



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: General
9 July 2010

Original: English



**Twenty-Second Meeting of the Parties to the
Montreal Protocol on Substances that
Deplete the Ozone Layer**
Bangkok, 8–12 November 2010
Item 10 of the provisional agenda
for the high-level segment**

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

**Draft decisions for the consideration of the Twenty-Second
Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol**

Note by the secretariat

1. Chapter I of the present note sets out draft decisions developed by parties and contact groups comprising parties during the thirtieth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. The Working Group did not reach consensus on these draft decisions but did agree that they should be considered by the Twenty-Second Meeting of the Parties. The Working Group also agreed that further work could be undertaken intersessionally on several of the draft decisions. Consequently, it is likely that additional iterations of some of the proposals will be prepared before the Twenty-Second Meeting of the Parties. To ensure that parties are able to consider the most up-to-date versions of the draft decisions the Ozone Secretariat will post on its website any updated texts that it receives. If necessary it will also issue an addendum to the present note prior to the Twenty-Second Meeting of the Parties setting forth any such texts.
2. Chapter II of the present note contains draft decisions prepared by the Secretariat pertaining to administrative matters related to the Montreal Protocol. The parties have historically adopted decisions on such matters at their annual meetings.
3. The proposed amendments to the Montreal Protocol that were submitted by the Federated States of Micronesia, and Canada, Mexico and the United States of America pursuant to Article 9 of the Vienna Convention and paragraph 2 of Article 10 of the Montreal Protocol can be found in documents UNEP/OzL.Pro.22/6 and UNEP/OzL.Pro.22/5, respectively.

* Reissued for technical reasons on 6 October 2010.

** UNEP/OzL.Pro.22/1.

I. Draft decisions submitted by parties and/or emanating from contact groups during the thirtieth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group for consideration by the Twenty-Second Meeting of the Parties

A. Draft decision XXII/[A]: Endorsement of a new Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel

Submission by Colombia

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

1. To thank Mr. José Pons Pons (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) for his long and outstanding efforts on behalf of the Montreal Protocol as Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel;
2. To endorse the selection of Ms. Marta Pizano (Colombia) as a new Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel.

B. Draft decision XXII/[B]: Endorsement of a new co-chair of the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel

Submission by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

1. To thank Mr. Jan C. van der Leun (Netherlands), who has served as Co-Chair of the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel since its inception, for his long and outstanding efforts on behalf of the Montreal Protocol;
2. To endorse Mr. Nigel D. Paul (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) as the new Co-Chair of the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel.

C. Draft decision XXII/[C]: Terms of reference for an evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol

Submission by the contact group on terms of reference established at the thirtieth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

1. To approve the terms of reference for an evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol contained in annex --- to the present report;
2. To set up a steering panel of [six] members to supervise the evaluation process and to select a consultant or consultants to carry out the evaluation, to act as a point of contact for the consultant or consultants during the course of the evaluation and to ensure that the terms of reference are implemented in the most appropriate manner possible;
3. To select the following [six] members to serve as the steering panel from among the parties to the Montreal Protocol: [----, ----, ----, ----, ---- and ----]. The appointed panel has equal representation of individuals selected by parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol and parties not so operating;
4. To request the Ozone Secretariat to finalize the procedure for the selection of the qualified external and independent consultant or consultants. On the basis of submitted proposals, the Secretariat shall prepare a shortlist of qualified bidders and facilitate review of relevant proposals by the steering panel;
5. To instruct the steering panel to organize its meetings with the assistance of the Ozone Secretariat with dates and venues selected, as far as possible, to coincide with other ozone meetings, thereby reducing related costs;
6. To approve the provision of up to [\$---,---] in the 2011 budget of the Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol to fund the evaluation, and to deduct the same amount from other resources of the Trust Fund;

7. To ensure that the final report and recommendations of the consultant or consultants are made available to parties for consideration at the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties.

Annex to decision XXII/[C] –

Terms of reference for an evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol

A. Preamble

1. The achievements of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol have often been recognized by the international community, and there is no doubt that the mechanism is both a cornerstone of the Protocol and an outstanding example of multilateral cooperation. Indeed, by the end of 2008 the Multilateral Fund had approved projects to phase out the consumption and production of about 478,000 ozone-depleting-potential (ODP) tonnes of ozone-depleting substances in developing countries, and over 85 per cent of this amount had already been phased out. As a result of those activities, nearly all parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol are in compliance with their obligations under the Protocol, while most of their consumption and production of ozone-depleting substances, except for HCFCs, has been eliminated.

2. The financial mechanism was established by Article 10 of the Montreal Protocol to provide financial and technical cooperation to parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 to enable their compliance with the Protocol's control measures. The Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol recognized the need to review periodically the operation of the financial mechanism to ensure maximum effectiveness in pursuing the goals of the Montreal Protocol. Since its inception in 1991, the mechanism, which includes the Multilateral Fund, an Executive Committee, a Secretariat and implementing and bilateral agencies, has been evaluated twice by the parties, in 1994–1995 and 2003–2004.

3. The year 2010 is a landmark year in the history of both the Montreal Protocol and the financial mechanism, as virtually all remaining production and consumption of CFCs, halons and carbon tetrachloride is to be phased out by 1 January 2010. In the light of this major milestone, it is particularly timely for the parties to the Protocol to take a retrospective look at the achievements of the financial mechanism, the challenges that it has faced, the manner in which they have been addressed and the lessons that have been learned, with a view to ensuring that the mechanism is well placed to address the challenges of the future effectively. Those challenges include phasing out HCFCs and the remaining consumption of methyl bromide, implementing ozone-depleting substance destruction pilot projects and, in the future, may also include a phase-down of HFCs, should the international community decide to include HFCs under the Montreal Protocol.

B. Purpose

4. In the light of the above, and considering that it has been more than five years since the last evaluation was conducted, the [Twenty-Second Meeting of the Parties] decided that it was appropriate to evaluate and review the Financial Mechanism with a view to ensuring its effective functioning in meeting the needs of parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 and parties not so operating in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol. The study should be based on the present terms of reference, carried out by an independent consultant and completed by May 2012, in time for consideration by the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol at its thirty-second meeting.

C. Scope

5. In carrying out the study, the consultant should consider the results, policy framework, organizational structure and lessons learned associated with the financial mechanism as follows:

- (a) Results of the financial mechanism:
 - (i) Extent to which both investment and non-investment projects approved under the Multilateral Fund have contributed to phasing out ozone-depleting substances in parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in accordance with Montreal Protocol compliance targets;
 - (ii) Total reductions of ozone-depleting substances in ODP-tonnes and metric tonnes resulting from Multilateral Fund activities;

- (iii) [Total reductions [and introduction of] greenhouse gases in carbon dioxide equivalent terms resulting from Multilateral Fund activities and production capacity installed];
 - (iv) Comparison of planned ozone-depleting substance phase-out and ozone-depleting substance phase-out achieved;
 - (v) Comparison of planned cost-effectiveness of projects and cost-effectiveness achieved;
 - (vi) [Comparison of approved incremental costs and actual [incremental] costs of selected samples of completed projects];
 - (vii) Comparison of planned project implementation time and implementation time achieved;
 - (viii) [Identification of any incidental results of Multilateral Fund activities, including environmental co-benefits, not directly related to the reduction of ozone-depleting substances [or greenhouse gases]];
 - (ix) Efficacy of provided capacity-building and institutional strengthening and compliance assistance;
 - (x) [Comparison of substitutes and alternatives funded by the Multilateral Fund in respect of their environmental impacts mentioned in paragraph 11 of decision XIX/6;]
- (b) Policies and procedures:
- (i) Effectiveness and efficiency of procedures and practices to develop and approve projects under the Multilateral Fund;
 - (ii) Coherence and effectiveness of the project review process;
 - (iii) Adequacy of planning and implementation process of projects and activities to ensure compliance;
 - (iv) Effectiveness and efficiency of monitoring and reporting procedures and practices;
 - (v) Adequacy of internal evaluation and verification mechanisms to monitor and confirm results, including an analysis of existing databases;
 - (vi) Extent to which policies and procedures are adapted or improved based on experiences and relevant circumstances;
- (c) Organizational structure:
- (i) Adequacy and effectiveness of [the division of labour between] the Executive Committee, the Secretariat, the evaluation function, the Treasurer and the implementing and bilateral agencies;
 - (ii) Adequacy and effectiveness of interaction between the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund and the Meeting of the Parties and related subsidiary bodies;
 - (iii) Review of the role and guidance provided by parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in the project development and implementation process;
 - (iv) Adequacy and effectiveness of timing between meetings, submission deadlines and reporting deadlines;
- (d) Multilateral and bilateral implementing agencies:
- (i) Examination of accountability mechanisms applicable to the agencies;
 - (ii) Identification of any bottlenecks, gaps and overlaps in the operation of the agencies;
 - (iii) Adequacy of the administrative cost regime;

- (e) Other issues:
- (i) Review of the distribution of funding among regions where parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 are located, as well as between low-volume consuming countries and non-low-volume consuming countries;
 - (ii) Identification of the countries of origin of the technology and the related inputs (chemicals, spare parts, etc) provided through a representative sample of investment projects, and consideration of the possible dependency of beneficiary enterprises on those countries for the continued operation of such technology;
 - (iii) Review of local and international consultant and technology costs in a representative sample of investment and non-investment projects and respective shares of those costs in relation to total project costs;
 - (iv) Proportion of administrative costs including Secretariat and implementing agency costs in terms of total resources;
 - (v) Experience and effectiveness of the transfer of technology;
- (f) Lessons learned:
- (i) Lessons learned in view of the future challenges of the Montreal Protocol and the Multilateral Fund;
 - (ii) Lessons learned for other international environmental institutions and agreements.

[D. Form and presentation of the study

6. The study shall be presented using a practical, easy-to-use and easy-to-read layout, and should include a comprehensive summary for policy makers [of about 30 pages] and a detailed index followed by the body of the study and its annexes.]

E. Conclusions and recommendations

7. In carrying out the study, the consultant(s) will identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats associated with the financial mechanism and, where relevant, make recommendations suggesting possible improvements.

F. Sources of information

8. The Multilateral Fund Secretariat, the Ozone Secretariat, the Executive Committee, the implementing and bilateral agencies, the Treasurer, ozone offices, recipient countries and companies are invited to cooperate with the consultant(s) and to provide all necessary information. The evaluation should take into account the relevant decisions of the Meetings of the Parties and the Executive Committee.

9. The consultant(s) should widely consult relevant persons and institutions and other relevant sources of information deemed useful.

G. Time frame and milestones

10. The following table presents a tentative time frame and milestones for the study:

November 2010	Approval of the terms of reference by the Meeting of the Parties
	Selection of a steering panel by the Meeting of the Parties
January 2011	Finalization of the procedure for the selection of qualified external and independent consultant(s)
March 2011	Analysis of bids by the Ozone Secretariat and recommendations to steering panel
	Independent consultant selected by the panel
April 2011	Contract awarded
	Consultant(s) meets the steering panel to discuss study modalities and details
October/November 2011	Midterm review: preliminary draft report submitted to and reviewed by the steering panel
February 2012	Final draft report submitted to and reviewed by steering panel
May 2012	Final draft report submitted to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-second meeting
September 2012	Final report submitted to the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties

D. Draft decision XXII/[D]: Terms of reference for the study on the 2012–2014 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

Submission by the contact group on terms of reference established at the thirtieth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

Recalling decisions on previous terms of reference for studies on the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol,

Recalling also decisions on previous replenishments of the Multilateral Fund,

1. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to prepare a report for submission to the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties, and to present it through the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting, to enable the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to take a decision on the appropriate level of the 2012–2014 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund;

2. That, in preparing the report referred to in the preceding paragraph, the Panel should take into account, among other things:

(a) All control measures and relevant decisions agreed upon by the parties to the Montreal Protocol and the Executive Committee, in particular those related to the special needs of low-volume and very-low-volume consuming countries, and decisions agreed upon by the Twenty-Second Meeting of the Parties and the Executive Committee at its sixty-first and sixty-second meetings insofar as those decisions will necessitate expenditure by the Multilateral Fund during the period 2012–2014;

(b) The need to allocate resources to enable all parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol to maintain compliance with Articles 2A–2E, 2G and 2I of the Protocol;

(c) The need to allocate resources to enable all parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 to meet 2013 and 2015 compliance obligations in respect of Articles 2F and 2H of the Protocol;

(d) Rules and guidelines agreed upon by the Executive Committee at all meetings, up to and including its sixty-second meeting, for determining eligibility for the funding of investment projects, non-investment projects, including institutional strengthening, measures to combat illegal trade and sectoral or national phase-out plans, including hydrochlorofluorocarbon phase-out management plans, measures to manage banks of ozone-depleting substances and ozone-depleting substance destruction projects [and considering a potential compliance scenario for hydrofluorocarbons];

(e) The impact that the international market, ozone-depleting substance control measures and country phase-out activities are likely to have on the supply of and demand for ozone-depleting substances, the corresponding effects on the price of ozone-depleting substances and the resulting incremental costs of investment projects during the period under review;

3. That, in preparing the report referred to above, the Panel should consult widely with all relevant persons and institutions and other relevant sources of information deemed useful;

4. That the Panel shall strive to complete the report referred to above in time to enable it to be distributed to all parties two months before the thirty-first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group;

5. That the Panel should provide indicative figures for the periods 2015–2017 and 2018–2020 to support a stable and sufficient level of funding [that would be updated prior to figures for those periods being finalized];

6. [That the Panel should provide indicative figures for resources that would be needed to enable all parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 to meet potential compliance obligations in the amendment proposals submitted in 2010 to be considered by the Twenty-Second Meeting of the Parties];

7. [That the panel should provide indicative figures for additional funding for the promotion of alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons with low global-warming potential, taking into account health and safety requirements].

E. Draft decision XXII/[E]: Hydrochlorofluorocarbon guidelines approved by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund

Submission by Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

1. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to assess:

(a) The extent to which the funding guidelines on hydrochlorofluorocarbons adopted by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol at its sixtieth meeting would allow for the selection and financing of low-global-warming-potential alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons in parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol, using the classification of global-warming potentials presented by the Panel in its 2010 progress report;

(b) Quantities and types of hydrofluorocarbons that are likely to be phased in as alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons, and in which sectors, because of a lack of low-global-warming-potential alternatives or insufficient funding for adopting low-global-warming-potential alternatives, taking into account environmental, health and safety requirements;

2. To request the Panel to submit a report on the results of its analysis to the Open-ended Working Group for consideration at its thirty-first meeting.

F. Draft decision XXII/[F]: Affirmation of the status of hydrochlorofluorocarbons preblended in polyols as controlled substances under the Montreal Protocol

Submission by India

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

[Noting that significant quantities of hydrochlorofluorocarbons are preblended into polyols as mixtures, which are thereafter used for manufacturing polyurethane foams,

Acknowledging that clarification of the status of preblended polyols as a mixture containing controlled substances is urgently needed in view of the importance of accurately establishing the baselines for hydrochlorofluorocarbons in parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol and the importance of the phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons in the polyurethane foams sector for compliance with the adjusted phase-out schedule for hydrochlorofluorocarbons in accordance with decision XIX/6,

Recalling the definition of controlled substances in paragraph 4 of Article 1 of the Montreal Protocol and previous decisions of the Meeting of the Parties related to the definition and classification of controlled substances, namely, decisions I/12 A, XII/10 and XIV/7;

Taking into account the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's technical guidance on the terminology for polyurethanes and polyurethane foams,

1. To affirm that hydrochlorofluorocarbons that are preblended or premixed in polyols shall be considered to be controlled substances as defined in paragraph 4 of Article 1 of the Montreal Protocol and thus shall be subject to the phase-out schedules for hydrochlorofluorocarbons agreed to by the parties;

2. To urge the parties to record and report accurately their production, consumption, imports and exports of hydrochlorofluorocarbons preblended in polyols in accordance with Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol from 2009 onwards and, to the extent possible, from earlier years;

3. To request the Ozone Secretariat to adjust the reporting formats for data reported under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol to permit data pertaining to hydrochlorofluorocarbons preblended in polyols to be accurately and separately collected and recorded;

4. To advise the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol to consider hydrochlorofluorocarbons preblended in polyols to be on a par with hydrochlorofluorocarbons in any other form for the purposes of phase-out and eligibility for associated technical and financial assistance for parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5.]

G. Draft decision XXII/[G]: Revision of the list of approved destruction technologies

Submission by Australia

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

Recalling decision XV/9 on the approval of destruction technologies and annex II to the report of the Fifteenth Meeting of the Parties, which lists approved destruction processes by source and destruction method,

Recalling also that paragraph (c) of decision VII/5 and paragraph 7 of decision XI/13 urge parties to adopt recovery and recycling technologies for quarantine and pre-shipment uses of methyl bromide, to the extent technically and economically feasible, until alternatives are available,

Recalling further that paragraph 6 of decision XX/6 requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, in its report on opportunities for reductions in methyl bromide use or emissions for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes, to provide to the Meeting of the Parties a list of available methyl bromide recapture technologies for consideration by the parties,

Noting that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel was able to provide a list of examples of commercial recapture units in operation in several countries in their report to the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties,

Noting also that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel has reported on a number of emerging technologies for the destruction of ozone-depleting substances that complement those reported on previously,

1. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and the relevant technical options committees, in consultation with other relevant experts, to recommend, for consideration at the thirty-first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group:

(a) The appropriate destruction and recovery efficiency for methyl bromide and any other substance already listed in annex II to the report of the Fifteenth Meeting of the Parties;

(b) Any further destruction technologies that have the destruction and recovery efficiency recommended by the Panel pursuant to the preceding subparagraph or previously recommended by the Panel;

2. To invite interested persons to submit to the Secretariat by 1 February 2011 data relevant to the recommendation to be made by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel pursuant to paragraph 1 above.

H. Draft decision XXII/[H]: Development of criteria for the evaluation of destruction facilities for end-of-life management of ozone-depleting substances

Submission by Nigeria

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

Recalling the work of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its associated task forces in assessing existing and emerging destruction technologies and in making recommendations for the list of approved destruction technologies, as last requested in decision XVI/15,

Noting with appreciation the organization and content of the seminar on the environmentally sound management of banks of ozone-depleting substances held pursuant to decision XXI/2,

Acknowledging that one of the significant themes of the seminar was the need to ensure the appropriate destruction of ozone-depleting substances recovered from products and equipment at the end of their lives and that consistent criteria for the handling and destruction of ozone-depleting substances would contribute to increased confidence in destruction capabilities in a number of regions of the world, including in parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol,

1. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to convene a task force of appropriately informed and experienced members with the ability to address the development of criteria for the handling and destruction of ozone-depleting substances at relevant destruction facilities using processes already included in the list of approved destruction processes;

2. To request the task force to review and report on those destruction technologies that are not already included in the current list of approved destruction processes and that are emerging to address the specific challenges posed by end-of-life recovery and destruction;

3. Also to request the task force to make recommendations to the parties, as appropriate, on the emerging technologies referred to in paragraph 2 above for future inclusion in the list of approved destruction processes;

4. Further to request the task force to identify and report on the criteria that should be applied when assessing the appropriateness of using identified destruction facilities for the handling and destruction of ozone-depleting substances;

5. To request the task force to provide guidance on whether the criteria referred to in the preceding paragraph should be included in section 3.1 of the Montreal Protocol handbook or elsewhere;

6. Also to request the task force to provide its report for the thirty-first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

I. Draft decision XXII/[I]: Destruction technologies with regard to ozone-depleting substances

Submission by the contact group on the environmentally sound treatment of banks of ozone-depleting substances established at the thirtieth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

[*Recalling* the work of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its associated task forces in assessing existing and emerging destruction technologies and in making recommendations to the list of approved destruction technologies, as last requested in decision XVI/15,

Noting with appreciation the organization and content of the seminar on the environmentally sound management of banks of ozone-depleting substances held pursuant to decision XXI/2,

Acknowledging that one of the significant themes of the seminar was the need to ensure the appropriate destruction of ozone-depleting substances recovered from products and equipment at the end of their lives and that consistent criteria for the handling and destruction of ozone-depleting substances would contribute to increased confidence in destruction capabilities in a number of regions of the world, including in parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol,]

[*Recalling* decision XV/9 on the approval of destruction technologies and annex II to the report of the Fifteenth Meeting of the Parties, which lists approved destruction processes by source and destruction method,

Recalling that, by paragraph (c) of decision VII/5 and paragraph 7 of decision XI/13, parties are urged to adopt recovery and recycling technologies for quarantine and pre-shipment uses of methyl bromide, to the extent technically and economically feasible, until alternatives are available,

Also recalling that, by paragraph 6 of decision XX/6, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel is requested, in its report on opportunities for reductions in methyl bromide use or emissions for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes, to provide to the Meeting of the Parties a list of available methyl bromide recapture technologies for consideration by the Parties,

Noting that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel was able to provide a list of examples of commercial recapture units in operation in several countries in its report to the Twenty-First Meeting of the Parties,

*Also noting that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel has reported on a number of emerging technologies for the destruction of ozone-depleting substances that complement those reported on previously,]*¹

1. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and the relevant technical options committees, in consultation with other relevant experts, to evaluate and recommend, for consideration at the thirty-first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group:

(a) The appropriate destruction and [recovery] [removal] efficiency for methyl bromide and to update the destruction and [recovery] [removal] efficiency if requested for any other substance already listed in annex II to the report of the Fifteenth Meeting of the Parties;

(b) The emerging technologies identified in its 2010 progress report and any other developments in the sector, including any technologies which would meet the recommended [recovery] [removal] efficiency for methyl bromide identified in paragraph 1 (a) above;

(c) Criteria that should be applied when assessing the appropriateness of using identified destruction facilities for the handling and destruction of ozone-depleting substances, with a view to their possible inclusion in the Montreal Protocol handbook;

2. To invite interested persons to submit to the Secretariat by 1 February 2011 data relevant to the recommendation to be made by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel pursuant to paragraph 1 above.

J. Draft decision XXII/[J]: Environmentally sound management of banks of ozone-depleting substances

Submission by the European Union

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

Stressing that there is an opportunity in the short term for ozone and climate benefits in addressing the management and destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances, which will end in 2020;

Recalling that decision XXI/2 requests the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, based on results of destruction projects and other available information, to suggest to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting components designed to help parties of diverse size and with diverse wastes to develop national and/or regional strategic approaches to address the environmentally sound disposal of the banks of ozone-depleting substances that are present in their countries and/or regions;

Recalling that decision XXI/2 also requests the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to review the destruction technologies identified in its 2002 report as having a high potential, and any other technologies, and to report on those technologies and their commercial and technical availability;]

Noting that, beyond the pilot destruction projects funded by the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, there are possibilities for funding the management and destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances from private and public sources such as the Global Environment Facility and voluntary carbon markets and that, in particular, the fifth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility will provide further opportunities for funding the management and destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances;

1. To encourage parties to address banks of ozone-depleting substances under the Global Environment Facility by seeking synergies with broader strategies for the management of hazardous chemical substances, including persistent organic pollutants, through activities such as national inventories of the size, type and location of banks of ozone-depleting substances and the development of legislative frameworks and strategies for sound waste management, from collection to destruction, seeking synergies whenever possible with the management of other hazardous chemical substances;

2. In the context of action called for under paragraph 1 above, to encourage parties and relevant stakeholders to pursue extended responsibility schemes, in which producers and importers of products or substances become responsible for their management at the end of their lives, and to consider other options for providing incentives for the collection and destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances;

1 Submission by Australia.

3. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to review the list of destruction technologies adopted by Parties, taking into account the emerging technologies identified in its 2010 progress report and any other developments in the sector, to provide an evaluation of their performance and commercial and technical availability, and to make appropriate recommendations to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting;

4. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to take into account that in addition to pilot destruction projects funded by the Multilateral Fund other projects for managing banks of ozone-depleting substances have been financed by other private and public sources, such as the Global Environment Facility and voluntary carbon markets, and to include information from these projects in its report to the Open-ended Working Group called for under paragraph 7 of decision XXI/2;

5. To invite Parties and agencies to continue to explore additional options for the long-term management of banks of ozone-depleting substances, including the availability of and synergies with climate and chemical funding.

K. Draft decision XXII/[K]: Environmentally sound management of banks of ozone-depleting substances

Submission by Mauritius

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

1. To request the United Nations Environment Programme Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, in line with the findings of the pilot project in Nepal, to undertake a study with regard to banks of ozone-depleting substances in low-volume-consuming countries so as to:

(a) Ensure destruction with optimum cost benefits;

(b) Aggregate small quantities of ozone-depleting substances found in low-volume-consuming countries to facilitate effective and sound destruction;

2. Also to request the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics to report to the Working Group at its thirty-first meeting on the results of its analysis, after due consultations with relevant networking countries.

L. Draft decision XXII/[L]: Environmentally sound management of banks of ozone-depleting substances

Submission by the contact group on the environmentally sound treatment of banks of ozone-depleting substances established at the thirtieth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

[Stressing that there is an opportunity in the short term for ozone and climate benefits in addressing the management and destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances, which will end in 2020;

Recalling that decision XXI/2 requests the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, based on results of destruction projects and other available information, to suggest to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting components designed to help parties of diverse size and with diverse wastes to develop national and/or regional strategic approaches to address the environmentally sound disposal of the banks of ozone-depleting substances that are present in their countries and/or regions;

Noting that, beyond the pilot destruction projects funded by the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, there are possibilities for funding the management and destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances from private and public sources such as the Global Environment Facility and voluntary carbon markets and that, in particular, the fifth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility will provide further opportunities for funding the management and destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances;

[1. [To request the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to continue its efforts on further cost-effective projects on the destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances during its next replenishment] [request the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to provide parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 necessary funding from the Multilateral Fund fully to manage banks of ozone-depleting substances], through activities such as national inventories of the size, type and location

of banks of ozone-depleting substances and the development of legislative frameworks and strategies for sound waste management, from collection to destruction;]

2. [To [encourage parties to [address] [seek] [explore] opportunities to obtain funding for the [collection and] [management of] banks of ozone-depleting substances under the Global Environment Facility [and other agencies] by seeking synergies [with energy-efficient programmes] and activities with broader strategies for the management of hazardous chemical substances, including persistent organic pollutants] [request the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to provide parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 necessary funding from the Multilateral Fund fully to manage banks of ozone-depleting substances], through activities such as national inventories of the size, type and location of banks of ozone-depleting substances and the development of legislative frameworks and strategies for sound waste management, from collection to destruction; without excluding the possibility of requesting the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to continue its efforts on further cost-effective projects on the destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances during its next replenishment;]

3. To encourage parties and relevant stakeholders, in the context of action called for under paragraph 1 above, to consider extended responsibility schemes in which producers and importers of products or substances become responsible for their management at the end of their lives, and to consider other options for providing incentives for the collection and destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances;

4. To [encourage] [parties] [enterprises] to consider accessing the voluntary carbon market for the destruction of ozone-depleting substances and share their experiences with others [especially regarding the high transport costs for ozone-depleting substance banks to reach destruction facilities];

5. To encourage [parties to work with the] voluntary carbon markets [to change existing requirements to allow the destruction of ozone-depleting substance banks internationally] [further to consider the crediting of destruction of ozone-depleting substances done internationally];

6. To encourage parties to consider measures for the destruction of [banks of hydrochlorofluorocarbons] [contaminated hydrochlorofluorocarbons that cannot be reused] in preparation of their hydrochlorofluorocarbon phase-out management plans [with an understanding that the measures could be designed to complement the hydrochlorofluorocarbon phase-out management plans without further resources from the Multilateral Fund];

7. [To request the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to consider the funding of cost-effective destruction projects during the next replenishment period;]

8. [To request the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to develop criteria by its sixty-sixth meeting on components and elements that should be part of national strategies on the disposal of ozone-depleting substances in Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol, and levels of funding required to build such strategies] [without prejudging the source of funding for those strategies];

9. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to take into account that in addition to pilot destruction projects funded by the Multilateral Fund other projects for managing banks of ozone-depleting substances have been financed by other private and public sources, such as the Global Environment Facility and voluntary carbon markets, and to include information from these projects, including on how to gain access to the voluntary carbon markets, in its report to the Open-ended Working Group called for under paragraph 7 of decision XXI/2;

[9 bis To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to monitor and [periodically] report [to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting] on developments in the voluntary carbon markets [and assess their stability, predictability [and their environmental integrity] and capacity to offer a sustainable flow of resources to new ozone-depleting substance destruction projects;]

10. [To request the [United Nations Environment Programme] [Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund], in line with the findings of the pilot project in Nepal, to undertake a study with regard to banks of ozone-depleting substances in low-volume-consuming countries so as to:

(a) Ensure destruction with optimum cost benefits;

(b) Aggregate small quantities of ozone-depleting substances found in low-volume-consuming countries to facilitate effective and sound destruction;]

11. [Also to request the [United Nations Environment Programme] [Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund] to report to the Open-Ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting on the results of its analysis, after due consultations with relevant networking countries;]

12. To invite Parties and agencies to continue to explore additional options for the long-term management of banks of ozone-depleting substances, including the availability of and synergies with climate and chemical funding.]

M. Draft decision XXII/[M]: Phase-out of HFC-23 as a by-product of HCFC-22 production

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

Recalling decision X/16, which recognizes the importance of implementing the Montreal Protocol and takes note of hydrofluorocarbons and perfluorocarbons as replacements for ozone-depleting substances that have potentially substantial impacts on the climate system,

Noting with appreciation the special report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, "Safeguarding the Ozone Layer and the Global Climate System: Issues Related to Hydrofluorocarbons and Perfluorocarbons",

Recalling decision XVIII/12, by which the Ozone Secretariat was requested to facilitate consultations between the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and relevant organizations aimed at drawing on the work already carried out under these organizations, including work relating to HCFC-22,

Recalling also the report prepared by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel pursuant to decision XVIII/12, in particular the chapter on the role of the Clean Development Mechanism with respect to HFC-23 by-product emissions resulting from the production of HCFC-22,

Mindful that Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol are obligated to freeze production of hydrochlorofluorocarbons by 2004 and phase out consumption by 2030 and that Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 are obligated to freeze production of hydrochlorofluorocarbons by 2016 and phase out consumption by 2040,

Recognizing the unique relationship of HFC-23 to the controlled substance HCFC-22, given that the production of HCFC-22 results in emissions of HFC-23 as a by-product and that the production of HCFC-22 for feedstock uses is expected to continue beyond the phase-out of production for controlled uses under the Montreal Protocol,

Recognizing also the opportunity to facilitate an environmentally responsible approach to managing the production of HCFC-22 for both controlled and feedstock uses,

Acknowledging that emissions of HFC-23 are covered by the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and that actions taken under the present decision are not intended to affect that coverage,

Emphasizing the potential implications of projects in HCFC-22 production facilities funded through the Kyoto Protocol's Clean Development Mechanism and that the value of Clean Development Mechanism credits may exceed 50 times the cost of mitigating HFC-23 emissions;

Recognizing the need for immediate action to prevent uncontrolled HFC-23 by-product emissions from harming the climate system, particularly in the light of the control measure that will take effect on 1 January 2014 in accordance with the amendment by which the Meeting of the Parties subjected hydrofluorocarbons to the Montreal Protocol,

1. To request the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol to review and update information presented in the report by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund on HCFC-22 production facilities located in parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5,² including information on the location of such facilities, their production capacity, the production capacity of each individual production line and whether it is the subject of an existing project under the Clean Development Mechanism to limit or destroy HFC-23 and the end date of any such project;

2. To request the Executive Committee also to present the findings of the study referred to in the preceding paragraph at the thirty-first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group;

2 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/62.

3. To request the Executive Committee further to develop estimates of the incremental costs, including capital costs and operational costs, associated with the collection and destruction of HFC-23 by-product emissions from HCFC-22 production in facilities located in parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5;

4. To request the Executive Committee to formulate guidelines for funding projects to collect and destroy by-product emissions of HFC-23 during the production of HCFC-22, including production for feedstock, by the sixty-fourth meeting of the Executive Committee;

5. To request the Executive Committee also, as a matter of urgency, to facilitate the formulation and implementation of projects to eliminate by-product emissions of HFC-23 during the production of HCFC-22 for facilities or production lines that are not collecting emissions reduction credits under the Clean Development Mechanism;

6. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, in consultation with the Scientific Assessment Panel, to conduct a study of the potential costs and environmental benefits HFC-23 by-product control measures in the production of HCFC-22, by facility or production line, excluding the costs and benefits associated with existing Clean Development Mechanism projects when relevant, and to prepare a report in time to distribute it 60 days before the thirty-first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, to assist the Parties in further considering the issues relating to HFC-23 emitted as a by-product of the HCFC-22 production.].

N. Draft decision XXII/[N]: Quarantine and pre-shipment uses

Submission by the contact group on quarantine and pre-shipment uses established at the thirtieth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

[Noting that, according to the assessment of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee, a reduction [of 18–27 per cent] of the global consumption of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment uses could be achieved by replacing [approximately 1,937–2,942 tonnes of] methyl bromide used in the four main categories of such uses with currently available technologies,

Recalling decision X/11, requesting parties to submit to the Ozone Secretariat a list of regulations that mandate the use of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment treatments, and decision XI/13, requesting parties to review their national regulations with a view to removing any requirement that methyl bromide be used for quarantine and pre-shipment applications where technically and economically feasible alternatives exist,

Noting the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's conclusion that the parties' definitions of quarantine and pre-shipment applications [in decisions VII/5 and XI/12] are not being applied consistently in some areas, resulting in a significant volume of methyl bromide being inappropriately classified as being used for quarantine purposes for pre-plant soil treatment,

Reminding parties of their obligation to report annual data on the consumption of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment uses under Article 7 of the Protocol and to establish and implement a system for licensing trade in methyl bromide, including methyl bromide used for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes, under Article 4 [, as recalled in decision XXI/10],

Reminding also parties of their outstanding tasks agreed upon in decisions XX/6 and XXI/10, notably the establishment and submission of national strategies to reduce the use of methyl bromide for phytosanitary measures and/or reduce emissions,

1. To request [both importing and exporting] parties to review their national sanitary, phytosanitary, environmental and stored product regulations that mandate the use of methyl bromide with a view to allowing the use of alternative treatments or procedures that provide an appropriate level of phytosanitary protection, consistent with the standards and guidelines promulgated under the International Plant Protection Convention, [taking into account alternatives that have been identified by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel,] [and to avoid imposing any obligation to treat consignments with methyl bromide both before shipment and upon arrival];

2. To urge parties to classify as quarantine and pre-shipment uses of methyl bromide only those uses that are consistent with the definitions of quarantine and pre-shipment applications agreed upon by the parties in decisions VII/5 and XI/12;]

[3. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee, in consultation with other relevant experts and the secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention, to provide for consideration by the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting a report that includes:

(a) An assessment, as referred to in paragraph 3 (4) of decision XXI/10, applying the methodology provided [by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee] [in the annex to the present decision] of:

- (i) The technical and economical feasibility of alternatives to methyl bromide treatments of sawn timber and wood packaging material, grains and similar foodstuffs and logs and alternatives to pre-plant soil uses qualifying as quarantine measures;
- (ii) The impact of the implementation of the alternatives referred to in the preceding subparagraph;
- (iii) The impact of restricting the quantity of methyl bromide production and consumption for all quarantine and pre-shipment uses;

(b) [*to be completed to address concerns of other parties*];]

[4. To request all parties to gather the best possible data about the sectors in which methyl bromide is used for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes and to provide that data to the Ozone Secretariat by January 2012;]

[5. To request the Ozone Secretariat to review, in view of their completeness and consistency, the Article 7 reports and other data provided by parties in response to past decisions of the Meeting of the Parties on methyl bromide production, consumption and uses for quarantine and pre-shipment applications for the years 2005 and later, and to request relevant parties to provide additional data or clarifications where appropriate.]]

O. Draft decision XXII/[O]: Situation of Haiti

Submission by Grenada and Saint Lucia

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

Noting with appreciation the efforts and commitment made by the Government of Haiti to sustain compliance with the Montreal Protocol,

Recognizing the extraordinary difficulties now faced by Haiti as a result of the devastating 7.2 magnitude earthquake that occurred on 12 January 2010, which has had adverse effects on the economic and social welfare of the people of Haiti,

Understanding Haiti's commitment to meeting its obligations in respect of phasing out ozone-depleting substances under the Montreal Protocol and its amendments,

1. To urge all parties to assist Haiti by controlling the export of ozone-depleting substances and technologies dependent on ozone-depleting substances to Haiti through the control of trade in accordance with decision X/9 of the Tenth Meeting of the Parties and other relevant decisions;

2. To request the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, when considering project proposals for Haiti, to take into account the special situation of Haiti and the special difficulties that it may pose in respect of the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances, including in particular the accelerated phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons, in accordance with the requirements of the Montreal Protocol;

3. Also to request the Executive Committee to ensure that appropriate assistance is provided to Haiti in the areas of institutional strengthening, capacity-building, data collection and monitoring and control of trade in ozone-depleting substances, along with any other assistance that may be deemed necessary;

4. Further to request the Executive Committee to ensure that appropriate assistance is provided for the development of a strategy to achieve the reorganization of Haiti's national ozone unit and in the continuation of its efforts to report to the Ozone Secretariat data on consumption of ozone-depleting substances in accordance with the requirements of the Montreal Protocol;

5. That all determinations made by the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol should be considered in the light of the difficulties faced by Haiti as a result of the earthquake.

**P. Draft decision XXII/[P]: Treatment of stockpiled ozone-depleting substances
Submission by the European Union**

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

Recalling that in decision XVIII/17 the Secretariat was requested to maintain a consolidated record of the cases in which parties had explained that their excess production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances in a given year were a consequence of the production or import of ozone-depleting substances in that year that had been stockpiled for some specified purposes in a future year,

Recalling also that the Secretariat was also requested to incorporate that record in the documentation prepared for each meeting 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,

Noting that the Secretariat has reported 29 cases since 1999 involving 12 parties that have 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 resulted from one of the scenarios mentioned above,

1. To request parties, when reporting data under Article 7 of the Protocol, to identify any excess production and consumption that is a consequence of ozone-depleting substance production in the reporting year that was stockpiled:

- (a) For domestic destruction or export for destruction in a future year;
- (b) For domestic feedstock use or export for that use in a future year;
- (c) For export to meet basic domestic needs of developing countries in a future year;

2. To request parties having reported cases covered in paragraph 1 above to identify for each case, when reporting data under Article 7 of the Protocol, the final use of the stockpiled ozone-depleting substances and when it took place;

3. To remind all parties to report all production of ozone-depleting substances, whether intended or unintended, to enable the calculation of their production and consumption according to Article 3 of the Protocol;

4. To request the Secretariat, in consultation with the Implementation Committee, to update and review the forms and tools for reporting data under Article 7 of the Protocol for consideration by the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to enable the Meeting of the Parties:

- (a) To establish a reporting framework to account for limited stockpiles related to the cases listed in paragraph 1 above;
- (b) To ensure that the resulting reporting framework allows such stockpiles to be tracked and reconciled with their intended uses in the following years;
- (c) To simplify and update the reporting tools taking into account all possible uses of the substances and possible suggestions by the Parties;

5. To request the Secretariat to bring forward to the Implementation Committee for further consideration any case:

- (a) Of excess production or consumption that is not covered by the scenarios listed in paragraph 1 above;
- (b) In which the final use of stockpiled ozone-depleting substances has not been reported in the year following the year in which it was reported as stockpiled production;
- (c) In which stockpiled ozone-depleting substances have not been used for one of the uses listed in paragraph 1 above in the year following the year in which they were reported as stockpiled production.

II. Draft decisions on administrative matters

A. Draft decision XXII/[AA]: Status of ratification of the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and the London, Copenhagen, Montreal and Beijing amendments to the Montreal Protocol

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

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 at 1 November 2010, [---] parties had ratified the London Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, [---] parties had ratified the Copenhagen Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, [---] parties had ratified the Montreal Amendment to the Montreal Protocol and [---] 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.

B. Draft decision XXII/[BB]: Membership of the Implementation Committee

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

1. To note with appreciation the work done by the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol in 2010;
2. To confirm the positions of Egypt, Jordan, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia and United States of America as members of the Committee for one further year and to select -----, -----, -----, ----- and ----- as members of the Committee for a two-year period beginning 1 January 2011;
3. To note the selection of ----- to serve as President and of ----- to serve as Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Committee for one year beginning 1 January 2011.

C. Draft decision XXII/[CC]: Membership of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

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 2010;
2. To endorse the selection of -----, -----, -----, -----, -----, ----- and ----- as members of the Executive Committee representing parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol and the selection of -----, -----, -----, ----- and ----- as members representing parties operating under that paragraph, for one year beginning 1 January 2011;
3. To note the selection of ----- to serve as Chair and ----- to serve as Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee for one year beginning 1 January 2011.

D. Draft decision XXII/[DD]: Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

1. To endorse the selection of ----- and ----- as Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in 2011.

E. Draft decision XXII/[EE]: Data and information provided by the parties in accordance with Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

1. To note with appreciation that [--] parties of the [--] which should have reported data for 2008 have now done so and that [--] of those parties reported their data by 30 June 2010 in conformity with decision XV/15;
2. To note, however, that the following parties have to date not reported data for 2009: [--];
3. Also 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;
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. Also to note 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.

F. Draft decision XXII/[FF]: Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

The Meeting of the Parties decides:

To convene the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol back-to-back with the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention in [], and to announce a firm date and venue for the meeting as soon as possible.
