VIII/3: Vienna Convention Trust Fund for Financing Activities on Research and Systematic Observations Relevant to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer**

*Recalling* decision VI/2, by which the Conference of the Parties established the Vienna Convention Trust Fund for Research and Systematic Observations,

*Recalling also* that the United Nations Environment Programme extended the Trust Fund to 31 December 2015 in order to continue supporting monitoring and research activities in developing countries and countries with economies in transition and that the Conference of the Parties is to decide in 2014 on whether to extend the Trust Fund beyond 2015,

*Noting with appreciation* the report provided by the Secretariat on the operation of, contributions to, and expenditures from the Trust Fund since its inception,<sup>2</sup>

*Also noting with appreciation* the contributions to the Trust Fund made by several Parties and the joint efforts of the World Meteorological Organization and the Ozone Secretariat in the implementation of the activities of the Trust Fund,

*Recognizing* the need to continue and strengthen atmospheric research and monitoring activities in order to address the many uncertainties that exist regarding the expected ozone recovery process and interaction between ozone and climate changes,

*Noting* the recommendations of the Ozone Research Managers at their seventh meeting, particularly with regard to the Trust Fund, in respect of which the Managers emphasize its importance in enabling capacity-building activities and the need for both monetary and specific in kind contributions that are directly targeted at ozone- and ultraviolet radiation-related activities,

1. To urge all Parties and relevant international organizations to make voluntary financial contributions to the Trust Fund and voluntary in kind contributions to enable the continuation and enhancement of monitoring and research activities in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, taking into account the need for balanced global coverage;

2. To request the Secretariat to continue to invite Parties and relevant international organizations annually to make voluntary contributions to the Fund and with each successive invitation to the Parties to report on the prior years' contributions, funded activities and planned future activities;

3. To request the Secretariat and the World Meteorological Organization to continue their cooperation in respect of the Trust Fund pursuant to the terms of the memorandum of understanding between the two bodies on the operation of the Fund and to alert the Parties should a need arise to amend the memorandum of understanding to take into consideration evolving needs and conditions;

4. To remind the Secretariat and the World Meteorological Organization of the request in paragraph 7 of decision VII/2 of the Conference of the Parties that they strive for regional balance in the activities supported by the Fund and that they make an effort to leverage other sources of funding;

### **VIII/4: Financial matters: financial reports and budgets**

*Recalling* decision VII/3 on financial matters,

*Recognizing* that voluntary contributions are an essential complement for the effective implementation of the Vienna Convention;

*Welcoming* the continued excellent management by the Secretariat of the finances of the Trust Fund for the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer:

1. To take note with appreciation of the financial statement of the Trust Fund for the biennium 2006-2007 ended 31 December 2007 and the report on the actual expenditures for 2007 as compared to the approvals for that year;<sup>3</sup>

2. To approve the revised 2008 budget for the Trust Fund in the amount of \$1,213,142, the budget for 2009 in the amount of \$699,897, the budget for 2010 in amount of \$717,901, and the budget for 2011 in the amount of \$1,268,489 as set out in annex I to the report of the eighth meeting of the

2 UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/5.

3 UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/4/Add.1.

Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer;<sup>4</sup>

3. To authorize the Secretariat to draw down amounts of \$96,897 in 2009, \$114,901 in 2010 and \$665,489 in 2011, respectively, from the Fund balance for the purpose of reducing that balance;

4. To ensure, as a consequence of the draw-downs referred to in paragraph 3, that the contributions to be paid by the Parties amount to \$603,000 for each of the years 2009, 2010 and 2011 as set out in annex II to the report of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer;

5. To urge all Parties to pay their outstanding contributions as well as their future contributions promptly and in full;

6. To request the Executive Director to extend the Vienna Convention Trust Fund until 31 December 2015;<sup>5</sup>

### **VIII/5: Ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention**

To convene the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention back-to-back with the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

## **X. Adoption of decisions by the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol**

### **A. Adoption of decisions**

*The Meeting of the Parties decides:*

#### **XX/1: Status of ratification of the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and the London, Copenhagen, Montreal and Beijing amendments to the Montreal Protocol**

1. To note with satisfaction the large number of countries which have ratified the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer;

2. To note that, as of 15 November 2008, 193 Parties had ratified the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol, 189 Parties had ratified the London Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, 184 Parties had ratified the Copenhagen Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, 167 Parties had ratified the Montreal Amendment to the Montreal Protocol and 144 Parties had ratified the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol;

3. To urge all States that have not yet done so to ratify, approve or accede to the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol and its amendments, taking into account that universal participation is necessary to ensure the protection of the ozone layer;

#### **XX/2: Essential-use nominations for Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 for controlled substances for 2009 and 2010**

*Noting with appreciation* the work done by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its Medical Technical Options Committee,

*Mindful* that, according to decision IV/25, the use of chlorofluorocarbons for metered-dose inhalers does not qualify as an essential use if technically and economically feasible alternatives or substitutes are available that are acceptable from the standpoint of environment and health,

4 UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/7-UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/9.

5 Budget tables are set out in section B of the annex to the present compilation.

*Noting* the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's conclusion that technically satisfactory alternatives to chlorofluorocarbon-based metered-dose inhalers are available for short-acting beta-agonists and other therapeutic categories for asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease,

*Mindful* that paragraph 8 of decision XII/2 allows the transfer of chlorofluorocarbons between metered-dose inhaler companies,

*Welcoming* the continued progress in several Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in reducing their reliance on chlorofluorocarbon based metered-dose inhalers as alternatives are developed, receive regulatory approval and are marketed for sale,

1. To authorize the levels of production and consumption for 2009 and 2010 necessary to satisfy essential uses of chlorofluorocarbons for metered-dose inhalers for asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease as specified in the annex to the present decision;

2. That Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol, when licensing, authorizing or allocating essential-use exemptions for a manufacturer of metered dose inhalers, shall ensure, in accordance with paragraph 1 (b) of decision IV/25, that pre-1996 and post-1996 stocks of controlled substances are taken into account such that no more than a one-year operational supply is maintained by the manufacturer;

### **Annex to decision XX/2**

#### **Essential-use authorizations for 2009 and 2010 of chlorofluorocarbons for metered-dose inhalers approved by the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties**

| Party                    | Quantity (metric tonnes) |      |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|------|
|                          | 2009                     | 2010 |
| European Community       | 22                       | 0    |
| United States of America | -                        | 92   |
| Russian Federation       | 248                      | 0    |

### **XX/3: Essential-use exemptions for Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5**

*Mindful* of the impending 2010 phase-out of certain controlled substances in Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5,

*Desiring* to implement effectively paragraph 7 of decision IV/25 and make the currently used essential-use exemption process and related decisions fully applicable to both Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5, subject to the phase-out dates applicable to those Parties, and Parties not so operating,

*Taking into consideration* that some Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 may prepare essential-use nominations for the first time and may therefore face difficulties in doing so,

1. To make the following modifications to the decisions noted below:

(a) To remove reference to the term "not operating under Article 5" or, "for non-Article 5 Parties" from the following titles and provisions of the following past decisions of the Parties:

- (i) Title of decisions VIII/9, VIII/10, VIII/11, XI/14, XVII/5, XVIII/7, XIX/13;
- (ii) Decision VIII/10, first line of paragraphs 1–9;
- (iii) Decision XV/5, paragraphs 2, 3, 5(a) and 6;
- (iv) Decision XVIII/7, paragraphs 2 and 3;
- (v) Decision XVIII/16, first line of paragraph 7;

(b) To remove reference to the term "not operating under Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol" from the following titles and provisions of the following past decisions of the Parties:

- (i) Decision XVII/5, paragraph 2;
- (ii) Decision XIX/13, paragraphs 2 and 3;



- (c) To remove and replace reference to the date “1996” with the term “phase-out” in the following provisions of past decisions of the Parties:
- (i) Decision XVII/5, paragraph 2;
  - (ii) Decision XVIII/7, paragraph 2;
  - (iii) Decision XIX/13, paragraph 2;
- (d) To add a new paragraph after paragraph 3 of decision XVII/5 to read as follows:
- 3 bis* With reference to paragraph 6 of decision XV/5, to request that Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol submit a date to the Ozone Secretariat prior to the Twenty-Second Meeting of the Parties, by which time a regulation or regulations to determine the non-essentiality of the vast majority of chlorofluorocarbons for metered-dose inhalers where the active ingredient is not solely salbutamol will have been proposed;
- (e) To add a new paragraph after paragraph 5 of decision IX/19 to read as follows:
- 5 bis.* To require Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 submitting essential-use nominations for chlorofluorocarbons for metered-dose inhalers for the treatment of asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease to present to the Ozone Secretariat an initial national or regional transition strategy by 31 January 2010 for circulation to all Parties. Where possible, Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 are encouraged to develop and submit to the Secretariat an initial transition strategy by 31 January 2009. In preparing a transition strategy, Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 should take into consideration the availability and price of treatments for asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in countries currently importing chlorofluorocarbon-containing metered-dose inhalers;
- (f) To add a new paragraph after paragraph 2 of decision XII/2 to read as follows:
- 2 bis.* That any chlorofluorocarbon metered-dose inhaler product approved after 31 December 2008, excluding any product in the process of registration and approved by 31 December 2009, for treatment of asthma and/or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in a Party operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5, is not an essential use, unless the product meets the criteria set out in paragraph 1 (a) of decision IV/25;
- (g) To add a new paragraph after paragraph 4 of decision XV/5 to read as follows:
- 4 bis.* That no quantity of chlorofluorocarbons for essential uses shall be authorized after the commencement of the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties if the nominating Party operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 has not submitted to the Ozone Secretariat, in time for consideration by the Parties at the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, a preliminary plan of action regarding the phase-out of the domestic use of chlorofluorocarbon-containing metered-dose inhalers where the sole active ingredient is salbutamol;
2. That both the Parties submitting nominations for essential-use exemptions and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel reviewing nominations for essential-use exemptions shall consider the decisions noted above in their amended form when considering essential-use nominations in 2009 and beyond, subject to any further future decisions of the Parties;
3. To request the Secretariat to include the changes above in the relevant decisions of the Parties contained in the Montreal Protocol handbook at the time of its next revision, and to note in that handbook that the related decisions include the modifications adopted by the present decision;
4. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to reflect paragraphs 1–3 above in a revised version of the handbook on essential-use nominations and to submit, for consideration by Parties, suggestions for any appropriate changes to the handbook and the timing to make such changes;

**XX/4: Campaign production of chlorofluorocarbons for metered-dose inhalers**

*Acknowledging* that chlorofluorocarbon consumption and production in Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 will cease from 1 January 2010, with possible essential-use exemptions,

*Acknowledging also* that many Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 import chlorofluorocarbon-free metered-dose inhalers from Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5,

*Recognizing* that campaign production offers potential advantages in lieu of annual essential-use nominations under decision IV/25 to meet needs for pharmaceutical-grade chlorofluorocarbons,

*Noting* that decision XVIII/16, paragraph 12, requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to assess “quantities for a limited campaign production of chlorofluorocarbons exclusively for metered-dose inhalers in Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 and Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5,”

*Noting also* that the Medical Technical Options Committee presented findings concerning the amounts of chlorofluorocarbons that may be needed for metered-dose inhalers only for Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in 2008,

*Acknowledging* that the Medical Technical Options Committee has reported the need for additional information concerning the operations of a final campaign for Article 5 Parties except from one major manufacturing Party,

1. To request that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel present a report to the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties, preceded by a preliminary report to the Open-ended Working Group at its twenty-ninth meeting, concerning:

(a) The potential timing for final campaign production, taking into account, among other things, the information submitted in the nominations for 2010 and that some Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 may prepare essential use nominations for the first time for the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties;

(b) Options for long-term storage, distribution, and management of produced quantities of pharmaceutical-grade chlorofluorocarbons before they are needed by Parties, including existing methods used by Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5;

(c) Options for minimizing the potential for too much or too little chlorofluorocarbons production as part of a final campaign;

(d) Contractual arrangements that may be necessary, considering the models currently used by Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 that submit essential-use nominations consistent with decision IV/25;

(e) Options for reducing production of non-pharmaceutical-grade chlorofluorocarbons, together with options for final disposal of such chlorofluorocarbons;

2. To request the Multilateral Fund Secretariat to report to the Open-ended Working Group at its twenty-ninth meeting on the status of agreements to convert metered-dose inhaler manufacturing facilities located in Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 and the implementation of approved projects;

**XX/5: Critical-use exemptions for methyl bromide for 2009 and 2010**

*Noting with appreciation* the work done by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee,

*Noting* that Parties submitting requests for methyl bromide have supported their requests with management strategies as requested under decision Ex.I/4, and that they should periodically provide updated information,

1. To permit, for the agreed critical-use categories for 2009 set forth in table A of the annex to the present decision for each Party, subject to the conditions set forth in the present decision and decision Ex.I/4 to the extent that those conditions are applicable, the levels of production and consumption for 2009 set forth in table B of the annex to the present decision which are necessary to satisfy critical uses, in addition to the amounts permitted in decision XIX/9;

2. To permit, for the agreed critical-use categories for 2010 set forth in table C of the annex to the present decision for each Party, subject to the conditions set forth in the present decision and in decision Ex.I/4 to the extent that those conditions are applicable, the levels of production and consumption for 2010 set forth in table D of the annex to the present decision which are necessary to satisfy critical uses, with the understanding that additional levels of production and consumption and categories of uses may be approved by the Meeting of the Parties in accordance with decision IX/6;

3. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to ensure that recent findings with regard to the adoption rate of alternatives are annually updated and reported to the Parties in its first report of each year and inform the work of the Panel;

4. That when assessing supplemental requests for critical use exemptions for 2010 for a specific nomination, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel should take into account the most current information, including any information on domestic implementation of related 2009 and 2010 critical uses, in accordance with paragraph 2 of decision IX/6;

5. That a Party with a critical use exemption level in excess of permitted levels of production and consumption for critical uses is to make up any such differences between those levels by using quantities of methyl bromide from stocks that the Party has recognized to be available;

6. That Parties shall endeavour to license, permit, authorize or allocate quantities of critical-use methyl bromide as listed in tables A and C of the annex to the present decision;

7. That each Party which has an agreed critical use renews its commitment to ensure that the criteria in paragraph 1 of decision IX/6 are applied when licensing, permitting or authorizing critical use of methyl bromide and, in particular, the criterion laid down in paragraph 1 (b) (ii) of decision IX/6. Each Party is requested to report on the implementation of the present paragraph to the Ozone Secretariat by 1 February for the years to which the present decision applies;

8. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to continue publishing annually in its progress report prior to each meeting of the Open-ended Working Group the stocks of methyl bromide held by each nominating Party as reported in that Party's accounting framework report;

9. To recognize the continued contribution of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee's expertise and to agree that, in accordance with section 4.1 of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's terms of reference, the Committee should ensure that it develops its recommendations in a consensus process that includes full discussion among all available members of the Committee and should ensure that members with relevant expertise are involved in developing its recommendations;

10. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to ensure that the critical-use recommendations reported in its annual progress report clearly set out the reasons for recommendations and that, where requests are received from Parties for further information, the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee should provide a response within four weeks of submission of such a request;

11. That Parties licensing, permitting or authorizing methyl bromide for critical uses shall request the use of emission minimization techniques such as virtually impermeable films, barrier film technologies, deep shank injection and/or other techniques that promote environmental protection, whenever technically and economically feasible;

12. That each Party should continue to ensure that its national management strategy for the phase-out of critical uses of methyl bromide addresses the aims specified in paragraph 3 of decision Ex.I/4, and that each Party should periodically update or provide supplements to its national management strategy to provide new information on actions, such as identifying alternatives or regulatory updates, being undertaken to make significant progress in reducing critical use nominations, and indicating currently envisaged progress towards a phase-down;

13. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to ensure that its consideration of nominations analyse the impact of national, subnational and local regulations and law on the potential use of methyl bromide alternatives, and include a description of the analysis in the critical use nomination report;

**Annex to decision XX/5****Critical-use exemptions for methyl bromide for 2009 and 2010****Table A. 2009 agreed critical use categories (metric tonnes)**

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| Canada | Pasta (4.74)   |
| Israel | Dates (2.100), flour mills (0.300), broomrape (125.000), cut flowers – bulbs – protected (85.431), cut flowers – open field (34.698), melon – protected and field (87.500), potato (75.000), sweet potatoes (95.000), strawberry runners (Sharon and Gaza) (28.075), strawberry fruit – protected (Sharon and Gaza) (77.750) |

**Table B. 2009 permitted levels of production and consumption (metric tonnes)**

|        |         |
|--------|---------|
| Canada | 4.74    |
| Israel | 610.554 |

**Table C. 2010 agreed critical use categories (metric tonnes)**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Australia                | Strawberry runners (29.790), Rice (6.65)  |
| Canada                   | Mills (22.878), strawberry runners (Prince Edward Island) (7.462)   |
| Japan                    | Chestnuts (5.400), cucumbers (30.690), ginger - field (53.400), ginger – protected (8.300), melons (81.72), pepper - green and hot (72.99), watermelon (14.500)   |
| United States of America | Commodities (19.242), NPMA food processing structures (cocoa beans removed) (37.778), mills and processors (173.023), dried cured pork (4.465), cucurbits (302.974), eggplant – field (32.820), forest nursery seedlings (117.826), nursery stock – fruit, nut, flower (17.363), orchard replant (215.800), ornamentals (84.617), peppers – field (463.282), strawberries – field (1007.477), strawberry runners (4.690), tomatoes – field (737.584), sweet potato slips (14.515) |

**Table D. 2010 permitted levels of production and consumption (metric tonnes)**

|                          |            |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Australia                | 36.44      |
| Canada                   | 30.34      |
| Japan                    | 267.0      |
| United States of America | 2 763.456* |

\* Minus available stocks.

**XX/6: Actions by Parties to reduce methyl bromide use for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes and related emissions**

*Recognizing* that methyl bromide use for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes is an important remaining use of an ozone-depleting substance that is not controlled pursuant to paragraph 6 of Article 2H of the Montreal Protocol and that the 2006 assessment report of the Scientific Assessment Panel indicated that “emissions associated with continued or expanded exemptions, QPS ... may also delay recovery [of the ozone layer]”,<sup>6</sup>

*Recalling* that Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol requires Parties to report on the annual amount of methyl bromide used for quarantine and pre-shipment applications and that decision XI/13 urges Parties to implement procedures to monitor the uses of methyl bromide by commodity and quantity for quarantine and pre-shipment,

*Recalling also* decision VII/5 urging Parties to refrain from using methyl bromide and to use non-ozone depleting technologies wherever possible and decision XI/13 encouraging Parties to use recovery and recycling technologies where technically and economically feasible until alternatives are available,

*Reaffirming* the importance of managing and, when economically and technically feasible, replacing quarantine and pre-shipment applications of methyl bromide, as stated in the preamble to decision XVII/15,

<sup>6</sup> *Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2006*, p. 21. Available at the website [http://ozone.unep.org/Assessment\\_Panels/SAP/Scientific\\_Assessment\\_2006/index.shtml](http://ozone.unep.org/Assessment_Panels/SAP/Scientific_Assessment_2006/index.shtml).

*Stressing* that methyl bromide is a potent ozone-depleting substance and that it and many of its alternatives are hazardous substances that have caused serious human health impacts, notably on workers in ports and warehouses in some Parties,

*Recognizing* that many Parties have relied on methyl bromide for trade and the conservation of biodiversity and will continue to do so until alternatives become available and accepted for all quarantine and pre-shipment uses,

*Acknowledging* the efforts made by Parties to phase out or reduce the use and emissions of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes whether through adoption of alternatives or the use of recapture technologies,

*Acknowledging with appreciation* the joint efforts of the Ozone Secretariat and the International Plant Protection Convention in reviewing alternatives to methyl bromide for phytosanitary purposes, particularly under ISPM-15, and the Convention's recommendation encouraging Parties to develop and implement strategies to replace and/or reduce methyl bromide use for phytosanitary applications,

*Mindful* that the use of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes is still increasing in some regions of the world,

*Recognizing* current data gaps and the need for better information to monitor and analyse trends in quarantine and pre-shipment use and further to identify opportunities for reducing global amounts of methyl bromide required for quarantine and pre-shipment applications under the Montreal Protocol,

1. To urge those Parties that have not yet done so to report data on the use of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment applications, as required under paragraph 3 of Article 7, by April 2009 and to report such data in accordance with existing Protocol requirements and decisions annually thereafter;
2. To request the Ozone Secretariat:
  - (a) To update the definition of pre-shipment in paragraph 5.6 of the Instructions/Guidelines for data reporting to reflect decision XI/12;
  - (b) To post on its website, production and consumption data reported by the Parties under paragraph 3 of Article 7 for methyl bromide used for quarantine and pre-shipment applications;
3. To request the Implementation Committee to consider the reporting of methyl bromide used for quarantine and pre-shipment applications under paragraph 3 of Article 7, in accordance with the Non-Compliance Procedure of the Montreal Protocol;
4. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, in consultation with the International Plant Protection Convention secretariat, to review all relevant, currently available information on the use of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment applications and related emissions, to assess trends in the major uses, available alternatives and other mitigation options, and barriers to the adoption of alternatives or determine what additional information or action may be required to meet those objectives; the assessment should consider:
  - (a) A description of the majority of the volumes of methyl bromide used for quarantine and pre-shipment applications, by the major uses and target pests;
  - (b) The technical and economic availability of alternative substances and technologies for the main methyl bromide uses, by volume, and of technologies for methyl bromide recovery, containment and recycling;
  - (c) Quarantine and pre-shipment applications for which no alternatives are available to date and an assessment of why alternatives are not technically or economically feasible or cannot be adopted;
  - (d) Illustrative examples of regulations or other relevant measures that directly affect the use of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment treatment (including information requested in decision X/11);
  - (e) Other barriers preventing the adoption of alternatives to methyl bromide;
  - (f) Projects demonstrating technically and economically feasible alternatives, including technologies for recapture and destruction of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment applications;

5. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to present a draft report based on the analysis of the available information to the Open-ended Working Group at its twenty-ninth meeting, indicating areas where the information is not sufficient, explaining, where appropriate, why the data were inadequate and presenting a practical proposal for how best to gather the information required for a satisfactory analysis;

6. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to present a final report highlighting areas where sufficient information indicates opportunities for reductions in methyl bromide use or emissions for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes, including a list of available methyl bromide recapture technologies for consideration by the Parties and, where there is insufficient information, a final proposal for further data gathering for the consideration of the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties;

7. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, in accordance with its terms of reference, to list categories of use it has identified that have been classified as quarantine and pre-shipment use by some Parties but not by others by the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and that those Parties are requested to provide the information on the rationale for doing so to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel in time for inclusion in its final report to the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties

8. To request the Ozone Secretariat, in cooperation with the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, the International Plant Protection Convention secretariat and other relevant bodies, to organize in the margins of the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties a workshop to discuss the report referred to in paragraph 4 of the present decision and other relevant inputs with a view to determining possible further actions;

9. To request the Ozone Secretariat to strengthen cooperation and coordination with the International Plant Protection Convention secretariat in accordance with decisions XVII/15 and XVIII/14;

10. To encourage Parties in accordance with the recommendations of the third meeting of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures under the International Plant Protection Convention to put in place a national strategy that describes actions that will help them to reduce the use of methyl bromide for phytosanitary measures and/or reduce emissions of methyl bromide and make such strategies available to other Parties through the Ozone Secretariat, where possible before the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties; the strategy may include the following areas for action:

- (a) Replacing methyl bromide use;
- (b) Reducing methyl bromide use;
- (c) Physically reducing methyl bromide emissions;
- (d) Accurately recording methyl bromide use for phytosanitary measures.

## **XX/7: Environmentally sound management of banks of ozone-depleting substances**

1. To invite Parties, international funding agencies, including the Multilateral Fund and the Global Environment Facility, and other interested agents to enable practical solutions for the purpose of gaining better knowledge on mitigating ozone-depleting substance emissions and destroying ozone-depleting substance banks, and on costs related to the collection, transportation, storage and destruction of ozone depleting substances, notably in Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol;

2. To request the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to consider as a matter of urgency commencing pilot projects that may cover the collection, transport, storage and destruction of ozone-depleting substances. As an initial priority, the Executive Committee might consider projects with a focus on assembled stocks of ozone-depleting substances with high net global warming potential, in a representative sample of regionally diverse Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5. It is understood that this initial priority would not preclude the initiation of other types of pilot projects, including on halons and carbon tetrachloride, should these have an important demonstration value. In addition to protecting the ozone layer, these projects will seek to generate practical data and experience on management and financing modalities, achieve climate benefits, and would explore opportunities to leverage co-financing;

3. To encourage Parties to develop or consider further improvements in the implementation of national and/or regional legislative strategies and other measures that prevent the venting, leakage or emission of ozone-depleting substances by ensuring:

(a) Proper recovery of ozone-depleting substances from equipment containing ozone-depleting substances, during servicing, use and at end of life, where possible in applications such as refrigeration, air conditioning, heat pumps, fire protection, solvents and process agents;

(b) The use of best practices and performance standards to prevent ozone-depleting substance emissions at the end of the product life cycle, whether by recovery, recycling, reclamation, reuse as feedstock or destruction;

4. To encourage all Parties to develop or consider improvements in national or regional strategies for the management of banks, including provisions to combat illegal trade by applying measures listed in decision XIX/12;

5. To invite Parties to submit their strategies and subsequent updates to the Ozone Secretariat as soon as possible for the purpose of sharing information and experiences, including with interested stakeholders of other multilateral environmental agreements, such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol and the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal. The strategies will be placed on the Ozone Secretariat website, which will be updated regularly;

6. To note that any project implemented pursuant to the present decision when applicable should be done in conformity with national, regional, and/or international requirements, such as those mandated by the Basel Convention and Rotterdam Convention;

7. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to conduct a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis of destroying banks of ozone-depleting substances taking into consideration the relative economic costs and environmental benefits, to the ozone layer and the climate, of destruction versus recycling, reclaiming and reusing such substances. In particular, the report should cover the following elements:

(a) Consolidation of all available data on ozone-depleting substance banks and summary of this information identifying the sectors where recovery of ozone-depleting substances is technically and economically feasible;

(b) Respective levels of likely mitigation amounts, based on the categorization of reachable banks at low, medium, and high effort according to substances, sectors, regions, and where possible, subregions;

(c) Assessment of associated benefits and costs of respective classes of banks in terms of ozone depleting potential and global warming potential;

(d) Exploration of the potential “perverse incentives” or other adverse environmental effects that may be associated with certain mitigation strategies, in particular related to recovery and recycling for reuse;

(e) Consideration of the positive and negative impacts of recovery and destruction of ozone-depleting substances, including direct and indirect climate effects;

(f) Consideration of the technical, economic and environmental implications of incentive mechanisms to promote the destruction of surplus ozone-depleting substances;

8. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to provide an interim report in time for dissemination one month before the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and to provide the final report one month before the Twenty First Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol;

9. To request the Ozone Secretariat, with the assistance of the Multilateral Fund Secretariat, to consult with experts from the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Global Environment Facility, the Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism, the World Bank and other relevant funding experts to develop a report on possible funding opportunities for the management and destruction of ozone-depleting substance banks, to present the report to the Parties for review and comments one month prior to the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group and, if possible, to convene a single meeting among experts from the funding institutions;

10. That the report referred to in paragraph 9 of the present decision would focus on describing possible institutional arrangements, potential financial structures, likely logistical steps and the necessary legal framework for each of the following, if relevant:

- (a) Recovery;
- (b) Collection;
- (c) Storage;
- (d) Transport;
- (e) Destruction;
- (f) Supporting activities;

11. To request the Ozone Secretariat to convene a workshop among Parties that will include the participation of the Montreal Protocol assessment panels, the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund and the Fund's implementing agencies, and seek the participation of the secretariats of other relevant multilateral environmental agreements, non-governmental organizations and experts from funding institutions for the discussion of technical, financial and policy issues related to the management and destruction of ozone-depleting substance banks and their implications for climate change;

12. That the above workshop will be held preceding the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and that interpretation will be provided in the six official languages of the United Nations;

13. Further to consider, at the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, possible actions regarding the management and destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances in the light of the report to be provided by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel under paragraph 7 above, the working group report to be provided by the Secretariat under paragraph 9 above and the discussions emanating from the workshop under paragraph 11 above;

14. To request the Ozone Secretariat to communicate the present decision to the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol in time for possible consideration at the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol on the understanding that the decision is without prejudice to any discussions that may be held on ozone-depleting substance banks within their forum;

### **XX/8: Workshop for a dialogue on high-global warming potential alternatives for ozone-depleting substances**

*Noting* that the transition from, and phase-out of, ozone-depleting substances has implications for climate system protection,

*Recognizing* that decision XIX/6 encourages Parties to promote the selection of alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons to minimize environmental impacts, in particular impacts on climate,

*Recognizing also* that there is scope for coordination between the Montreal Protocol and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol for reducing emissions and minimizing environmental impacts from hydrofluorocarbons, and that Montreal Protocol Parties and associated bodies have considerable expertise in these areas which they could share,

*Recognizing further* that there is a need for more information on the environmental implications of possible transitions from ozone-depleting substances to high-global warming potential chemicals, in particular hydrofluorocarbons,

1. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to update the data contained within the Panel's 2005 *Supplement to the IPCC/TEAP Special Report*<sup>7</sup> and to report on the status of alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons and hydrofluorocarbons, including a description of the various use patterns, costs, and potential market penetration of alternatives no later than 15 May 2009;

---

<sup>7</sup> Available at the website [http://ozone.unep.org/Assessment\\_Panels/TEAP/Reports/TEAP\\_Reports/teap-supplement-ippc-teap-report-nov2005.pdf](http://ozone.unep.org/Assessment_Panels/TEAP/Reports/TEAP_Reports/teap-supplement-ippc-teap-report-nov2005.pdf).



2. To request the Ozone Secretariat to prepare a report that compiles current control measures, limits and information reporting requirements for compounds that are alternatives to ozone-depleting substances and that are addressed under international agreements relevant to climate change;
3. To request the Ozone Secretariat with input, where appropriate, from the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol to convene an open-ended dialogue on high-global warming potential alternatives for ozone-depleting substances among Parties, including participation by the assessment panels and the Multilateral Fund Secretariat, and inviting the Fund's implementing agencies, other relevant multilateral environmental agreement secretariats and non-governmental organizations to discuss technical and policy issues related to alternatives for ozone-depleting substances, with a particular focus on exchanging views of the best ways of how the experience from the Montreal Protocol can be used to address the impact of hydrofluorocarbons, and also with a view to maximizing the ozone and climate benefits of the hydrochlorofluorocarbon early phase-out under the Montreal Protocol;
4. To encourage Parties to include their climate experts as participants in the workshop;
5. That the above-mentioned dialogue on high-global warming potential alternatives to ozone-depleting substances should be held just before the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group and that interpretation will be provided in the six official languages of the United Nations;
6. To request the co-chairs of the workshop, in cooperation with the Ozone Secretariat, to prepare a summary report of the discussions that take place during the dialogue and to report on the proceedings to the Open-ended Working Group at its twenty-ninth meeting;
7. To invite one representative of a Party operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 and one representative of a Party not so operating to serve as co-chairs of the workshop;
8. To request the Ozone Secretariat to communicate the present decision to the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol and to encourage that secretariat to make the decision available at the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to that Convention for possible consideration of participation in the workshop;

## **XX/9: Application of the Montreal Protocol's trade provisions to hydrochlorofluorocarbons**

*Recalling* decision XV/3, which clarifies the definition of States not party to the Montreal Protocol for the purposes of obligations of Parties to the Copenhagen and Beijing Amendments to the Montreal Protocol in respect of control measures on hydrochlorofluorocarbons,

*Noting* decision XIX/6, by which the Parties agreed to accelerate the phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons, including the establishment of the new freeze date of 1 January 2013 for Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5,

*Acknowledging* that the accelerated phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons as determined by decision XIX/6 brings forward control measures for hydrochlorofluorocarbons for Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol from 2016 to 2013,

1. To annul paragraph 1 (a) of decision XV/3, which reads

the term "State not party to this Protocol" in Article 4, paragraph 9 does not apply to those States operating under Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Protocol until 1 January 2016 when, in accordance with the Copenhagen and Beijing Amendments, hydrochlorofluorocarbon production and consumption control measures will be in effect for States that operate under Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Protocol;

and replace it with:

the term "State not party to this Protocol" in Article 4, paragraph 9, does not apply to those States operating under Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Protocol until 1 January 2013 when, in accordance with the Copenhagen and Beijing Amendments, hydrochlorofluorocarbon production and consumption control measures will be in effect for States that operate under Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Protocol;

**XX/10: 2009–2011 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund**

1. To adopt a budget for the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol for 2009–2011 of \$490,000,000 on the understanding that \$73,900,000 of that budget will be provided from anticipated contributions due to the Multilateral Fund and other sources for the 2006–2008 triennium, and that \$16,100,000 will be provided from interest accruing to the Fund during the 2009–2011 triennium. The Parties note that outstanding contributions from some Parties with economies in transition in the period 2006–2008 stand at \$5,604,438;

2. To adopt the scale of contributions for the Multilateral Fund based on a replenishment of \$133,333,334 for 2009, \$133,333,333 for 2010, and \$133,333,333 for 2011 as it appears in annex III to the report of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer;<sup>8</sup>

3. That the Executive Committee should take action to ensure, as far as possible, that the whole of the budget for 2009–2011 is committed by the end of 2011, and that Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 should make timely payments in accordance with paragraph 7 of decision XI/6;

**XX/11: Extension of the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism to the 2009–2011 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund**

1. To direct the Treasurer to extend the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism to the period 2009–2011;

2. That Parties choosing to pay their contributions to the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol in national currencies will calculate their contributions based on the average United Nations exchange rate for the six-month period commencing 1 January 2008;

3. That, subject to paragraph 4 below, Parties not choosing to pay in national currencies pursuant to the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism will continue to pay in United States dollars;

4. That no Party should change the currency selected for its contribution in the course of the triennium 2009–2011;

5. That only Parties with inflation rate fluctuations of less than 10 per cent, as per published figures of the International Monetary Fund, for the preceding triennium will be eligible to use the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism;

6. To urge Parties to pay their contributions to the Multilateral Fund in full and as early as possible in accordance with paragraph 7 of decision XI/6;

7. To agree that if the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism is to be used for the replenishment period 2012–2014 Parties choosing to pay their contributions in national currencies will calculate their contributions based on the average United Nations exchange rate for the six-month period commencing 1 January 2011;

**XX/12: Data and information provided by the Parties in accordance with Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol**

1. To note with appreciation that 189 Parties out of the 191 which should have reported data for 2007 have now done so and that 75 of those Parties reported their data by 30 June 2008 in conformity with decision XV/15;

2. To note, however, that the following Parties have to date not reported data for 2007: Solomon Islands and Tonga;

3. To note that their non-reporting of data places the Parties named above in non-compliance with their data-reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol until such time as the Secretariat receives their outstanding data;

---

8 UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/7-UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/9.

4. To urge those Parties, where appropriate, to work closely with the implementing agencies to report the required data to the Secretariat as a matter of urgency and to request the Implementation Committee to review the situation of those Parties at its next meeting;

5. To note that a lack of timely data reporting by Parties impedes effective monitoring and assessment of Parties' compliance with their obligations under the Montreal Protocol by the Implementation Committee and the Meeting of the Parties;

6. To note further that reporting data by 30 June each year greatly facilitates the work of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol in assisting Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 to comply with the control measures of the Montreal Protocol;

7. To encourage Parties to continue to report consumption and production data as soon as figures are available, and preferably by 30 June each year, as agreed in decision XV/15;

### **XX/13: Reports of Parties submitted under Article 9 of the Montreal Protocol**

1. To note with appreciation the reports submitted in 2007 and 2008 by the following 18 Parties in accordance with Article 9 of the Montreal Protocol: Argentina, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Mexico, Namibia, Norway, Oman, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Uganda and Zambia;

2. To recall that paragraph 3 of Article 9 states that, every two years after entry into force of the Montreal Protocol, which entered into force in 1989, each Party shall submit to the Secretariat a summary of activities that it has conducted pursuant to that Article and that relevant activities include promotion of research and development, information exchange on technologies for reducing emissions of ozone-depleting substances, alternatives to the use of controlled substances and the costs and benefits of relevant control strategies and raising awareness of the environmental effects of emissions of controlled and other substances that deplete the ozone layer;

3. To recognize that information relevant to the reporting obligation under paragraph 3 of Article 9 may be generated through cooperative efforts undertaken in the context of regional ozone networks, activities by ozone research managers under Article 3 of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, participation by Parties in the assessment work of both the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and the Scientific Assessment Panel under Article 6 of the Montreal Protocol and national public awareness-raising initiatives;

4. To note that the reporting under paragraph 3 of Article 9 of the Protocol can be undertaken through electronic means;

5. To request the Secretariat to share the information reported under paragraph 3 of Article 9 of the Protocol with other Parties through the Secretariat's website;

### **XX/14: Report on the establishment of licensing systems under Article 4B of the Montreal Protocol**

*Noting* that paragraph 3 of Article 4B of the Montreal Protocol requires each Party, within three months of the date of introducing its system for licensing the import and export of new, used, recycled and reclaimed controlled substances in Annexes A, B, C and E of the Protocol, to report to the Secretariat on the establishment and operation of that system,

*Noting with appreciation* that 159 Parties to the Montreal Amendment to the Protocol have established import and export licensing systems for ozone-depleting substances as required under the terms of the amendment,

*Noting also with appreciation* that 18 Parties to the Protocol that have not yet ratified the Montreal Amendment have also established import and export licensing systems for ozone-depleting substances,

*Recognizing* that licensing systems provide for the monitoring of imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances, prevent illegal trade and enable data collection,

1. To encourage all remaining Parties to the Protocol that have not yet ratified the Montreal Amendment to ratify it and to establish import and export licensing systems for ozone-depleting substances if they have not yet done so;

2. To urge all Parties that already operate licensing systems for ozone-depleting substances to ensure that they are structured in accordance with Article 4B of the Protocol and that they are implemented and enforced effectively;

3. To review periodically the status of the establishment of import and export licensing systems for ozone-depleting substances by all Parties to the Protocol, as called for in Article 4B of the Protocol;

### **XX/15: Difficulties faced by Iraq as a new Party**

*Noting with appreciation* Iraq's joining the international community in its efforts to preserve the ozone layer, which came into effect with the recent accession of Iraq as a Party to the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and all its amendments,

*Recognizing* the difficulties faced by Iraq by joining the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol and all its amendments shortly before key phase-out dates,

*Recognizing also* the security situation and the political, economic and social difficulties faced by Iraq over the last two decades,

*Understanding* Iraq's commitments for phasing out ozone-depleting substances under the Montreal Protocol and its amendments within a limited time frame,

1. To urge all Parties to assist Iraq, as a new Party, in controlling the export of ozone-depleting substances and ozone-depleting substance-based technologies into Iraq through the control of trade as per the provisions of the Montreal Protocol and relevant decisions of the Meeting of the Parties and to encourage Iraq to participate in an informal prior informed consent process as referred to in decision XIX/12;

2. To request the Executive Committee when considering project proposals for Iraq to phase out ozone-depleting substances to take into account the special situation of this new Party, which may face difficulties in the phase out of ozone-depleting substances in annexes A and B, and to be flexible in considering the project proposals, without prejudice to the possible review of the non-compliance situation of Iraq by the Parties;

3. To request the implementing agencies to provide appropriate assistance to Iraq in developing its country programme and national phase-out plans and in continuing its efforts to report to the Secretariat, as soon as possible, data on consumption of ozone-depleting substances in accordance with the Montreal Protocol requirements;

4. To request the Implementation Committee to report on the compliance situation of Iraq to the Open-ended Working Group preceding the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties, during which the present decision will be reconsidered;

### **XX/16: Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Ecuador**

*Noting* that Ecuador ratified the Montreal Protocol on 30 April 1990, the London Amendment on 23 February 1993, the Copenhagen Amendment on 24 November 1993 and the Montreal Amendment on 16 February 2007, is classified as a Party operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol and had its country programme approved by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol in February 1992,

*Noting also* that the Executive Committee has approved \$6,352,995 from the Multilateral Fund to enable Ecuador's compliance with the Protocol in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol,

*Noting further* that Ecuador has reported annual consumption of the controlled substances in Annex E (methyl bromide) for 2007 of 122.4 ODP tonnes, which exceeds the Party's maximum allowable consumption of 53.0 ODP tonnes for the controlled substance for that year, and that Ecuador is therefore in non-compliance with the control measures for methyl bromide under the Protocol for methyl bromide in 2007,

1. To record with appreciation Ecuador's submission of a plan of action to ensure its prompt return to compliance with the Protocol's methyl bromide control measures under which, without prejudice to the operation of the financial mechanism of the Protocol, Ecuador specifically commits itself:

- (a) To reducing methyl bromide consumption to no greater than:
    - (i) 52.8 ODP tonnes in 2008 and in each subsequent calendar year until 2014;
    - (ii) Zero ODP tonnes in 2015, save for critical uses that may be authorized by the Parties;
  - (b) To monitoring its import and export licensing system for ozone-depleting substances;
2. To urge Ecuador to work with the relevant implementing agencies to implement its plan of action to phase out consumption of methyl bromide;
  3. To monitor closely the progress of Ecuador with regard to the implementation of its plan of action and the phase-out of methyl bromide. To the degree that the Party is working toward and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, it should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In that regard, Ecuador should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet those commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that may be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance;
  4. To caution Ecuador in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures that may be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance that, in the event that it fails to remain in compliance, the Parties will consider measures consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. Those measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of the methyl bromide that is the subject of non-compliance is ceased so that exporting Parties are not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance;

### **XX/17: Request for change in baseline data by Saudi Arabia**

*Noting* that Saudi Arabia has submitted a request to revise its consumption data for the Annex E controlled substance (methyl bromide) for the baseline years 1995–1998 from 0.7 to 204.1 ODP tonnes,

*Noting also* that decision XV/19 of the Fifteenth Meeting of the Parties sets out the methodology for the submission and review of requests to revise baseline data,

*Noting with appreciation* the extensive efforts undertaken by Saudi Arabia to fulfil the information requirements of decision XV/19, in particular its efforts to verify the accuracy of its proposed new baseline data through a national survey of methyl bromide use carried out with the assistance of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme with funding from the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol,

1. That Saudi Arabia has presented sufficient information, in accordance with decision XV/19, to justify its request to change its baseline consumption data for methyl bromide;
2. To change the baseline consumption data of Saudi Arabia for methyl bromide for the years 1995–1998 from 0.7 to 204.1 ODP tonnes based on the average calculated level of consumption for the following four years: 1995 – 161.8 ODP tonnes; 1996 – 222.5 ODP tonnes; 1997 – 210.4 ODP tonnes; 1998 – 221.7 ODP tonnes.

### **XX/18: Potential non-compliance in 2006 with the provisions of the Montreal Protocol in respect of consumption of the controlled substances in Annex A, group I, (chlorofluorocarbons) by Solomon Islands and request for a plan of action and data for the year 2007**

*Noting* that Solomon Islands ratified the Montreal Protocol on 17 June 1993, the London Amendment on 17 August 1999 and the Copenhagen Amendment on 17 August 1999, is classified as a Party operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol and had its country programme approved by the Executive Committee in March 2002,

*Noting also* that the Executive Committee has approved \$119,233 from the Multilateral Fund to enable Solomon Islands' compliance in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol,

*Noting further* that Solomon Islands has reported annual consumption for the controlled substance in Annex A, group I (chlorofluorocarbons), for 2006 of 1.4 ODP tonnes, which exceeds the Party's maximum allowable consumption level of 1.1 ODP tonnes for that controlled substance for that

year and that in the absence of further clarification Solomon Islands is therefore presumed to be in non-compliance with the control measures under the Protocol,

*Noting* that Solomon Islands has still not reported its ozone-depleting substances data for 2007 in accordance with Article 7 of the Protocol, thereby placing the Party in non-compliance with its data-reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol,

1. To request Solomon Islands to submit to the Secretariat, as a matter of urgency and no later than 31 March 2009, for consideration by the Implementation Committee at its next meeting, an explanation for its excess consumption in 2006, together with a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure the Party's prompt return to compliance;

2. To request Solomon Islands further to report the outstanding data for 2007 as a matter of urgency, and preferably no later than 31 March 2009, in time for consideration by the Implementation Committee at its forty-second meeting;

3. To monitor closely the progress of Solomon Islands with regard to the phase-out of chlorofluorocarbons. To the degree that the Party is working toward and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, it should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In that regard, Solomon Islands should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet its commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that may be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance;

4. To caution Solomon Islands, in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures, that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner the Meeting of the Parties will consider measures consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. Those measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4, such as ensuring that the supply of the chlorofluorocarbons that is the subject of non-compliance is ceased so that exporting Parties are not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance;

### **XX/19: Non-compliance with the provisions of the Montreal Protocol in respect of consumption of the controlled substances in Annex A, groups I (chlorofluorocarbons) and II (halons) by Somalia**

*Noting* that Somalia ratified the Montreal Protocol and its London, Copenhagen, Montreal and Beijing Amendments on 1 August 2001 and is classified as a Party operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol,

*Noting also* that Somalia has no country programme that has been approved by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol,

*Acknowledging* the serious challenges faced by Somalia in implementing its obligations under the Montreal Protocol and also acknowledging the progress made by the Party in spite of those challenges,

*Noting* that Somalia has reported annual consumption for the controlled substances in Annex A, group I (chlorofluorocarbons), for the year 2007 of 79.5 ODP tonnes, which exceeds the Party's maximum allowable consumption level of 36.2 ODP tonnes for those controlled substances for that year, and that in the absence of further clarification Somalia is therefore presumed to be in non-compliance with the control measures under the Protocol,

*Noting also* that Somalia reported annual consumption for the controlled substances in Annex A, group-II (halons), for 2006 of 18.8 ODP tonnes and 13.2 ODP tonnes for 2007, which exceeds the Party's maximum allowable consumption of 8.8 ODP tonnes for those controlled substances for those years and that Somalia was therefore in non-compliance with the control measures for halons under the Protocol,

1. To note with appreciation Somalia's submission of a plan of action to ensure its prompt return to compliance with the Protocol's halon control measures under which, without prejudice to the operation of the financial mechanism of the Protocol, Somalia specifically commits itself:

- (a) To reducing halon consumption to no greater than:
  - (i) 9.4 ODP tonnes in 2008;
  - (ii) 9.4 ODP tonnes in 2009;

- (iii) Zero ODP tonnes in 2010, save for essential uses that may be authorized by the Parties;
- (b) To introducing a system for licensing the imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances, including import quotas, by the end of December 2009;
2. To request Somalia to submit to the Secretariat, as a matter of urgency and no later than 31 March 2009, for consideration by the Implementation Committee at its next meeting, a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure the Party's prompt return to compliance with its consumption of chlorofluorocarbons;
  3. To urge Somalia to work with the relevant implementing agencies to implement its plan of action to phase out consumption of halons and implementation of its licensing system and to participate in regional network activities;
  4. To request the Executive Committee, without prejudice to the operation of the financial mechanism, to consider innovative ways of assisting the Party, through the implementing agencies of the Multilateral Fund, to implement its plan of action to phase out halons and to implement its licensing system, including, but not limited to, awareness-raising, institutional strengthening and technical assistance;
  5. To monitor closely the progress of Somalia with regard to the implementation of its plan of action to phase-out halons and the implementation of its licensing system;
  6. To the degree that the Party is working toward and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, it should continue to be treated in the same manner as a Party in good standing. In that regard, Somalia should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet those commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that may be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance;
  7. To caution Somalia in accordance with item B of the indicative list of measures that may be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance that, in the event that it fails to remain in compliance, the Parties will consider measures consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures. Those measures may include the possibility of actions available under Article 4 such as ensuring that the supply of halons that are the subject of non-compliance is ceased so that exporting Parties are not contributing to a continuing situation of non-compliance;

## **XX/20: Montreal Protocol financial matters: financial reports and budgets**

*Recalling* decision XIX/5 on financial matters,

*Recognizing* that voluntary contributions are an essential complement for the effective implementation of the Montreal Protocol,

*Welcoming* the continued excellent management by the Secretariat of the finances of the Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer,

1. To take note with appreciation of the financial statement of the Trust Fund for the biennium 2006–2007 ended 31 December 2007 and the report by the Secretariat on the actual expenditures for 2007 as compared to the approvals for that year;<sup>9</sup>
2. To approve the revised 2008 budget for the Trust Fund in the amount of \$4,679,658, and the 2009 budget in the amount of \$5,258,828 and to take note of the proposed budget of \$4,843,983 for 2010, as set out in annex IV to the report of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer;<sup>10</sup>
3. To authorize the Secretariat to draw down \$981,895 in 2009 and note the proposed drawdown of \$567,050 in 2010;
4. To approve, as a consequence of the draw-downs referred to in paragraph 3 above, total contributions to be paid by the Parties of \$4,276,933 for 2009 and to note the contributions of \$4,276,933 for 2010, as set out in annex V to the report of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the

<sup>9</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/4/Add.1.

<sup>10</sup> UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/7-UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/9.

Parties to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer;

5. Also to approve that the contributions of individual Parties for 2009 shall be listed in annex V to the report of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer;

6. To authorize the Secretariat to maintain a constant operating cash reserve at 15 per cent of the estimated annual planned expenditures that will be used to meet the final expenditures under the Trust Fund;

7. To express its concern over delays in payment of agreed contributions by Parties, contrary to the provisions in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the terms of reference for the administration of the Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer;

8. To urge all Parties to pay their contributions promptly and in full and further to urge Parties that have not done so to pay their contributions for prior years as soon as possible;

9. To encourage Parties, non-Parties, and other stakeholders to contribute financially and with other means to assist members of the three assessment panels and their subsidiary bodies with their continued participation in the assessment activities under the Protocol;

10. To invite Parties to notify the Secretariat of the Montreal Protocol of all contributions made to the Trust Fund at the time such payments are made;

11. To request the Executive Secretary, in accordance with rule 14 of the rules of procedure, to provide Parties with an indication of the financial implications of draft decisions which cannot be met from existing resources within the budget of the Trust Fund;

12. To request the Secretariat of the Montreal Protocol to ensure the implementation of Secretariat-related decisions adopted by the Meeting of the Parties as approved, within the budgets and the availability of financial resources in the Trust Fund;

13. To request the Secretariat to inform the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on all sources of income received, including the reserve and fund balance and interest, as well as actual and projected expenditures and commitments, and to request the Executive Secretary to provide an indicative report on all expenditures against budget lines;

14. To request the Open-ended Working Group to keep under review the financial information provided by the Secretariat, including the timeliness and transparency of that information;

15. To request the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme to extend the Trust Fund until 31 December 2015;<sup>11</sup>

### **XX/21: Membership of the Implementation Committee**

1. To note with appreciation the work done by the Implementation Committee under the Non-compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol in 2008;

2. To confirm the positions of Jordan, Mauritius, Mexico, New Zealand and the Russian Federation as members of the Committee for one further year and to select Armenia, Germany, Nicaragua, Niger and Sri Lanka as members of the Committee for a two-year period commencing 1 January 2009;

3. To note the selection of Ms. Robyn Washbourne (New Zealand) to serve as President and of Mr. Ghazi Faleh Odat (Jordan) to serve as Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Committee for one year commencing 1 January 2009;

### **XX/22: Membership of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund**

1. To note with appreciation the work done by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol with the assistance of the Fund secretariat in 2008;

---

11 Budget tables are set out in section B of the annex to the present compilation.



2. To endorse the selection of Australia, Belgium, Germany, Japan, Romania, Sweden and the United States of America as members of the Executive Committee representing Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol and the selection of Bolivia, China, Dominican Republic, Gabon, Georgia, Namibia and Yemen as members representing Parties operating under that paragraph, for one year commencing 1 January 2009;

3. To note the selection of Mr. Husamuddin Ahmadzai (Sweden) to serve as Chair and Mr. Juan Tomas Filpo (Dominican Republic) to serve as Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee for one year commencing 1 January 2009;

### **XX/23: Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol**

To endorse the selection of Mr. Martin Sirois (Canada) and Mr. Muhammad Maqsood Akhtar (Pakistan) as Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in 2009;

### **XX/24: Endorsement of new co-chair of the Halons Technical Options Committee of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel**

To endorse the selection of Mr. Sergey Kopylov (Russian Federation) as the new Co-Chair of the Halons Technical Options Committee;

### **XX/25: Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol**

To convene the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, and to announce a firm date for the meeting as soon as possible;

### **XX/26: Adoption of the Doha Declaration**

To adopt the Doha Declaration, as set out in annex VI to the report of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.<sup>12</sup>

## **B. Comments made at the time of adoption of the decisions**

198. Several representatives made comments in connection with the adoption of the decisions. The representative of Germany noted that under German law all international financial commitments were subject to approval by the Budget Committee of the German Parliament. His agreement to adoption of the decision on replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol was therefore subject to approval from that committee. He expected, however, that approval would be forthcoming shortly.

199. While expressing satisfaction with the decision on the environmentally sound management of banks of ozone-depleting substances, the representative of the European Community said that the concept of net global warming potential was scientifically vague and should not set a precedent for future decisions.

200. The representative of the European Community noted with satisfaction that, after a long process, the phase-out of CFCs for metered-dose inhalers in non-Article 5 Parties was close to being achieved and confirmed that the European Community would phase out production of CFCs for that purpose by 1 January 2010. She expressed the hope that the United States of America would not submit an essential use nomination for 2011. The representative of the United States clarified that his country had made significant progress and had recently established an end date for one active ingredient for CFC-based metered-dose inhalers, epinephrine, but he stressed that that was not the only active ingredient on the United States market and that his country might seek an exemption for 2011.

---

12 UNEP/OzL.Conv.8/7-UNEP/OzL.Pro.20/9.

201. Two representatives of Article 5 Parties observed that the Doha Declaration represented an important milestone in the history of the Montreal Protocol.

202. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, speaking on behalf of the group of African countries, noted that Article 5 Parties faced significant challenges in phasing out ozone-depleting substances, including a severe lack of financial and technological capacity – challenges that had been magnified by the acceleration of the phase-out of HCFCs which the Parties had agreed in 2007. She noted further that the Montreal Protocol was one of the most important multilateral environmental agreements encouraging the transfer of environmentally sensitive technology to developing countries and needed to be supported. They were, however, concerned about the level of funding allocated for the institutional strengthening projects and compliance assistance programmes for the next triennium 2009–2011, which represented the major support areas from the Multilateral Fund in promoting compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Article 5 Parties. She said that reinforcement of those programmes should be given high priority in the replenished Multilateral Fund to enhance capacity-building. She called upon non-Article 5 Parties to accelerate their phase-out of ozone-depleting substances currently covered by essential- and critical-use exemptions by adopting suitable and effective environmentally friendly alternatives. The African group remained dedicated to the aims of the Montreal Protocol and fully committed to meeting their obligations. With the joint efforts of all Parties behind it, the Protocol could look forward to another twenty years of success.

## **XI. Adoption of the report of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol**

203. The present report was adopted on Thursday, 20 November 2008, on the basis of the draft report submitted to the Parties.

## **XII. Closure of the meeting**

204. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the President declared the meeting closed at 7.30 p.m. on Thursday, 20 November 2008.

## Annex I

## Trust Fund for the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer

## Revised 2008 and approved 2009, 2010 and 2011 budgets

|           |                                    |   | w/m | 2008 (US\$) | w/m | 2009 (US\$) | w/m | 2010 (US\$) | w/m | 2011 (US\$) |
|-----------|------------------------------------|---|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|
| <b>10</b> | <b>PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT</b> |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|           | <i>1100</i>                        | <i>Project personnel</i>  |     |             |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|           | 1101                               | Executive Secretary (D-2) (shared with the Montreal Protocol, MP)                           | 6   | 132 227     | 6   | 135 664     | 6   | 139 192     | 6   | 142 811     |
|           | 1104                               | Scientific Affairs Officer (P-5) (shared with MP)   | 6   | 99 000      | 6   | 101 574     | 6   | 104 215     | 6   | 106 925     |
|           | 1105                               | Administrative Officer (P-5) (paid by UNEP)   |     | —           |     | —           |     | —           |     | —           |
|           | 1107                               | Programme Officer (Communication and Information) (P3)                                      | 12  | 122 500     | 12  | 125 685     | 12  | 128 953     | 12  | 132 306     |
|           | 1199                               | Subtotal  |     | 353 727     |     | 362 923     |     | 372 360     |     | 382 042     |
|           | <i>1300</i>                        | <i>Administrative Support</i>   |     |             |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|           | 1301                               | Administrative Assistant (G-7) (Shared with MP)   | 6   | 20 000      | 6   | 21 250      | 6   | 22 631      | 6   | 23 220      |
|           | 1303                               | Programme Assistant (G-6)   | 12  | 21 100      |     | 22 472      |     | 23 932      |     | 25 488      |
|           | 1304                               | Programme Assistant (G-6) (shared with MP)  | 6   | 16 500      | 6   | 17 573      | 6   | 18 715      | 6   | 19 931      |
|           | 1305                               | Information Assistant (G-6) (Shared with MP)  | 6   | 15 300      | 6   | 16 295      | 6   | 17 354      | 6   | 18 482      |
|           | 1310                               | Bilingual Senior Secretary (G-6)  | 12  | 21 000      | 12  | 22 365      | 12  | 23 819      | 12  | 25 367      |
|           | 1322                               | Preparatory and Parties meeting (shared with MP every 3 years, it applies to 2008 and 2011) |     | 210 000     |     | —           |     | —           |     | 210 000     |
|           | 1324                               | Meetings of the Bureau  |     | 20 000      |     | —           |     | —           |     | 20 000      |
|           | 1326                               | Promotion activities for the protection of the Ozone Layer                                  |     | 10 000      |     | 10 000      |     | 10 000      |     | 10 000      |
|           | 1327                               | Meeting of the Ozone Research Managers  |     | 31 950      |     | —           |     | —           |     | 34 027      |

|             |  | w/m | 2008 (US\$)    | w/m | 2009 (US\$)    | w/m | 2010 (US\$)    | w/m | 2011 (US\$)    |
|-------------|--|-----|----------------|-----|----------------|-----|----------------|-----|----------------|
| 1399        | Subtotal   |     | 365 850        |     | 109 955        |     | 116 451        |     | 386 515        |
| 1600        | <i>Travel on official business</i>                             |     |                |     |                |     |                |     |                |
| 1601        | Staff travel on official business                              |     | 30 000         |     | 30 000         |     | 30 000         |     | 30 000         |
| 1699        | Subtotal   |     | 30 000         |     | 30 000         |     | 30 000         |     | 30 000         |
| <b>1999</b> | <b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>   |     | <b>749 577</b> |     | <b>502 878</b> |     | <b>518 811</b> |     | <b>798 557</b> |
| 3300        | <i>Participation Costs of Developing Countries</i>             |     |                |     |                |     |                |     |                |
| 3302        | Preparatory and Parties meetings                               |     | —              |     | —              |     | —              |     | —              |
| 3304        | Bureau meetings  |     | 20 000         |     | —              |     | —              |     | 20 000         |
| 3307        | Meeting of Ozone Research Managers                             |     | 175 000        |     | —              |     | —              |     | 175 000        |
| 3399        | Subtotal   |     | 195 000        |     | —              |     | —              |     | 195 000        |
| <b>3999</b> | <b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>   |     | <b>195 000</b> |     | <b>—</b>       |     | <b>—</b>       |     | <b>195 000</b> |
| <b>40</b>   | <b>EQUIPMENT AND PREMISES COMPONENT</b>                        |     |                |     |                |     |                |     |                |
| 4100        | <i>Expendable Equipment (items under \$1,500)</i>              |     |                |     |                |     |                |     |                |
| 4101        | Miscellaneous expendables (shared with MP)                     |     | 9 000          |     | 9 000          |     | 9 000          |     | 9 000          |
| 4199        | Sub-total  |     | 9 000          |     | 9 000          |     | 9 000          |     | 9 000          |
| 4200        | <i>Non-Expendable Equipment</i>                                |     |                |     |                |     |                |     |                |
| 4201        | Personal computers and accessories                             |     | —              |     | 2 500          |     | 2 500          |     | —              |
| 4202        | Portable computers   |     | 5 000          |     | 5 000          |     | 5 000          |     | 5 000          |
| 4203        | Other office equipment (server, fax, scanner, furniture, etc.) |     | 5 000          |     | 5 000          |     | 5 000          |     | 5 000          |
| 4204        | Photocopiers   |     | —              |     | 10 000         |     | 10 000         |     | —              |
| 4299        | Sub-total  |     | 10 000         |     | 22 500         |     | 22 500         |     | 10 000         |
| 4300        | <i>Premises</i>  |     |                |     |                |     |                |     |                |
|             | Rental of office premises (shared with MP)                     |     | 17 500         |     | 17 500         |     | 17 500         |     | 17 500         |
| 4301        |  |     |                |     |                |     |                |     |                |
| 4399        | Subtotal   |     | 17 500         |     | 17 500         |     | 17 500         |     | 17 500         |
| <b>4999</b> | <b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>   |     | <b>36 500</b>  |     | <b>49 000</b>  |     | <b>49 000</b>  |     | <b>36 500</b>  |
| <b>50</b>   | <b>MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT</b>                                 |     |                |     |                |     |                |     |                |
| 5100        | <i>Operation and Maintenance of Equipment</i>                  |     |                |     |                |     |                |     |                |
| 5101        | Maintenance of equipment and others (shared with MP)           |     | 10 000         |     | 10 000         |     | 10 000         |     | 10 000         |
| 5199        | Sub-total  |     | 10 000         |     | 10 000         |     | 10 000         |     | 10 000         |

|             | w/m   | 2008 (US\$) | w/m | 2009 (US\$)      | w/m | 2010 (US\$)    | w/m | 2011 (US\$)      |
|-------------|---|-------------|-----|------------------|-----|----------------|-----|------------------|
| 5200        | <i>Reporting Costs</i>                                    |             |     |                  |     |                |     |                  |
| 5201        | Reporting   | 7 500       |     | 7 500            |     | 7 500          |     | 7 500            |
| 5202        | Reporting (Ozone Research Managers meeting report)        | 15 000      |     | —                |     | —              |     | 15 000           |
| 5299        | Subtotal  | 22 500      |     | 7 500            |     | 7 500          |     | 22 500           |
| 5300        | <i>Sundry</i>   |             |     |                  |     |                |     |                  |
| 5301        | Communications  | 25 000      |     | 25 000           |     | 25 000         |     | 25 000           |
| 5302        | Freight charges (documents)                               | 20 000      |     | 20 000           |     | 20 000         |     | 20 000           |
| 5304        | Others (Ozone layer protection public awareness campaign) | 5 000       |     | 5 000            |     | 5 000          |     | 5 000            |
| 5399        | Subtotal  | 50 000      |     | 50 000           |     | 50 000         |     | 50 000           |
| 5400        | <i>Hospitality</i>  |             |     |                  |     |                |     |                  |
| 5401        | Hospitality   | 10 000      |     | —                |     | —              |     | 10 000           |
| 5499        | Sub-total   | 10 000      |     | —                |     | —              |     | 10 000           |
| <b>5999</b> | <b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>                                    |             |     | <b>92 500</b>    |     | <b>67 500</b>  |     | <b>67 500</b>    |
| <b>99</b>   | <b>TOTAL DIRECT PROJECT COST</b>                          |             |     | <b>1 073 577</b> |     | <b>619 378</b> |     | <b>1 122 557</b> |
|             | <b>Programme support costs (13%)</b>                      |             |     | <b>139 565</b>   |     | <b>80 519</b>  |     | <b>82 590</b>    |
|             | <b>GRAND TOTAL (inclusive of programme support costs)</b> |             |     | <b>1 213 142</b> |     | <b>699 897</b> |     | <b>717 901</b>   |
|             | <b>Draw down from Trust Fund balance*</b>                 |             |     | <b>610 142</b>   |     | <b>96 897</b>  |     | <b>114 901</b>   |
|             | <b>Contribution to be paid by the Parties</b>             |             |     | <b>603 000</b>   |     | <b>603 000</b> |     | <b>603 000</b>   |

\* The contribution of the Parties for 2008 is set at 603,000 in accordance with paragraph 5 of decision VII/3. The draw down levels in 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 have been set with a view to maintaining the level of Parties' contributions constant through to 2011.

## Explanatory notes for the revised 2008 and approved 2009, 2010 and 2011 budgets of the Trust Fund for the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer

| <b>Budget line</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   |
|--|--|
| Personnel component  | Indicative professional salary costs applicable to the Nairobi duty station for 2008–2009 and 2010–2011 have been used for the budget proposals. Where information on actual staff costs is available, however, the figures have been adjusted accordingly. Unspent commitments normally revert to the Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol.   |
| 1101, 1104 and 1107  | A minimal adjustment has been made to budget lines 1101, 1104 and 1107 to cover changes in salaries and entitlements of staff in the Professional category and above.  |
| 1105   | The post of Administrative Officer continues to be paid from the 13 per cent programme support costs based on actual expenditures.   |
| Administrative support/personnel<br>1301–1310                        | Standard General Service salary costs applicable to the Nairobi duty station have been used for the 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 budget proposals. The salary levels for 2008 have been revised to reflect an increase in General Service staff salaries effective November 2007.   |
| Administrative support/conference services<br>1322, 1324, 1326, 1327 | <p>Necessary funds may be transferred from the conference servicing budget lines should such services be required to be rendered, either by individual consultancies or under corporate contracts.</p> <p>The current conference servicing costs have been based on the following reasons and assumptions:</p> <p>1322: The conferencing costs of the eighth and ninth meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention are shared with the Twentieth and Twenty-Third Meetings of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in 2008 and 2011;</p> <p>1324: Two Bureau meetings are scheduled for 2008 and 2011. The first meeting is to be held back-to-back with the Ozone Research Managers' meeting and the second, back-to-back with the meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The meetings have provision for interpretation and document translation into the appropriate languages based on the membership of the Bureau;</p> <p>1326: A minimum amount is proposed every year to cover activities in connection with the celebration of the International Day for the Protection of the Ozone Layer;</p> <p>1327: A small increase has is been proposed to cover conference costs related to the organization of the seventh and eighth Ozone Research Managers meetings in 2008 and 2011;</p> |
| Travel on official business<br>– 1601                                | The budgets for 2008 and 2011 include travel of Secretariat officers in connection with the organization of the Ozone Research Managers' meetings and the meetings of the Conference of the Parties.   |

| <b>Budget line</b> | <b>Comment</b>   |
|--------------------|--|
| 3302               | <p>The participation of representatives of Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in the various Convention meetings is assumed at \$5,000 per representative per meeting, taking into account not more than one person's travel costs per country, using the most appropriate and advantageous economy-class fare and United Nations daily subsistence allowances.</p> <p>Considering that the meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention is normally held jointly with the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, the participation costs are borne by the Montreal Protocol.</p> |
| 3304               | <p>The participation costs are based on two Bureau meetings respectively in 2008 and 2011 for four participants from developing countries or countries with economies in transition, being held back-to-back with the Ozone Research Managers' meeting and the meeting of the Conference of the Parties. To reduce costs, the participation of Bureau members at the Bureau meeting and the meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention will be covered by funds already allocated for the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.</p>  |
| 3307               | <p>One Ozone Research Managers' meeting was held in 2008. The next meeting will be held in 2011. Funding has been reserved for participation by 35 experts from qualifying developing countries that submit national reports.</p>  |
| 4201–4204          | <p>The Secretariat is maintaining its electronic data processing systems to make the documentation of the Protocol and the Convention available electronically to Parties. This requires periodic procurement of necessary peripherals and software licenses, together with updating of the existing computer servers.</p> <p>A minimum provision has been made to enable the Secretariat to replace some equipment each year.</p>   |
| 5100–5400          | <p>Provisions under these budget lines contain minimal increases based on inflation rates recommended by the United Nations.</p>   |
| 5304               | <p>The amount set aside against this budget line in 2008 will be used for some public awareness reporting on ozone layer protection.</p>   |

## Annex II

### Trust Fund for the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer: Scale of contributions by the Parties for 2009–2011 based on the United Nations scale of assessments

(General Assembly resolution 61/237 of 13 February 2007 with a maximum assessment rate of 22 per cent)  
(in United States dollars)

|    | Name of Party       | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | 2010 Contributions by Parties | 2011 Contributions by Parties |
|----|---------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1  | Afghanistan         | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 2  | Albania             | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 3  | Algeria             | 0.085                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 4  | Angola              | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 5  | Antigua and Barbuda | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 6  | Argentina           | 0.325                                      | 0.325   | 0.324   | 1 953                         | 1 953                         | 1 953                         |
| 7  | Armenia             | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 8  | Australia           | 1.787                                      | 1.787   | 1.781   | 10 739                        | 10 739                        | 10 739                        |
| 9  | Austria             | 0.887                                      | 0.887   | 0.884   | 5 331                         | 5 331                         | 5 331                         |
| 10 | Azerbaijan          | 0.005                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 11 | Bahamas             | 0.016                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 12 | Bahrain             | 0.033                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 13 | Bangladesh          | 0.010                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 14 | Barbados            | 0.009                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 15 | Belarus             | 0.020                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 16 | Belgium             | 1.102                                      | 1.102   | 1.098   | 6 623                         | 6 623                         | 6 623                         |
| 17 | Belize              | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 18 | Benin               | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 19 | Bhutan              | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |



|    | Name of Party            | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | 2010 Contributions by Parties | 2011 Contributions by Parties |
|----|--------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 20 | Bolivia                  | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 21 | Bosnia and Herzegovina   | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 22 | Botswana                 | 0.014                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 23 | Brazil                   | 0.876                                      | 0.876   | 0.873   | 5 264                         | 5 264                         | 5 264                         |
| 24 | Brunei Darussalam        | 0.026                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 25 | Bulgaria                 | 0.020                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 26 | Burkina Faso             | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 27 | Burundi                  | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 28 | Cambodia                 | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 29 | Cameroon                 | 0.009                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 30 | Canada                   | 2.977                                      | 2.977   | 2.967   | 17 891                        | 17 891                        | 17 891                        |
| 31 | Cape Verde               | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 32 | Central African Republic | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 33 | Chad                     | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 34 | Chile                    | 0.161                                      | 0.161   | 0.160   | 968                           | 968                           | 968                           |
| 35 | China                    | 2.667                                      | 2.667   | 2.658   | 16 028                        | 16 028                        | 16 028                        |
| 36 | Colombia                 | 0.105                                      | 0.105   | 0.105   | 631                           | 631                           | 631                           |
| 37 | Comoros                  | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 38 | Congo                    | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 39 | Cook Islands             | -  | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 40 | Costa Rica               | 0.032                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 41 | Côte d'Ivoire            | 0.009                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 42 | Croatia                  | 0.050                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 43 | Cuba                     | 0.054                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 44 | Cyprus                   | 0.044                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |

|    | Name of Party                         | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | 2010 Contributions by Parties | 2011 Contributions by Parties |
|----|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 45 | Czech Republic                        | 0.281                                      | 0.281   | 0.280   | 1 689                         | 1 689                         | 1 689                         |
| 46 | Democratic People's Republic of Korea | 0.007                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 47 | Democratic Republic of Congo          | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 48 | Denmark                               | 0.739                                      | 0.739   | 0.737   | 4 441                         | 4 441                         | 4 441                         |
| 49 | Djibouti                              | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 50 | Dominica                              | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 51 | Dominican Republic                    | 0.024                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 52 | Ecuador                               | 0.021                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 53 | Egypt                                 | 0.088                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 54 | El Salvador                           | 0.020                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 55 | Equatorial Guinea                     | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 56 | Eritrea                               | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 57 | Estonia                               | 0.016                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 58 | Ethiopia                              | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 59 | European Community                    | 2.500                                      | 2.500   | 2.492   | 15 024                        | 15 024                        | 15 024                        |
| 60 | Fiji                                  | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 61 | Finland                               | 0.564                                      | 0.564   | 0.562   | 3 389                         | 3 389                         | 3 389                         |
| 62 | France                                | 6.301                                      | 6.301   | 6.280   | 37 867                        | 37 867                        | 37 867                        |
| 63 | Gabon                                 | 0.008                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 64 | Gambia                                | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 65 | Georgia                               | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 66 | Germany                               | 8.577                                      | 8.577   | 8.548   | 51 545                        | 51 545                        | 51 545                        |
| 67 | Ghana                                 | 0.004                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 68 | Greece                                | 0.596                                      | 0.596   | 0.594   | 3 582                         | 3 582                         | 3 582                         |
| 69 | Grenada                               | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |

|    | Name of Party              | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | 2010 Contributions by Parties | 2011 Contributions by Parties |
|----|----------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 70 | Guatemala                  | 0.032                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 71 | Guinea                     | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 72 | Guinea-Bissau              | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 73 | Guyana                     | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 74 | Haiti                      | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 75 | Holy See                   | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 76 | Honduras                   | 0.005                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 77 | Hungary                    | 0.244                                      | 0.244   | 0.243   | 1 466                         | 1 466                         | 1 466                         |
| 78 | Iceland                    | 0.037                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 79 | India                      | 0.450                                      | 0.450   | 0.448   | 2 704                         | 2 704                         | 2 704                         |
| 80 | Indonesia                  | 0.161                                      | 0.161   | 0.160   | 968                           | 968                           | 968                           |
| 81 | Iran (Islamic Republic of) | 0.180                                      | 0.180   | 0.179   | 1 082                         | 1 082                         | 1 082                         |
| 82 | Iraq                       | 0.015                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 83 | Ireland                    | 0.445                                      | 0.445   | 0.443   | 2 674                         | 2 674                         | 2 674                         |
| 84 | Israel                     | 0.419                                      | 0.419   | 0.418   | 2 518                         | 2 518                         | 2 518                         |
| 85 | Italy                      | 5.079                                      | 5.079   | 5.062   | 30 523                        | 30 523                        | 30 523                        |
| 86 | Jamaica                    | 0.010                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 87 | Japan                      | 16.624                                     | 16.624  | 16.568  | 99 904                        | 99 904                        | 99 904                        |
| 88 | Jordan                     | 0.012                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 89 | Kazakhstan                 | 0.029                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 90 | Kenya                      | 0.010                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 91 | Kiribati                   | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 92 | Kuwait                     | 0.182                                      | 0.182   | 0.181   | 1 094                         | 1 094                         | 1 094                         |
| 93 | Kyrgyzstan                 | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |

|     | Name of Party                    | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | 2010 Contributions by Parties | 2011 Contributions by Parties |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 94  | Lao People's Democratic Republic | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 95  | Latvia                           | 0.018                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 96  | Lebanon                          | 0.034                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 97  | Lesotho                          | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 98  | Liberia                          | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 99  | Libyan Arab Jamahiriya           | 0.062                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 100 | Liechtenstein                    | 0.010                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 101 | Lithuania                        | 0.031                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 102 | Luxembourg                       | 0.085                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 103 | Madagascar                       | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 104 | Malawi                           | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 105 | Malaysia                         | 0.190                                      | 0.190   | 0.189   | 1 142                         | 1 142                         | 1 142                         |
| 106 | Maldives                         | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 107 | Mali                             | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 108 | Malta                            | 0.017                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 109 | Marshall Islands                 | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 110 | Mauritania                       | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 111 | Mauritius                        | 0.011                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 112 | Mexico                           | 2.257                                      | 2.257   | 2.249   | 13 564                        | 13 564                        | 13 564                        |
| 113 | Micronesia (Federated State of)  | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 114 | Monaco                           | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 115 | Mongolia                         | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 116 | Montenegro                       | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 117 | Morocco                          | 0.042                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |

|     | Name of Party       | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | 2010 Contributions by Parties | 2011 Contributions by Parties |
|-----|---------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 118 | Mozambique          | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 119 | Myanmar             | 0.005                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 120 | Namibia             | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 121 | Nauru               | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 122 | Nepal               | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 123 | Netherlands         | 1.873                                      | 1.873   | 1.867   | 11 256                        | 11 256                        | 11 256                        |
| 124 | New Zealand         | 0.256                                      | 0.256   | 0.255   | 1 538                         | 1 538                         | 1 538                         |
| 125 | Nicaragua           | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 126 | Niger               | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 127 | Nigeria             | 0.048                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 128 | Niue                | -  | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 129 | Norway              | 0.782                                      | 0.782   | 0.779   | 4 700                         | 4 700                         | 4 700                         |
| 130 | Oman                | 0.073                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 131 | Pakistan            | 0.059                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 132 | Palau               | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 133 | Panama              | 0.023                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 134 | Papua New Guinea    | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 135 | Paraguay            | 0.005                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 136 | Peru                | 0.078                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 137 | Philippines         | 0.078                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 138 | Poland              | 0.501                                      | 0.501   | 0.499   | 3 011                         | 3 011                         | 3 011                         |
| 139 | Portugal            | 0.527                                      | 0.527   | 0.525   | 3 167                         | 3 167                         | 3 167                         |
| 140 | Qatar               | 0.085                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 141 | Republic of Korea   | 2.173                                      | 2.173   | 2.166   | 13 059                        | 13 059                        | 13 059                        |
| 142 | Republic of Moldova | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |

|     | Name of Party                    | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | 2010 Contributions by Parties | 2011 Contributions by Parties |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 143 | Romania                          | 0.070                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 144 | Russian Federation               | 1.200                                      | 1.200   | 1.196   | 7 212                         | 7 212                         | 7 212                         |
| 145 | Rwanda                           | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 146 | Saint Kitts and Nevis            | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 147 | Saint Lucia                      | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 148 | Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 149 | Samoa                            | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 150 | Sao Tome and Principe            | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 151 | Saudi Arabia                     | 0.748                                      | 0.748   | 0.745   | 4 495                         | 4 495                         | 4 495                         |
| 152 | Senegal                          | 0.004                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 153 | Serbia                           | 0.021                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 154 | Seychelles                       | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 155 | Sierra Leone                     | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 156 | Singapore                        | 0.347                                      | 0.347   | 0.346   | 2 085                         | 2 085                         | 2 085                         |
| 157 | Slovakia                         | 0.063                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 158 | Slovenia                         | 0.096                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 159 | Solomon Islands                  | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 160 | Somalia                          | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 161 | South Africa                     | 0.290                                      | 0.290   | 0.289   | 1 743                         | 1 743                         | 1 743                         |
| 162 | Spain                            | 2.968                                      | 2.968   | 2.958   | 17 837                        | 17 837                        | 17 837                        |
| 163 | Sri Lanka                        | 0.016                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 164 | Sudan                            | 0.010                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 165 | Suriname                         | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 166 | Swaziland                        | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 167 | Sweden                           | 1.071                                      | 1.071   | 1.067   | 6 436                         | 6 436                         | 6 436                         |

|     | Name of Party  | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | 2010 Contributions by Parties | 2011 Contributions by Parties |
|-----|--|--|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 168 | Switzerland  | 1.216                                      | 1.216   | 1.212   | 7 308                         | 7 308                         | 7 308                         |
| 169 | Syrian Arab Republic                                 | 0.016                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 170 | Tajikistan   | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 171 | Thailand   | 0.186                                      | 0.186   | 0.185   | 1 118                         | 1 118                         | 1 118                         |
| 172 | The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia            | 0.005                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 173 | Togo   | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 174 | Tonga  | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 175 | Trinidad and Tobago                                  | 0.027                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 176 | Tunisia  | 0.031                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 177 | Turkey   | 0.381                                      | 0.381   | 0.380   | 2 290                         | 2 290                         | 2 290                         |
| 178 | Turkmenistan   | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 179 | Tuvalu   | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 180 | Uganda   | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 181 | Ukraine  | 0.045                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 182 | United Arab Emirates                                 | 0.302                                      | 0.302   | 0.301   | 1 815                         | 1 815                         | 1 815                         |
| 183 | United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | 6.642                                      | 6.642   | 6.620   | 39 916                        | 39 916                        | 39 916                        |
| 184 | United Republic of Tanzania                          | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 185 | United States of America                             | 22.000                                     | 22.000  | 21.926  | 132 212                       | 132 212                       | 132 212                       |
| 186 | Uruguay  | 0.027                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 187 | Uzbekistan   | 0.008                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 188 | Vanuatu  | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 189 | Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)                   | 0.200                                      | 0.200   | 0.199   | 1 202                         | 1 202                         | 1 202                         |

|     | Name of Party | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | 2010 Contributions by Parties | 2011 Contributions by Parties |
|-----|---------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 190 | Vietnam       | 0.024                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 191 | Yemen         | 0.007                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 192 | Zambia        | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
| 193 | Zimbabwe      | 0.008                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —                             | —                             |
|     | <b>Total</b>  | <b>102.489</b>                             | <b>100.339</b>                                | <b>100.000</b>  | <b>603 000</b>                | <b>603 000</b>                | <b>603 000</b>                |



## Annex III

### Scale of contributions for the 2009–2011 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

| No. | Country        | United Nations scale of assessment for the years 2007–2009 | Adjusted United Nations scale of assessment with no Party contributing more than 22% | Annual contributions (in United States dollars) for years 2009, 2010 and 2011 | Average inflation rate for the period 2006–2008 | Qualifying FERM use<br>YES=1<br>NO=0 | FERM users' currencies' rates of exchange | FERM users' national currencies | FERM users' payments in national currencies |
|-----|----------------|--|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| 1   | Australia      | 1.787  | 2.169533208  | 2 892 710.94  | 3.49%   | 1                                    | 1.0883                                    | Australian dollar               | 3 148 137.32                                |
| 2   | Austria        | 0.887  | 1.076875185  | 1 435 833.58  | 2.45%   | 1                                    | 0.6570                                    | Euro                            | 943 342.66                                  |
| 3   | Azerbaijan     | 0.005  | 0.006070322  | 8 093.76  | 15.79%  | 0                                    | 0.0000                                    |                                 |   |
| 4   | Belarus        | 0.020  | 0.024281289  | 32 375.05   | 10.25%  | 0                                    | 0.0000                                    |                                 |   |
| 5   | Belgium        | 1.102  | 1.337899046  | 1 783 865.39  | 2.93%   | 1                                    | 0.6570                                    | Euro                            | 1 171 999.56                                |
| 6   | Bulgaria       | 0.020  | 0.024281289  | 32 375.05   | 9.07%   | 1                                    | 1.2852                                    | Lev                             | 41 608.42                                   |
| 7   | Canada         | 2.977  | 3.614269927  | 4 819 026.57  | 2.23%   | 1                                    | 0.9945                                    | Canadian dollar                 | 4 792 521.92                                |
| 8   | Cyprus         | 0.044  | 0.053418837  | 71 225.12   | 3.02%   | 1                                    | 0.6570                                    | Euro                            | 46 794.90                                   |
| 9   | Czech Republic | 0.281  | 0.341152116  | 454 869.49  | 4.01%   | 1                                    | 16.7833                                   | Czech koruna                    | 7 634 211.08                                |
| 10  | Denmark        | 0.739  | 0.897193643  | 1 196 258.19  | 2.34%   | 1                                    | 4.8983                                    | Danish krone                    | 5 859 631.50                                |
| 11  | Estonia        | 0.016  | 0.019425032  | 25 900.04   | 7.06%   | 1                                    | 10.2798                                   | Estonia kroon                   | 266 247.25                                  |
| 12  | Finland        | 0.564  | 0.684732361  | 912 976.48  | 2.25%   | 1                                    | 0.6570                                    | Euro                            | 599 825.55                                  |
| 13  | France         | 6.301  | 7.649820225  | 10 199 760.30   | 2.31%   | 1                                    | 0.6570                                    | Euro                            | 6 701 242.52                                |
| 14  | Germany        | 8.577  | 10.413030959   | 13 884 041.28   | 2.33%   | 1                                    | 0.657                                     | Euro                            | 9 121 815.12                                |
| 15  | Greece         | 0.596  | 0.723582424  | 964 776.57  | 3.57%   | 1                                    | 0.657                                     | Euro                            | 633 858.20                                  |
| 16  | Hungary        | 0.244  | 0.296231731  | 394 975.64  | 6.04%   | 1                                    | 166.500                                   | Forint                          | 65 763 444.21                               |
| 17  | Iceland        | 0.037  | 0.044920385  | 59 893.85   | 7.98%   | 1                                    | 69.750                                    | Icelandic krona                 | 4 177 595.84                                |
| 18  | Ireland        | 0.445  | 0.540258689  | 720 344.92  | 3.02%   | 1                                    | 0.657                                     | Euro                            | 473 266.61                                  |
| 19  | Israel         | 0.419  | 0.508693013  | 678 257.35  | 2.48%   | 1                                    | 3.567                                     | Shekel                          | 2 419 140.49                                |
| 20  | Italy          | 5.079  | 6.166233443  | 8 221 644.59  | 2.57%   | 1                                    | 0.657                                     | Euro                            | 5 401 620.50                                |
| 21  | Japan          | 16.624   | 20.182607748   | 26 910 143.66   | 0.62%   | 1                                    | 106.000                                   | Yen                             | 2 852 475<br>228.42                         |

| No. | Country  | United Nations scale of assessment for the years 2007–2009 | Adjusted United Nations scale of assessment with no Party contributing more than 22% | Annual contributions (in United States dollars) for years 2009, 2010 and 2011 | Average inflation rate for the period 2006–2008 | Qualifying FERM use YES=1 NO=0 | FERM users' currencies' rates of exchange | FERM users' national currencies | FERM users' payments in national currencies |
|-----|--|--|--|---|---|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| 22  | Latvia   | 0.018  | 0.021853160  | 29 137.55   | 10.85%  | 0                              | 0.000                                     |                                 |   |
| 23  | Liechtenstein  | 0.010  | 0.012140645  | 16 187.53   | 1.46%   | 1                              | 1.070                                     | Swiss franc                     | 17 320.65                                   |
| 24  | Lithuania  | 0.031  | 0.037635999  | 50 181.33   | 6.97%   | 1                              | 2.268                                     | Litas                           | 113 821.30                                  |
| 25  | Luxembourg   | 0.085  | 0.103195480  | 137 593.97  | 2.89%   | 1                              | 0.657                                     | Euro                            | 90 399.24                                   |
| 26  | Malta  | 0.017  | 0.020639096  | 27 518.79   | 2.32%   | 1                              | 0.657                                     | Euro                            | 18 079.85                                   |
| 27  | Monaco   | 0.003  | 0.003642193  | 4 856.26  | 2.31%   | 1                              | 0.657                                     | Euro                            | 3 190.56                                    |
| 28  | Netherlands  | 1.873  | 2.273942752  | 3 031 923.67  | 2.06%   | 1                              | 0.657                                     | Euro                            | 1 991 973.85                                |
| 29  | New Zealand  | 0.256  | 0.310800504  | 414 400.67  | 3.33%   | 1                              | 1.272                                     | New Zealand dollar              | 526 910.45                                  |
| 30  | Norway   | 0.782  | 0.949398415  | 1 265 864.55  | 2.09%   | 1                              | 5.235                                     | Norwegian krone                 | 6 626 800.94                                |
| 31  | Poland   | 0.501  | 0.608246299  | 810 995.07  | 2.51%   | 1                              | 2.278                                     | Zloty                           | 1 847 690.06                                |
| 32  | Portugal   | 0.527  | 0.639811976  | 853 082.63  | 2.87%   | 1                              | 0.657                                     | Euro                            | 560 475.29                                  |
| 33  | Romania  | 0.070  | 0.084984513  | 113 312.68  | 6.54%   | 1                              | 2.397                                     | Leu                             | 271 576.51                                  |
| 34  | Russian Federation                                   | 1.200  | 1.456877364  | 1 942 503.15  | 10.90%  | 0                              | 0.000                                     |                                 |   |
| 35  | Slovakia   | 0.063  | 0.076486062  | 101 981.42  | 3.37%   | 1                              | 21.430                                    | Slovak koruna                   | 2 185 461.73                                |
| 36  | Slovenia   | 0.096  | 0.116550189  | 155 400.25  | 4.00%   | 1                              | 0.657                                     | Tolar                           | 102 097.97                                  |
| 37  | Spain  | 2.968  | 3.603343347  | 4 804 457.80  | 3.64%   | 1                              | 0.657                                     | Euro                            | 3 156 528.77                                |
| 38  | Sweden   | 1.071  | 1.300263047  | 1 733 684.06  | 2.19%   | 1                              | 6.173                                     | Swedish krona                   | 10 702 551.83                               |
| 39  | Switzerland  | 1.216  | 1.476302395  | 1 968 403.19  | 1.46%   | 1                              | 1.047                                     | Swiss franc                     | 2 060 918.14                                |
| 40  | Tajikistan   | 0.001  | 0.001214064  | 1 618.75  | 14.93%  | 0                              | 0.000                                     |                                 |   |
| 41  | Ukraine  | 0.045  | 0.054632901  | 72 843.87   | 15.73%  | 0                              | 0.000                                     |                                 |   |
| 42  | United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | 6.642  | 8.063816209  | 10 751 754.95   | 2.81%   | 1                              | 0.504                                     | Pound sterling                  | 5 413 508.62                                |

| No. | Country                  | United Nations scale of assessment for the years 2007–2009 | Adjusted United Nations scale of assessment with no Party contributing more than 22% | Annual contributions (in United States dollars) for years 2009, 2010 and 2011 | Average inflation rate for the period 2006–2008 | Qualifying FERM use YES=1 NO=0 | FERM users' currencies' rates of exchange | FERM users' national currencies | FERM users' payments in national currencies |
|-----|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| 43  | United States of America | 22.000   | 22.000000000   | 29 333 333.33   | 3.44%   | 1                              | 1.000                                     | United States dollar            | 29 333 333.33                               |
| 44  | Uzbekistan               | 0.008  | 0.009712516  | 12 950.02   | 12.54%  | 0                              | 0.000                                     |                                 |   |
|     | <b>Total</b>             | <b>86.247</b>  | <b>100.000000000</b>   | <b>133 333 333</b>  |   |                                |   |                                 |   |

## Annex IV

## Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

## Revised 2008 and approved 2009 and 2010 budgets

|           |  |  | w/m | 2008 (US\$) | w/m | 2009 (US\$) | w/m | 2010 (US\$) |
|-----------|--|--|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|
| <b>10</b> | <b>Project personnel component</b>   |  |     |             |     |             |     |             |
| 1100      | Project personnel  |  |     |             |     |             |     |             |
| 1101      | Executive Secretary (D-2) (shared with the Vienna Convention, VC)                          |  | 6   | 132 226     | 6   | 135 664     | 6   | 139 192     |
| 1102      | Deputy Executive Secretary (D-1)   |  | 12  | 264 600     | 12  | 240 000     | 12  | 246 240     |
| 1103      | Senior Legal Officer (P-5)   |  | 12  | 178 300     | 12  | 182 936     | 12  | 187 692     |
| 1104      | Senior Scientific Affairs Officer (P-5) (shared with VC)                                   |  | 6   | 99 000      | 6   | 101 574     | 6   | 104 215     |
| 1105      | Administrative Officer (P-5) (paid by UNEP)  |  | 12  | —           |     | —           |     | —           |
| 1106      | Database Manager (Information System & Technology - P4) <sup>1</sup>                       |  | 12  | 130 000     | 12  | 142 050     | 12  | 145 743     |
| 1107      | Programme Officer (Communication & Information - P3) (paid from VC)                        |  | 12  |             | 12  | —           | 12  |             |
| 1108      | Programme Officer (Monitoring and Compliance - P4) <sup>1</sup>                            |  | 12  | 135 000     | 12  | 147 513     | 12  | 151 348     |
| 1199      | Subtotal   |  |     | 939 126     |     | 949 737     |     | 974 430     |
| 1200      | Consultants  |  |     |             |     |             |     |             |
| 1201      | Assistance in data-reporting, analysis and promotion of the implementation of the Protocol |  |     | 40 000      |     | 40 000      |     | 40 000      |
| 1299      | Subtotal   |  |     | 40 000      |     | 40 000      |     | 40 000      |
| 1300      | Administrative Support   |  |     |             |     |             |     |             |
| 1301      | Administrative Assistant (G-7) (shared with VC)  |  | 6   | 20 000      | 6   | 21 250      | 6   | 22 631      |
| 1302      | Personal Assistant (G-6)   |  | 12  | 25 000      | 12  | 26 625      | 12  | 28 356      |
| 1303      | Programme Assistant (G-6) (paid from VC)   |  | 12  | —           | 12  | —           | 12  | —           |
| 1304      | Programme Assistant (G-6) (shared with VC)   |  | 6   | 16 500      | 6   | 17 573      | 6   | 18 715      |
| 1305      | Information Assistant (G-6) (shared with VC)   |  | 6   | 15 300      | 6   | 16 295      | 6   | 17 354      |
| 1306      | Documentation Clerk (G-4)  |  | 12  | 24 000      | 12  | 25 560      | 12  | 27 221      |
| 1307      | Data Assistant (G-6)   |  | 12  | 39 600      | 12  | 42 174      | 12  | 44 915      |
| 1308      | Programme Assistant - Fund (G-6) (paid by UNEP)  |  | 12  | —           | 12  | —           | 12  | —           |
| 1309      | Logistics Assistant (G-3) (paid by UNEP)   |  | 12  | —           | 12  | —           | 12  | —           |

|             |   | w/m | 2008 (US\$) | w/m | 2009 (US\$) | w/m | 2010 (US\$) |
|-------------|---|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|
|             | 1310                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1320                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1321                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1322                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1323                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1324                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1325                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1326                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1399                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1600                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1601                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1602                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 1699                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
| <b>1999</b> | <b>Component total</b>                  |     |             |     |             |     |             |
| <b>30</b>   | <b>Meeting/participation component</b>  |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 3300                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 3301                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 3302                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 3303                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 3304                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 3305                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 3306                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 3399                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
| <b>3999</b> | <b>Component total</b>                  |     |             |     |             |     |             |
| <b>40</b>   | <b>Equipment and premises component</b> |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 4100                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 4101                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             | 4199                                    |     |             |     |             |     |             |
|             |   |     |             |     |             |     |             |

|             |  | w/m | 2008 (US\$)   | w/m | 2009 (US\$)   | w/m | 2010 (US\$)   |
|-------------|--|-----|---------------|-----|---------------|-----|---------------|
| 4200        | Non-Expendable Equipment   |     |               |     |               |     |               |
|             | 4201 Personal computers and accessories                            |     | 5 000         |     | 10 000        |     | 10 000        |
|             | 4202 Portable computers  |     | —             |     | 5 000         |     | 5 000         |
|             | 4203 Other office equipment (server, fax, scanner, furniture etc.) |     | 5 000         |     | 10 000        |     | 10 000        |
|             | 4204 Photocopiers  |     | 10 000        |     | 10 000        |     | 10 000        |
| 4299        | Subtotal   |     | 20 000        |     | 35 000        |     | 35 000        |
| 4300        | Premises   |     |               |     |               |     |               |
|             | 4301 Rental of office premises (shared with VC)                    |     | 33 600        |     | 42 000        |     | 42 000        |
| 4399        | Subtotal   |     | 33 600        |     | 42 000        |     | 42 000        |
| <b>4999</b> | <b>Component total</b>   |     | <b>70 600</b> |     | <b>99 000</b> |     | <b>99 000</b> |
| <b>50</b>   | <b>Miscellaneous component</b>                                     |     |               |     |               |     |               |
| 5100        | Operation and Maintenance of Equipment                             |     |               |     |               |     |               |
|             | 5101 Maintenance of equipment and others (shared with VC)          |     | 20 000        |     | 25 000        |     | 25 000        |
| 5199        | Subtotal   |     | 20 000        |     | 25 000        |     | 25 000        |
| 5200        | Reporting Costs  |     |               |     |               |     |               |
|             | 5201 Reporting   |     | 50 000        |     | 55 000        |     | 55 000        |
|             | 5202 Reporting (Assessment Panels)                                 |     | 15 000        |     | 15 000        |     | 15 000        |
|             | 5203 Reporting (Protocol Awareness)                                |     | 5 000         |     | 5 000         |     | 5 000         |
| 5299        | Subtotal   |     | 70 000        |     | 75 000        |     | 75 000        |
| 5300        | Sundry   |     |               |     |               |     |               |
|             | 5301 Communications  |     | 40 000        |     | 46 000        |     | 46 000        |
|             | 5302 Freight charges   |     | 50 000        |     | 60 000        |     | 60 000        |
|             | 5303 Training  |     | 6 500         |     | 7 000         |     | 10 500        |
|             | 5304 Others (International Ozone Day)                              |     | 10 000        |     | 10 000        |     | 10 000        |
| 5399        | Subtotal   |     | 106 500       |     | 123 000       |     | 126 500       |

|             |  | w/m | 2008 (US\$)      | w/m | 2009 (US\$)      | w/m | 2010 (US\$)      |
|-------------|--|-----|------------------|-----|------------------|-----|------------------|
| 5400        | Hospitality  |     |                  |     |                  |     |                  |
|             | 5401 Hospitality   |     | 15 000           |     | 20 000           |     | 20 000           |
| 5499        | Subtotal   |     | 15 000           |     | 20 000           |     | 20 000           |
| <b>5999</b> | <b>Component total</b>                                     |     | <b>211 500</b>   |     | <b>243 000</b>   |     | <b>246 500</b>   |
| <b>99</b>   | <b>Total direct project cost</b>                           |     | <b>4 037 826</b> |     | <b>4 464 924</b> |     | <b>4 286 711</b> |
|             | <i>Programme support costs (13%)</i>                       |     | <i>524 916</i>   |     | <i>580 439</i>   |     | <i>557 272</i>   |
|             | <b>Grand total (inclusive of programme support costs)</b>  |     | <b>4 562 742</b> |     | <b>5 045 363</b> |     | <b>4 843 983</b> |
|             | <b>Operating cash reserve exclusive of PSC<sup>3</sup></b> |     | <b>116 915</b>   |     | <b>213 465</b>   |     | <b>—</b>         |
|             | <b>Total budget</b>  |     | <b>4 679 658</b> |     | <b>5 258 828</b> |     | <b>4 843 983</b> |
|             | <b>Draw down<sup>4</sup></b>                               |     | <b>402 725</b>   |     | <b>981 895</b>   |     | <b>567 050</b>   |
|             | <b>Contribution from the Parties</b>                       |     | <b>4 276 933</b> |     | <b>4 276 933</b> |     | <b>4 276 933</b> |

<sup>1</sup> The Parties approved the Secretariat's request for the upgrade of the following posts: Database Manager (1106), and Monitoring and Compliance Officer (1108).

<sup>2</sup> In decisions XX/7 and XX/8, the Parties requested the Secretariat to convene the following workshops preceding the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group: Workshop on environmentally sound management of banks of ozone-depleting substances and workshop for a dialogue on high-global-warming-potential alternatives to ozone-depleting substances. The cost of conducting one of these workshops has been included in budget lines 1321 (administrative and conference support) and 3303 (meeting participation). The second workshop will be funded within the budget allocation originally proposed for the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

In decision XX/6, the Parties also requested the Secretariat to organize in the margins of the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties a workshop on reduction of methyl bromide use for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes and related emissions. The cost of conducting this workshop has been included in budget lines 1322 (administrative and conference support and 3302 (meeting participation).

<sup>3</sup> By decisions XVIII/5 and XIX/5, paragraph 5, the Parties agreed to increase the operating cash reserve for 2008 to 11.3 per cent and an additional 3.7 per cent for 2009, after which the Parties will maintain the reserve at 15 per cent. The operating cash reserve will have reached the 15 per cent mark in 2009.

<sup>4</sup> Draw-down levels in 2008, 2009 and 2010 have been set with a view to maintaining the level of contributions constant through 2010.

## Explanatory notes for the revised 2008 and approved 2009 and 2010 budgets of the Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

| Budget line   | Comment   |
|---|---|
| Personnel component<br>1101–1108                          | Indicative professional salary costs applicable to the Nairobi duty station for 2008–2009 and 2010–2011 have been used for the 2008–2010 budget proposals. Unspent commitments normally revert to the Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol.   |
| 1106 and 1108   | An adjustment has been made in these budget lines to cover changes in the salaries and entitlements of staff in the Professional category and above.<br><br>The Parties approved the requested upgrade of the following posts: Database Manager from P-3 to P-4 and Programme Officer (Monitoring and Compliance) from P-3 to P-4.  |
| 1105  | The post of the Administrative Officer continues to be paid by UNEP from the 13 per cent programme support costs. As discussed at the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties, this post was upgraded from P-4 to P-5 at no cost to the Parties.  |
| Consultants – 1201  | Assistance in data reporting, updating of publications and translation of essential features of the Ozone Secretariat website, as well as in the development of a fully interlinked digital system at the Secretariat, will continue to be required. Funds under this line may be transferred to line 1100 to create or support short-term Professional posts if necessary. |
| Administrative support/personnel<br>1301–1307             | Standard General Service salary costs applicable to the Nairobi duty station for 2008–2009 have been used for the 2008, 2009 and 2010 budget proposals. An adjustment has been made in these budget lines in 2008 to cover an increase in salaries that took effect in November 2007.   |
| 1308 and 1309   | The posts of Programme Assistant (Fund) and Logistics Assistant continue to be paid from the 13 per cent programme support costs.   |
| 1310  | The post of bilingual secretary is funded from the Vienna Convention Trust Fund.  |
| 1320  | The Secretariat continues to require funding for general temporary assistance, particularly in the area of documents preparation for meetings, regular website development and maintenance, archiving and arrangements for participants' attendance at meetings.  |
| Administrative support/conference services –<br>1321–1326 | Necessary funds may be transferred from the conference servicing budget lines (1321–1326) should such services be required to be rendered, either by individual consultancies or under corporate contracts.   |
|   | The current conference servicing costs have been  |



**Budget line****Comment**

based on the following reasons and assumptions:

1321: The budget proposed is for one meeting of the Open-ended Working Group to be held each year in 2009 and 2010 in Nairobi or at another United Nations venue, in the six official United Nations languages.

1322: The budget for 2008 is lower than in 2009 and 2010 as the cost of the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in 2008 is shared with the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention.

It is assumed that the Meeting of the Parties and its preparatory meeting will be held in Nairobi in 2009 and 2010, in the six official United Nations languages. When meetings are not held in Nairobi, the additional costs that that entails will be borne by the Government hosting the meetings.

1323: The budget allocation in 2009 and 2010 will cover the costs of organizing annual meetings of the assessment panels and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's technical options committees, together with communication and other sundry costs related to the work of Panel members from developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

1324: One Bureau meeting is scheduled for each of the years 2009 and 2010, with provision for interpretation and document translation into the appropriate languages based on the membership of the Bureau.

1325: At least two Implementation Committee meetings of three days' duration are scheduled for each of the years 2009 and 2010 with interpretation and document translation as required, to be held back-to-back with the Open-ended Working Group meetings and the Meetings of the Parties in those years.

1326: At least one informal consultation meeting per year, expected to take place in Nairobi, is envisaged for 2009 and 2010 to facilitate the work of assisting the Parties and also in promoting ratification of and compliance with the Montreal Protocol and its amendments.

Travel on official business – 1601–1602

Travel on official business for 2009 and 2010 is being maintained at the 2007 level.

Meetings/Participation component – 3300

Participation of representatives of developing countries

The participation of representatives of Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in the various Protocol meetings is assumed at \$5,000 per meeting per representative, taking into account not more than one person's travel costs per country, using the most appropriate and advantageous economy-class fare and United Nations daily subsistence allowances.

3301

The budget provision requested in 2009 and 2010 for members and experts of the assessment panels

| Budget line                      | Comment   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 3302                             | and the technical options committees attending assessment panel meetings is being maintained at 2008 levels.  |
| 3303                             | In 2008, the total participation costs, based on some 80 participants attending the combined eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, is borne fully by the Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol. In 2009 and 2010, the budget allocation reverts to 2007 levels.  |
| 3304                             | Participation costs are based on some 60 participants attending the Open-ended Working Group meetings in both 2009 and 2010.  |
| 3305                             | Participation costs are based on one Bureau meeting a year for four Bureau members from developing countries or countries with economies in transition at each meeting.   |
| 3306                             | The participation costs for the two Implementation Committee meetings per year are based on eight members from developing countries and countries with economies in transition at each meeting and one representative each from three or four countries invited by the Implementation Committee at each meeting. Provision has also been made for travel by the Implementation Committee President or Vice-President from a country operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 to attend three Executive Committee meetings a year. |
| 3307                             | Funds have been allocated to finance the participation of two participants from developing countries and countries with economies in transition as part of informal consultations in 2009 and 2010 on critical issues relating to the Montreal Protocol, which, it is expected, will be held in Nairobi.  |
| Equipment and premises component | The cost of miscellaneous expendables is being increased minimally in 2009 and 2010 to take into account inflation. Resource use is being monitored constantly to maintain low expenditure levels.  |
| Expendable equipment – 4101      |   |
| Non-expendable equipment – 4200  | A minimal provision in 2009 and 2010 has been made to provide for increased server capacity and to enable the Secretariat to replace equipment as and when required.  |
| Premises (rent) – 4300           | The allocation for rental of premises in 2008 has been increased by 19.3 per cent, as an interim measure advised by the United Nations Controller, pending review of current rental rates in Nairobi. A rise of 25 per cent has been proposed by the Secretariat for 2009 and 2010 to cover envisaged increases.  |

| Budget line   | Comment  |
|---|--|
| Miscellaneous component<br>Operation and maintenance of equipment – 5101                            | The provision for operation and maintenance of equipment is being increased minimally in 2008, 2009 and 2010 to cover increased maintenance costs for constantly increasing server capacity and additional computing requirements for staff.   |
| Reporting costs (including editing, translation, duplication, publication and printing) – 5201–5203 | General reporting costs for the Secretariat are provided for under these lines. Line 5202 is reserved for reporting of assessment panels. A small amount is allocated in line 5203 for any editing, translation, duplication, publication and printing related to Protocol awareness campaigns.  |
| Sundry – Communications – 5301  | Careful monitoring of telecommunications resources and the use of electronic mail instead of facsimile communications enable the Secretariat to maintain a relatively low budget provision under this line.  |
| Freight and post – 5302   | This line has been reduced by \$10,000 in 2008 to signal the Secretariat's and the Parties' commitment to the use of electronic mail for disseminating correspondence and meeting documentation. This budget line will be monitored closely over the next two years with a view to reducing the costs of posting and shipping of correspondence and meeting documentation in keeping with maximizing the benefits of global electronic communication media.  |
| Training – 5303   | The provision for training is being maintained to meet evolving training needs and to cater for training schemes introduced by the United Nations as a result of the continuing human resources reform programme.  |
| Others (International Ozone Day) – 5304   | The Ozone Secretariat will continue to provide assistance to specific countries during 2009 and 2010 to assist in their preparations for the celebration of the International Day for the Preservation of the Ozone Layer.   |
| Hospitality – 5401  | Hospitality arrangements follow the usual procurement procedures of the United Nations.<br><br>In 2008, the cost of the official hospitality reception is being shared between the Montreal Protocol and the Vienna Convention because the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties and the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties are combined. An additional amount of \$5,000 each for 2009 and 2010 is being requested as the cost for those years will not be shared with the Vienna Convention. |

## Annex V

### Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer: Scale of contributions by the Parties for 2009 and 2010 based on the United Nations scale of assessments

(General Assembly resolution 61/237 of 13 February 2007 with a maximum assessment rate of 22 per cent)  
(in United States dollars)

|    | Name of Party       | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale: 22 per cent maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | Indicative 2010 contributions by Parties |
|----|---------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 1  | Afghanistan         | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 2  | Albania             | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 3  | Algeria             | 0.085                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 4  | Angola              | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 5  | Antigua and Barbuda | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 6  | Argentina           | 0.325                                      | 0.325   | 0.324   | 13 853                        | 13 853                                   |
| 7  | Armenia             | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 8  | Australia           | 1.787                                      | 1.787   | 1.781   | 76 171                        | 76 171                                   |
| 9  | Austria             | 0.887                                      | 0.887   | 0.884   | 37 808                        | 37 808                                   |
| 10 | Azerbaijan          | 0.005                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 11 | Bahamas             | 0.016                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 12 | Bahrain             | 0.033                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 13 | Bangladesh          | 0.010                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 14 | Barbados            | 0.009                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 15 | Belarus             | 0.020                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 16 | Belgium             | 1.102                                      | 1.102   | 1.098   | 46 973                        | 46 973                                   |
| 17 | Belize              | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 18 | Benin               | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 19 | Bhutan              | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |

|    | Name of Party            | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale: 22 per cent maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | Indicative 2010 contributions by Parties |
|----|--------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 20 | Bolivia                  | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 21 | Bosnia and Herzegovina   | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 22 | Botswana                 | 0.014                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 23 | Brazil                   | 0.876                                      | 0.876   | 0.873   | 37 339                        | 37 339                                   |
| 24 | Brunei Darussalam        | 0.026                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 25 | Bulgaria                 | 0.020                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 26 | Burkina Faso             | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 27 | Burundi                  | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 28 | Cambodia                 | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 29 | Cameroon                 | 0.009                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 30 | Canada                   | 2.977                                      | 2.977   | 2.967   | 126 894                       | 126 894                                  |
| 31 | Cape Verde               | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 32 | Central African Republic | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 33 | Chad                     | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 34 | Chile                    | 0.161                                      | 0.161   | 0.160   | 6 863                         | 6 863                                    |
| 35 | China                    | 2.667                                      | 2.667   | 2.658   | 113 680                       | 113 680                                  |
| 36 | Colombia                 | 0.105                                      | 0.105   | 0.105   | 4 476                         | 4 476                                    |
| 37 | Comoros                  | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 38 | Congo                    | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 39 | Cook Islands             | -  | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 40 | Costa Rica               | 0.032                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 41 | Côte d'Ivoire            | 0.009                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 42 | Croatia                  | 0.050                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 43 | Cuba                     | 0.054                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 44 | Cyprus                   | 0.044                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 45 | Czech Republic           | 0.281                                      | 0.281   | 0.280   | 11 978                        | 11 978                                   |

|    | Name of Party                         | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale: 22 per cent maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | Indicative 2010 contributions by Parties |
|----|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 46 | Democratic People's Republic of Korea | 0.007                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 47 | Democratic Republic of Congo          | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 48 | Denmark                               | 0.739                                      | 0.739   | 0.737   | 31 500                        | 31 500                                   |
| 49 | Djibouti                              | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 50 | Dominica                              | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 51 | Dominican Republic                    | 0.024                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 52 | Ecuador                               | 0.021                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 53 | Egypt                                 | 0.088                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 54 | El Salvador                           | 0.020                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 55 | Equatorial Guinea                     | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 56 | Eritrea                               | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 57 | Estonia                               | 0.016                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 58 | Ethiopia                              | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 59 | European Community                    | 2.500                                      | 2.500   | 2.492   | 106 562                       | 106 562                                  |
| 60 | Fiji                                  | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 61 | Finland                               | 0.564                                      | 0.564   | 0.562   | 24 040                        | 24 040                                   |
| 62 | France                                | 6.301                                      | 6.301   | 6.280   | 268 579                       | 268 579                                  |
| 63 | Gabon                                 | 0.008                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 64 | Gambia                                | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 65 | Georgia                               | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 66 | Germany                               | 8.577                                      | 8.577   | 8.548   | 365 593                       | 365 593                                  |
| 67 | Ghana                                 | 0.004                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 68 | Greece                                | 0.596                                      | 0.596   | 0.594   | 25 404                        | 25 404                                   |
| 69 | Grenada                               | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 70 | Guatemala                             | 0.032                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 71 | Guinea                                | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |

|    | Name of Party                    | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale: 22 per cent maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | Indicative 2010 contributions by Parties |
|----|----------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 72 | Guinea-Bissau                    | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 73 | Guyana                           | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 74 | Haiti                            | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 75 | Holy See                         | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 76 | Honduras                         | 0.005                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 77 | Hungary                          | 0.244                                      | 0.244   | 0.243   | 10 400                        | 10 400                                   |
| 78 | Iceland                          | 0.037                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 79 | India                            | 0.450                                      | 0.450   | 0.448   | 19 181                        | 19 181                                   |
| 80 | Indonesia                        | 0.161                                      | 0.161   | 0.160   | 6 863                         | 6 863                                    |
| 81 | Iran (Islamic Republic of)       | 0.180                                      | 0.180   | 0.179   | 7 672                         | 7 672                                    |
| 82 | Iraq                             | 0.015                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 83 | Ireland                          | 0.445                                      | 0.445   | 0.443   | 18 968                        | 18 968                                   |
| 84 | Israel                           | 0.419                                      | 0.419   | 0.418   | 17 860                        | 17 860                                   |
| 85 | Italy                            | 5.079                                      | 5.079   | 5.062   | 216 492                       | 216 492                                  |
| 86 | Jamaica                          | 0.010                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 87 | Japan                            | 16.624                                     | 16.624  | 16.568  | 708 595                       | 708 595                                  |
| 88 | Jordan                           | 0.012                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 89 | Kazakhstan                       | 0.029                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 90 | Kenya                            | 0.010                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 91 | Kiribati                         | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 92 | Kuwait                           | 0.182                                      | 0.182   | 0.181   | 7 758                         | 7 758                                    |
| 93 | Kyrgyzstan                       | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 94 | Lao People's Democratic Republic | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 95 | Latvia                           | 0.018                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 96 | Lebanon                          | 0.034                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |

|     | Name of Party                   | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale: 22 per cent maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | Indicative 2010 contributions by Parties |
|-----|---------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 97  | Lesotho                         | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 98  | Liberia                         | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 99  | Libyan Arab Jamahiriya          | 0.062                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 100 | Liechtenstein                   | 0.010                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 101 | Lithuania                       | 0.031                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 102 | Luxembourg                      | 0.085                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 103 | Madagascar                      | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 104 | Malawi                          | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 105 | Malaysia                        | 0.190                                      | 0.190   | 0.189   | 8 099                         | 8 099                                    |
| 106 | Maldives                        | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 107 | Mali                            | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 108 | Malta                           | 0.017                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 109 | Marshall Islands                | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 110 | Mauritania                      | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 111 | Mauritius                       | 0.011                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 112 | Mexico                          | 2.257                                      | 2.257   | 2.249   | 96 204                        | 96 204                                   |
| 113 | Micronesia (Federated State of) | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 114 | Monaco                          | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 115 | Mongolia                        | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 116 | Montenegro                      | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 117 | Morocco                         | 0.042                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 118 | Mozambique                      | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 119 | Myanmar                         | 0.005                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 120 | Namibia                         | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 121 | Nauru                           | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |



|     | Name of Party         | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale: 22 per cent maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | Indicative 2010 contributions by Parties |
|-----|-----------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 122 | Nepal                 | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 123 | Netherlands           | 1.873                                      | 1.873   | 1.867   | 79 836                        | 79 836                                   |
| 124 | New Zealand           | 0.256                                      | 0.256   | 0.255   | 10 912                        | 10 912                                   |
| 125 | Nicaragua             | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 126 | Niger                 | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 127 | Nigeria               | 0.048                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 128 | Niue                  | -  | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 129 | Norway                | 0.782                                      | 0.782   | 0.779   | 33 333                        | 33 333                                   |
| 130 | Oman                  | 0.073                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 131 | Pakistan              | 0.059                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 132 | Palau                 | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 133 | Panama                | 0.023                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 134 | Papua New Guinea      | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 135 | Paraguay              | 0.005                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 136 | Peru                  | 0.078                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 137 | Philippines           | 0.078                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 138 | Poland                | 0.501                                      | 0.501   | 0.499   | 21 355                        | 21 355                                   |
| 139 | Portugal              | 0.527                                      | 0.527   | 0.525   | 22 463                        | 22 463                                   |
| 140 | Qatar                 | 0.085                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 141 | Republic of Korea     | 2.173                                      | 2.173   | 2.166   | 92 624                        | 92 624                                   |
| 142 | Republic of Moldova   | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 143 | Romania               | 0.070                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 144 | Russian Federation    | 1.200                                      | 1.200   | 1.196   | 51 150                        | 51 150                                   |
| 145 | Rwanda                | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 146 | Saint Kitts and Nevis | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 147 | Saint Lucia           | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |

|     | Name of Party                             | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale: 22 per cent maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | Indicative 2010 contributions by Parties |
|-----|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 148 | Saint Vincent and the Grenadines          | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 149 | Samoa                                     | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 150 | Sao Tome and Principe                     | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 151 | Saudi Arabia                              | 0.748                                      | 0.748   | 0.745   | 31 883                        | 31 883                                   |
| 152 | Senegal                                   | 0.004                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 153 | Serbia                                    | 0.021                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 154 | Seychelles                                | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 155 | Sierra Leone                              | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 156 | Singapore                                 | 0.347                                      | 0.347   | 0.346   | 14 791                        | 14 791                                   |
| 157 | Slovakia                                  | 0.063                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 158 | Slovenia                                  | 0.096                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 159 | Solomon Islands                           | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 160 | Somalia                                   | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 161 | South Africa                              | 0.290                                      | 0.290   | 0.289   | 12 361                        | 12 361                                   |
| 162 | Spain                                     | 2.968                                      | 2.968   | 2.958   | 126 511                       | 126 511                                  |
| 163 | Sri Lanka                                 | 0.016                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 164 | Sudan                                     | 0.010                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 165 | Suriname                                  | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 166 | Swaziland                                 | 0.002                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 167 | Sweden                                    | 1.071                                      | 1.071   | 1.067   | 45 651                        | 45 651                                   |
| 168 | Switzerland                               | 1.216                                      | 1.216   | 1.212   | 51 832                        | 51 832                                   |
| 169 | Syrian Arab Republic                      | 0.016                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 170 | Tajikistan                                | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 171 | Thailand                                  | 0.186                                      | 0.186   | 0.185   | 7 928                         | 7 928                                    |
| 172 | The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | 0.005                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |

|     | Name of Party  | UN scale of assessment for years 2007-2009 | Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors | Adjusted UN scale: 22 per cent maximum assessment rate considered | 2009 Contributions by Parties | Indicative 2010 contributions by Parties |
|-----|--|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 173 | Togo   | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 174 | Tonga  | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 175 | Trinidad and Tobago                                  | 0.027                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 176 | Tunisia  | 0.031                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 177 | Turkey   | 0.381                                      | 0.381   | 0.380   | 16 240                        | 16 240                                   |
| 178 | Turkmenistan   | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 179 | Tuvalu   | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 180 | Uganda   | 0.003                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 181 | Ukraine  | 0.045                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 182 | United Arab Emirates                                 | 0.302                                      | 0.302   | 0.301   | 12 873                        | 12 873                                   |
| 183 | United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | 6.642                                      | 6.642   | 6.620   | 283 114                       | 283 114                                  |
| 184 | United Republic of Tanzania                          | 0.006                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 185 | United States of America                             | 22.000                                     | 22.000  | 21.926  | 937 746                       | 937 746                                  |
| 186 | Uruguay  | 0.027                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 187 | Uzbekistan   | 0.008                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 188 | Vanuatu  | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 189 | Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)                   | 0.200                                      | 0.200   | 0.199   | 8 525                         | 8 525                                    |
| 190 | Viet Nam   | 0.024                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 191 | Yemen  | 0.007                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 192 | Zambia   | 0.001                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
| 193 | Zimbabwe   | 0.008                                      | 0.000   | 0.000   | —                             | —  |
|     | <b>Total</b>   | <b>102.489</b>                             | <b>100.339</b>                                | <b>100.000</b>  | <b>4 276 933</b>              | <b>4 276 933</b>                         |

## Annex VI

### Doha Declaration

*We the ministers of the environment and heads of delegation of the 143 Parties attending the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer,*

*Acknowledging* the progress that has been made to address the problem of depletion of the ozone layer through the global elimination of production of over 96 per cent of historic levels of ozone-depleting substances between 1987 and 2007,

*Recognizing* that this progress was achieved through:

(a) Cooperation between developed and developing countries, including provision being made to meet the needs of developing countries, as manifested by: the near universal participation in the Protocol by all countries; efficiency and transparency of the Protocol bodies, including the Multilateral Fund and its Executive Committee, the Implementation Committee; the assessment panels of the Protocol, and the Ozone and Multilateral Fund secretariats;

(b) Triennial replenishments of the Multilateral Fund amounting to over \$2.4 billion from 1991-2008; excellent compliance by all Parties with the Protocol's provisions; capacity building in all developing country Parties' to the Protocol through funding of over 140 national ozone units;

(c) Phase-out of more than 80 per cent of the production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances by the developing countries; agreement by all Parties to accelerate the phase-out of their production and consumption of hydrochlorofluorocarbons; the extraordinary efforts and adaptability of the staff of the international and national implementing agencies to respond to the evolving needs of the Parties; the enormous and generous contributions of industry, non-governmental organizations and academia in supporting the Protocol's efforts;

(d) A firm commitment to maximizing and exploring the broad-reaching benefits of the Protocol, in particular to deterring climate change in addition to ozone layer protection,

*Taking account* of the remaining work that needs to be done to protect the ozone layer, including the obligations of developing countries to reduce their production and consumption of chlorofluorocarbons, halons and carbon tetrachloride to zero by 1 January 2010, and methyl bromide and methyl chloroform by 2015, and eventually eliminate their global production and consumption of hydrochlorofluorocarbons,

*Recognizing* the generosity of past, present and future contributions of Parties to the Multilateral Fund and its essential role in securing the objectives of the Montreal Protocol,

*Cognizant of the fact* that safeguarding the ozone layer will require continued global commitment, a sustained level of scientific research and monitoring and the taking of precautionary measures to control equitably total global emissions of substances that deplete the ozone layer,

*Acknowledging* that phasing out ozone depleting substances has a positive impact on the climate system and human health, and that many of the actions that can still be taken by the Protocol Parties to investigate and reduce the impact of ozone depleting substances can have significant benefits in the efforts to address climate change including the need for urgent and effective action,

*Wishing* to highlight the operational leadership of the Montreal Protocol in addressing environmental issues in a holistic fashion that takes into account relationships with other institutions,

**A. On the issue of destruction of ozone-depleting substances**

1. *Resolve* to undertake an initial effort to destroy banks of ozone-depleting substances in order urgently to address their ozone and climate impact, and through a process that is consistent with the requirements of other international legal regimes;
2. *Commit ourselves* to undertaking further studies to assess the technical and economic feasibility of destroying ozone-depleting substances, taking into account their ozone and climate impact;
3. *Commit ourselves also* to undertaking pilot projects to generate practical data and experience on management and financing modalities, achieving climate benefits, and exploring opportunities to leverage co-financing in order to maximize environmental benefits;

**B. On the issue of replenishment**

4. *Underline* the commitment to a replenishment of the Multilateral Fund of \$490 million for the period 2009–2011 with the understanding that these funds will be used to enable developing countries to meet their obligations under the Protocol;

**C. On atmospheric measurements**

5. *Urge* the Governments of the world to seek to ensure full coverage of the relevant data gathering programmes, in order to ensure that the atmosphere including its stratospheric ozone and its interrelation with climatic change is kept under continuous observation;

**D. On the Government of Qatar initiatives**

6. *Applaud* the two initiatives announced by the Government of Qatar to establish:
  - (a) A monitoring station in Qatar, for monitoring the Ozone Layer and the Earth's stratosphere in collaboration with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of the United States of America;
  - (b) An Ozone Layer and Climate Change Research Centre, within Qatar's Science and Technology Park and in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme, for conducting scientific research on ozone-depleting substance alternatives and developing environmentally friendly applications;

**E. On this and future paperless meetings**

7. *Recognize* the outstanding contribution of the Government of Qatar in embracing and conducting, for the first time in the history of the United Nations, a very successful paperless meeting, a practice which we hope will be extended to the conduct of future United Nations meetings; note, once again, the innovative contributions that Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol can make; and express great hope that the success achieved in Doha will serve as a model and pave the way to holding virtually paperless meetings in other United Nations forums and elsewhere;
8. *Express* great appreciation to the Government of Qatar for the donation of the computers and paperless system, which will enable future United Nations meetings to be held in a paperless manner.