



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: General
14 October 2009

Original: English



**Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties to the
Montreal Protocol on Substances that
Deplete the Ozone Layer**

Port Ghalib, Egypt, 4–8 November 2009

Item 6 (a) of the provisional agenda
for the preparatory segment*

**High-global-warming-potential alternatives to
ozone-depleting substances (decision XX/8):
proposed amendment to the Montreal Protocol**

Item 10 of the provisional agenda
for the high-level segment*

**Adoption of decisions by the Twenty-First Meeting
of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol**

Draft decisions and proposed amendments to the Montreal Protocol

Addendum

Note by the Secretariat

The annexes to the present note set out four draft decisions that are intended to replace decisions C, D, B and A in document 21/3: annex I sets out a proposal by Sweden on behalf of the European Union for a draft decision on sources of carbon tetrachloride emissions and opportunities for reductions; annex II sets out a proposal by Sweden on behalf of the European Union for a draft decision on the treatment of stockpiled ozone-depleting substances relative to compliance (decision XVIII/17); annex III sets out a proposal by Australia, the European Community and the United States of America for a draft decision on uses of controlled substances as process agents; annex IV sets out a proposal by the European Community for a draft decision on global laboratory and analytical use exemption. The proposals are being circulated as received and have not been formally edited.

* UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/1.

Annex I

Proposal by Sweden on behalf of the European Union for a draft decision on sources of carbon tetrachloride emissions and opportunities for reductions

By EU related to Sources of Carbon Tetrachloride Emissions and Opportunities for Reductions of ODS Emissions

2009.10.12

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The EU notes that significant quantities of stockpiled CTC reported to the Secretariat are scheduled to be destroyed in a subsequent year, which is coherent with the usual practice in chemical industrial production. Most of the quantities included in that list of stockpiled ODS compiled by the Secretariat are in EU Member States that have industrial chemical productions that lead to by-production or co-production of CTC, which is stored to be destroyed at a later stage.

On the other hand, data presented in the Report on Emission Reductions and Phase-out of CTC carried on under ExCom Dec. 55/45, clearly identifies discrepancies between atmospheric concentrations and the emission reported by Parties. Emissions up to 40.000 t/year of CTC are not reported by the usual emission tracking mechanisms.

This concern is not new, and TEAP was requested in 2006 to provide information to the Parties about this issue by Decision XVIII/10, but has been unable to properly reconcile atmospheric concentrations and reported emissions due to the difficulties in obtaining relevant data.

The main emitting regions identified under the ExCom report are South East Asia and China, North America and Europe.

The concerned member states in the EU are willing to further investigate the industrial chemical productions that could lead to carbon tetrachloride emission and invites other Parties with similar industrial facilities to conduct an internal study to clarify the sources of CTC emissions, with the aim of identifying the source of the referred discrepancies.

EU thinks this issue deserves important efforts, due to the magnitude of the unidentified associated emissions and has important value to clarify how Parties are dealing with industrial CTC productions and the by-production or co-productions of CTC when producing other chemical substances.

CRP CTC and PA (rev 2009.10.12)

[Decision XXI/nn: Sources of Carbon Tetrachloride Emissions and Opportunities for Reductions of ODS Emissions

Recalling Decision XVII/10 on sources of carbon tetrachloride emissions and opportunities for reduction, and the difficulties expressed by Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) in reconciling reported emissions data and atmospheric concentrations,,

Reiterating the concern regarding the large discrepancy between reported emissions and observed atmospheric concentrations, which suggests that emissions from industrial activity are significantly under reported and underestimated,

Acknowledging that CTC can be emitted from processes, stockpiles or containers in the form of vapour or it can be also released from the same sources in liquid or solid waste stream(s) and via products; all of which would also be considered as emissions

Mindful of the obligations to ensure control measures under Article 2D of the Montreal Protocol regarding production and consumption of carbon tetrachloride,

Desiring to reduce emissions to background concentration levels,

Noting the report UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/58/50 of the 58th Executive Committee on emission reductions and phase-out of carbon tetrachloride in light of decision XVIII/10 of the Eighteenth Meeting of the Parties and its verbal report to the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties concluding that the rapid decrease in model-estimated bottom-up emissions (i.e. based on information from industry and Article 7 data) is significantly lower than emissions derived from atmospheric measurements for the range of scientifically determined atmospheric lifetimes.

Noting that the report provided by TEAP speculated that the decrease in emissions from controlled uses may be compensated by a rapidly growing new source. It pointed out that more work needs to be done, providing the example of the need to explore high growth products such as HCFC-22 and its consequences for CTC co-production when producing feedstock for HCFC-22.

1. To request Parties having any carbon tetrachloride production, whether deliberate or inadvertent by-production, to review their carbon tetrachloride productions, consumptions and sources of emission by examining their the relevant production, consumption and associated emissions, including emissions via products and waste streams, and by giving special attention to the by-production of carbon tetrachloride in chloroform and other chlorinated solvents production processes and use in pharmaceutical manufacturing processes;
2. For the purpose of clarification “emission” mean any release from the processes, stockpiles, products, and waste streams either in the form of vapour or in the form of liquid;
3. To request Parties to provide the TEAP, latest by [September 2010] through the Ozone Secretariat, with the relevant information resulting from the review undertaken in accordance with paragraph 1, that should appropriately include:
 - a) Number and installed capacity of facilities producing carbon tetrachloride and an estimate of the annual emissions
 - b) Number of facilities/plants that produce or by-produce carbon tetrachloride, including information about the type of production process(s) identified in Paragraph 1 above, its installed capacity, and the management measures related to carbon tetrachloride and an estimation of the annual emissions
 - c) Number of CTC destruction facilities dedicated (on site, locally or regionally) to address the CTC disposal

- d) Existing quantities of CTC intentionally or inadvertently produced annually for or maintained in stocks for feedstock and process agents applications
- e) Contemporary treatment of waste and incidentally emitted quantities of carbon tetrachloride

4. To request the TEAP, in conjunction with its 2011 Assessment, to investigate chemical alternatives to ODS in exempted uses such as process agents and feedstocks and also investigate alternatives, including not-in-kind alternatives, to products made with process agents and feedstocks and provide assessment of the technical and economic feasibility of reducing or eliminating such use and emissions;

5. Request TEAP and the Scientific Assessment Panel (SAP) to continue to address the elements that would enable reconciliation of the large discrepancy between emissions reported and those inferred from atmospheric measurements;

6. To request that TEAP and SAP coordinate and report their relevant findings taking into account the information received from the Parties according to paragraph 3 and results of the study according to paragraph 4 and report in time for the thirty first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group for the consideration of the Twenty third Meeting of the Parties in 2011.]

End 2009-10-12

Annex II

Proposal by Sweden on behalf of the European Union and its 27 member States for a draft decision on the treatment of stockpiled ozone-depleting substances relative to compliance

[Treatment of stockpiled ozone-depleting substances relative to compliance (decision XVIII/17)]

At OEWG 26 stockpiled ODS for exempted use in future years was discussed. It turned out that a number of Parties stockpiled ODS and thereby exceeding their prescribed levels of production and consumption. This excess represented:

- (a) ODS production in that year, stockpiled for domestic destruction or export for destruction in a future year;
- (b) ODS production in that year, stockpiled for domestic feedstock use or export for that use in a future year;
- (c) ODS production in that year, stockpiled for export to meet basic domestic needs of developing countries in a future year;
- (d) ODS imported in that year, stockpiled for domestic feedstock use in a future year.

The Secretariat observed that only scenario (d) appeared to be consistent with the Protocol on the basis of decision VII/30 (Annex 1). The Working Group was told that the Committee had tentatively concluded that if situations (a)–(c) should occur again the Secretariat should report them to the Implementation Committee for case-by-case consideration as possible cases of non-compliance.

In considering this issue fully, the Parties decided in decision XVIII/17 to note the four cases discussed above; to recall that the Implementation Committee had concluded that scenario (d) was, in any event, in conformity with the provisions of the Montreal Protocol and decisions of the Meetings of the Parties; to request the Secretariat to maintain a consolidated record of the cases in which the Parties had explained that their situations were the consequence of scenarios (a), (b) or (c) and incorporate that record in the documentation of the Implementation Committee, for information purposes only, and in the Secretariat's report on data submitted by the Parties in accordance with Article 7 of the Protocol; to recognize that new scenarios not covered by paragraph 1 would be addressed by the Implementation Committee in accordance with the non-compliance procedure of the Protocol and the established practice thereunder; and to agree that the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties would revisit the issue in the light of information gathered in accordance with paragraph 3 of the decision.

The Secretariat made a consolidated record of cases in scenarios (a)-(c). MOP 21 is expected to consider this matter and to make a decision, as appropriate.

ACTION

Treatment of stockpiled ozone-depleting substances relative to compliance; Two questions need to be addressed

- (a) FIRST, Given the language of the decision, would export more than one year later (rather than in the following year) fulfil the expectation in the decision and the Parties' representation that they had overproduced for export?
- (b) SECOND: Given the fact that audits by the Multilateral Fund only affect Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5, would bringing such matters to the Implementation Committee create an imbalance, under which reliance on the decision by such Parties would be reviewed while the use of the decision by Parties not so operating would not?

POSSIBLE CRP: A consistent approach is needed to treat A2 & A5 taking into account commitments under the MLF. We are prepared to engage and clarify in a CRP elements to ensure a consistent approach that provide evenness of interpretation for the MOP.

PROPOSAL

In order to follow up these possible cases of non compliance the Meeting of the parties could consider addressing the issues as follows, based on a combination of the options discussed by the Parties:

The Meeting of the Parties could clarify that, quantities produced in excess of control limits in a given year could be registered through a domestic reporting and monitoring framework and, where they were exported for basic domestic needs, used for feedstock, or destroyed, deducted in the following year, provided that the Party concerned had in place a domestic system for ensuring that the earmarked quantities were put to their intended uses. Any such reporting framework should take into account existing reporting obligations, and to report the description of such domestic system to the Ozone Secretariat.

In any of those cases the [Implementation Committee] [Secretariat] would have to assess the existence and the effectiveness of such domestic systems.

[The Secretariat could be asked to present a set of criteria to assess if this system is designed in a way to ensure the monitoring of the excess production for the consideration of the [xx]Meeting of the Parties]

Provided that the Secretariat could conclude that the destruction, feedstock-use or export in line with scenario's a, b, or c, has taken place [within [3 months] [1 year]] of its intended year, [and it is demonstrated that the production [stockpiling] was done incidentally,] these cases would not have to be considered by the Implementation Committee.

[For Parties] that have excess production according to the scenarios a, b, and c in subsequent years these cases should be analyzed further by the Secretariat and brought forward to the Implementation Committee as to assess whether these cases should be brought forward to the Meeting of the Parties.

Arguments:

- *Transparency*
- *Pragmatism*

The Meeting of the Parties decides

1. To remind all Parties to report all production of ODS, including unwanted or unintentional by-production, to enable the calculation of their consumption.
2. To recall that the Secretariat was requested to maintain a consolidated record of the cases in which the Parties have explained that their situations are the consequence of one of the following scenarios:
 - (a) Ozone-depleting substance production in that year which had been stockpiled for domestic destruction or export for destruction in a future year;
 - (b) Ozone-depleting substance production in that year which had been stockpiled for domestic feedstock use or export for that use in a future year;
 - (c) Ozone-depleting substance production in that year which had been stockpiled for export to meet basic domestic needs of developing countries in a future year;

and incorporate that record in the documentation of the Implementation Committee, for information purposes only, as well as in the Secretariat's report on data submitted by the Parties in accordance with Article 7 of the Protocol.

3. To note that the Secretariat reported 23 cases from 1999 involving 12 Parties which had exceeded the allowed level of production or consumption of a particular ozone-depleting substance in a given year and explained that their excess production or consumption represented one of the scenarios mentioned in paragraph 1.
4. To request the Implementation Committee and the Secretariat to review and redesign the forms for reporting data under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol for consideration [at the 22nd Meeting of the Parties] [at the 30th OEWG] in light of the need to establish a reporting framework to account for limited stockpiles.
5. To request the Secretariat, in reviewing Article 7 reporting data forms, to ensure that the reporting form allows for assessment of all earmarked quantities so that these quantities may be tracked to reconcile stockpile with intended uses not later than the end of following year of the ODS stockpiled production.
6. To request the Secretariat to further analyze cases of Parties that report excess production under Article 7 more than 2 times in [2] subsequent years and to bring forward to the Implementation Committee for further consideration any case which is not in line with paragraphs 4 and 5.
7. To recognize that new scenarios not covered by paragraph 4 will be brought before the parties for consideration if such case would be addressed by the Implementation Committee in accordance with the non-compliance procedure of the Protocol and the established practice there under.]

Annex III

Proposal by Australia, the European Community and the United States of America for a draft decision on uses of controlled substances as process agents

Explanatory note

In its 2008 Progress Report the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) recommended that one of the listed processes (no 6 in the table of Decision XIX/15) could be removed as the only example of the process in India had ceased by the end of 2007. In light of its analysis of data received from China, TEAP recommended the addition of three new process agent uses to the table of Decision XIX/15: in the manufacture of polyvinylidene fluoride (PVdF) using CTC; in the manufacture of tetrafluorobenzoyl ethyl acetate using CTC; and in the manufacture of 4-bromophenol using CTC. This proposal, therefore, suggests updating table A of decision X/14 accordingly.

TEAP was unable to recommend any changes to the table B of decision X/14 because of a lack of information from Parties, except for Japan where process agent use has ceased.

Considering the 2004 enlargement of the European Community those Parties that are now part of the European Community no longer need to be listed individually in table B and the values should be integrated into the overall value for the European Community.

It appears that only two Parties submitted information about their process agent use according to Decision X/14. This absence of reporting hampers the work of TEAP. Parties should therefore be reminded of the reporting obligation and non-reporting should be brought to the attention of the implementation committee.

At the same time, the administrative burden for Parties and the Secretariat can be reduced by specifying conditions under which reporting is no longer necessary.

Draft decision on uses of controlled substances as process agents

Noting with appreciation the 2008 report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel;

Recalling Decision X/14 in which all Parties are asked to report to the Secretariat annually by 30 September on their use of controlled substances as process agents, the levels of emissions from those uses and the containment technologies used by them to minimize emissions of controlled substances;

Noting that the report by Executive Committee on process agent uses in Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol (UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.1/29/4) found that the adoption of technology not depending on ozone-depleting substances used as process agents has become the norm in Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol;

Noting that reporting by Parties operating under Article 5(1) on approved process agent projects under the Multilateral Fund does not replace the need to submit the required information under Decision X/14 to the Ozone Secretariat;

Noting with concern that only two Parties reported information consistent with Decision X/14 and that such limited data has impeded the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel in undertaking the level of analysis required;

Also noting that such limited information reported by Parties puts at risk the current exclusion of process agent uses of controlled substances from a Party's annual consumption calculation;

1. To request all Parties with process agent uses of controlled substances to submit the information required by Decision X/14 by 30 September each year to the Ozone Secretariat;
2. To clarify that the annual reporting obligation shall not apply once a Party informs the Ozone Secretariat they do not use ozone-depleting substances as process agents [until they start doing so] and this one-time procedure pertains to all Parties whether or not they are listed in Table B of Decision X/14.
3. To request the Ozone Secretariat every year to write to those Parties that did not submit a report in accordance with paragraph 2, requesting them to submit information consistent with Decision X/14;
4. To request the Ozone Secretariat to bring cases of non-reporting to the attention of the Implementation Committee for consideration.
5. To request the TEAP and the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to prepare a joint report for future meetings, reporting on progress with phasing out process-agent uses, in accordance with Decision XVII/6 (paragraph 6);
6. To revisit this issue at the 31st OEWG;
7. To update Table A of Decision X/14 as per the Annex to this decision;
8. To update Table B of Decision X/14 as per the Annex to this decision

Annex

Table A: List of uses of controlled substances as process agents

No.	Process agent application	Substance
1	Elimination of NCl_3 in chlor-alkali production	CTC
2	Chlorine recovery by tail gas absorption in chlor-alkali production	CTC
3	Production of chlorinated rubber	CTC
4	Production of endosulfan	CTC
5	Production of ibuprofen	CTC
6	Production of chlorosulfonated polyolefin (CSM)	CTC
7	Production of aramid polymer (PPTA)	CTC
8	Production of synthetic fibre sheet	CFC-11
9	Production of chlorinated paraffin	CTC
10	Photochemical synthesis of perfluoropolyetherpolyperoxide precursors of Z-perfluoropolyethers and difunctional derivatives	CFC-12
11	Reduction of perfluoropolyetherpolyperoxide intermediate for production of perfluoropolyether diesters	CFC-113
12	Preparation of perfluoropolyether diols with high functionality	CFC-113
13	Production of cyclodime	CTC
14	Production of chlorinated polypropene	CTC
15	Production of chlorinated ethylene vinyl acetate (CEVA)	CTC
16	Production of methyl isocyanate derivatives	CTC
17	Production of 3-phenoxybenzaldehyde	CTC
18	Production of 2-chloro-5-methylpyridine	CTC
19	Production of imidacloprid	CTC
20	Production of bupropfenin	CTC
21	Production of oxadiazon	CTC
22	Production of chloradized N-methylaniline	CTC
23	Production of 1,3-dichlorobenzothiazole	CTC
24	Bromination of a styrenic polymer	BCM
25	Synthesis of 2,4-D (2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid)	CTC
26	Synthesis of di-(2-ethylhexyl) peroxydicarbonate (DEHPC)	CTC
27	Production of radio-labelled cyanocobalamin	CTC
28	Production of high modulus polyethylene fibre	CFC-113
29	Production of vinyl chloride monomer	CTC
30	Production of sultamicillin	BCM
31	Production of prallethrin (pesticide)	CTC
32	Production of o-nitrobenzaldehyde (for dyes)	CTC
33	Production of 3-methyl-2-thiophenecarboxaldehyde	CTC
34	Production of 2-thiophenecarboxaldehyde	CTC
35	Production of 2-thiophene ethanol	CTC
36	Production of 3,5-dinitrobenzoyl chloride (3,5-DNBC)	CTC
37	Production of 1,2-benzisothiazol-3-ketone	CTC
38	Production of m-nitrobenzaldehyde	CTC
39	Production of tichlopidine	CTC
40	Production of p-nitro benzyl alcohol	CTC
41	Production of tolclofos methyl	CTC
42	Production of polyvinylidene fluoride (PVdF)	CTC
43	Production of tetrafluorobenzoyl ethyl acetate	CTC
44	Production of 4-bromophenol	CTC

Table B: Limits for process agent uses (all figures are in metric tonnes per year)

Party	Make-up or consumption	Maximum emissions
European Community	1083	17
United States of America	2300	181
Canada	13	0
Japan	0	0
Russian Federation	800	17
Australia	0	0

New Zealand	0	0
Norway	0	0
Iceland	0	0
Switzerland	5	0.4
TOTAL	4201	215,4

Annex IV

Proposal by the European Community for a draft decision on global laboratory and analytical use exemption

Explanatory note

a) The CTOC report

In its 2009 Progress Report, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) and its Chemicals Technical Options Committee (CTOC) provided a list of laboratory and analytical uses of ODS for which alternatives already exist.

However, the report did not provide sufficient information to enable Parties to exclude those uses from the global laboratory and analytical use exemption (the exemption) already now. For example, for some uses, the suggested alternatives were based only on scientific work. Only in a few cases has information been provided that gave sufficient assurance that the alternatives are technically and economically viable in all Parties or that the alternatives were now established standard methods. Therefore, it was felt that CTOC should continue working on this issue.

b) Extension of the global laboratory and analytical use exemption to Article-5-parties

In the past, only non-Article-5-Parties benefited from the exemption, whereas in Article-5-parties these uses were covered by the basic domestic needs regime. Since the latter regime ends at the end of 2009 for all substances except methyl bromide, trichloroethane and HCFCs, Article-5-Parties should also become eligible to take advantage of the global laboratory use exemption.

To avoid that Article-5 and non-Article-5-parties have different time schedules the draft decision first proposes the extension of the global laboratory and analytical use exemption until 31 December 2010, as this is the current date for the non-Article-5-Parties. In a second step the draft decision proposes the extension until 31 December 2014 for all Parties.

In the past, the extension of the exemption has often been done just before the end date and often has been granted only for a short period. This caused significant problems for planning by the companies involved. Since it is unlikely that the exemption as such will be lifted in foreseeable future, an earlier extension is proposed this time and for a longer timeframe. 31 December 2014 has been chosen because at this point the basic domestic needs regime ends also for methyl bromide and trichloroethane and Parties may wish to consider a new extension decision at that point anyway.

c) Uses already banned

Some Article-5 Parties expressed concerns regarding the laboratory and analytical uses already banned under the exemption. It was felt that, for the already banned uses, alternatives might not be available in some Parties. On the other hand, well established alternatives and ODS-free standard methods exist for those uses. Therefore, CTOC is requested in the draft decision, while continuing its work on alternatives, to verify also the situation of Article-5-Parties in relation to the uses already banned. The draft decision proposes to lift the existing use bans for a limited time for Article-5-Parties in cases which the corresponding Party considers as justified domestically.

d) Regional workshops

In its report, CTOC recommended a workshop on laboratory and analytical uses of ODS in the Gulf Region and West Asia. This could be useful for other regions as well, in particular in view of the

concerns expressed by some Parties regarding the existing use bans. Therefore, the draft decision encourages the regional networks to organise such workshops.

e) Other issues

As the information on the existing use bans and the rules applicable to the exemption were scattered in numerous decisions, it was considered useful to summarise the rules in the chapeau of the draft decision. In this regard the Ozone Secretariat is requested to update the corresponding website.

Draft decision on global laboratory use exemption

The Twenty-first Meeting of the Parties decides:

Noting the reports the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) provided under Decision XVII/10 and under Decision XIX/18 on laboratory and analytical uses of ozone depleting substances (ODS).

Noting that TEAP has identified in its report a number of procedures for which alternatives to the use of ODS are available, as summarised below:

- (a) Analyses in which the ODS is used as a solvent for spectroscopic measurements:
 - (i) of hydrocarbons (oil and grease) in water or soil
 - (ii) of simethicone (polydimethylsiloxane)
 - (iii) when recording infrared and nuclear magnetic resonance spectra, including hydroxyl index
- (b) Analyses in which the ODS is used as a solvent for electrochemical methods of analysis of:
 - (i) cyanocobalamin
 - (ii) bromine index
- (c) Analyses involving selective solubility in the ODS of:
 - (i) cascarosides
 - (ii) thyroid extracts
 - (iii) polymers
- (d) Analyses in which the ODS is used to preconcentrate the analyte, for:
 - (i) liquid chromatography (HPLC) of drugs and pesticides
 - (ii) gas chromatography of organic chemicals such as steroids
 - (iii) adsorption chromatography of organic chemicals
- (e) Titration of iodine with thiosulfate (iodometric analyses) for determination of:
 - (i) iodine
 - (ii) copper
 - (iii) arsenic
 - (iv) sulphur
- (f) Iodine and bromine index measurements (titrations)
- (g) Miscellaneous analyses, namely
 - (i) stiffness of leather
 - (ii) jellification point
 - (iii) specific weight of cement
 - (iv) gas mask cartridge breakthrough
- (h) Use of ODS as a solvent in organic chemical reactions

(i) O- and N-difluoromethylation

- (i) General use as laboratory solvent, namely
 - (i) washing of NMR tubes
 - (ii) removal of greases from glassware
 - (iii) solvent for organic chemical reactions

Recalling Decisions VII/11, XI/15, XVIII/15 and XIX/18 that already eliminated the following uses from the global exemption for laboratory and analytical uses:

- (a) Refrigeration and air conditioning equipment used in laboratories, including refrigerated laboratory equipment such as ultra-centrifuges;
- (b) Cleaning, reworking, repair, or rebuilding of electronic components or assemblies;
- (c) Preservation of publications and archives;
- (d) Sterilization of materials in a laboratory;
- (e) Testing of oil, grease and total petroleum hydrocarbons in water;
- (f) Testing of tar in road-paving materials;
- (g) Forensic finger-printing;
- (h) All laboratory and analytical uses of methyl bromide except:
 - (i) As a reference or standard:
 - To calibrate equipment which uses methyl bromide;
 - To monitor methyl bromide emission levels;
 - To determine methyl bromide residue levels in goods, plants and commodities;
 - (ii) In laboratory toxicological studies;
 - (iii) To compare the efficacy of methyl bromide and its alternatives inside a laboratory;
 - (iv) As a laboratory agent which is destroyed in a chemical reaction in the manner of feedstock;
- (i) Testing of organic matter in coal

Recalling the conditions applied to the exemption for laboratory and analytical uses contained in the Annex II of the report of the Sixth Meeting of the Parties.

1. to extend the applicability of the global laboratory and analytical use exemption also to countries operating under Article 5(1) from 1 January 2010 until 31 December 2010 for all ODS except those in Annex B Group III, Annex C Group I and Annex E.
2. to extend the global laboratory and analytical use exemption beyond 31 December 2010 until 31 December 2014:
 - (a) for Parties operating under Article 5(1) for all ODS except those in Annex B Group III, Annex C Group I and Annex E, and
 - (b) for Parties not operating under Article 5(1) for all ODS except those in Annex C Group I
3. To request all Parties to urge their national standards-setting organisations to identify and review those standards which mandate the use of ODS in laboratory and analytical procedures with a view to adopting, where possible, ODS-free laboratory and analytical products and processes;

5. To request the TEAP and its CTOC to complete the report as requested under Decision XIX/18 and to provide for the 30th OEWG
 - a) a list of laboratory and analytical uses of ODS, including those uses where no alternatives exist.
 - b) to identify the international and national standards that require the use of ODS and to indicate the corresponding alternative standard methods not mandating the use of ODS.
 - c) to consider the technical and economical availability of those alternatives in Article-5 and non-Article-5 Parties [as well as to ensure that the alternative methods show similar or better statistical properties (for example accuracy or detection limits)].
6. To request TEAP while continuing its work as described in paragraph 5, to evaluate the availability of alternatives for those uses already banned under the global exemption in Parties operating under Article 5(1), considering technical and economical aspects. By the 30th OEWG TEAP should present its findings and recommendations whether exemptions would be required for parties operating under Article 5(1) for any of the uses already banned.
7. To allow Parties operating under Article 5(1) until [the 22nd Meeting of the parties][31 December 2010 to deviate from the existing laboratory and analytical use bans in individual cases, where a party considers that this is [justified][the only option].
8. To request the Ozone Secretariat to update the list of laboratory and analytical uses that the Parties have agreed should no longer be eligible under the global exemption, as required by Decision X/19 [and to write to Parties reporting laboratory and analytical uses of ozone depleting substances encouraging them to transition to non-ozone depleting alternatives, where allowed by their national standards].
9. To request Parties to continue to investigate domestically the possibility of replacing ODS in those laboratory and analytical uses listed in the report by the TEAP and to make this information available to the Ozone Secretariat by [28 February 2010] [30 April 2010].
10. To encourage the Regional Offices of UNEP together with interested Parties in their region to organise a workshop on laboratory and analytical uses for the region as recommended by CTOC [before the 22nd Meeting of the parties][in 2010][if possible]. The workshops should raise awareness of possibilities for replacing ODS with alternatives, inform the participants about the existing rules and alternatives, and to provide assistance for information gathering to ensure compliance.