



Distr.: General
22 November 2012

Original: English



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

**Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to
the Montreal Protocol on Substances
that Deplete the Ozone Layer**
Geneva, 12–16 November 2012

Report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

Introduction

1. The Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol was held at the Geneva International Conference Centre in Geneva from 12 to 16 November 2012. The meeting consisted of a preparatory segment from 12 to 14 November and a high-level segment on 15 and 16 November.

Part one: preparatory segment

I. Opening of the preparatory segment

2. The preparatory segment was opened by its co-chairs, Ms. Gudi Alkemade (Netherlands) and Mr. Ghazi Odat (Jordan) on Monday, 12 November 2012 at 10.10 a.m.

3. Opening statements were delivered by the representative of the Government of Switzerland, Mr. Bruno Oberle, Director of the Federal Office for the Environment, and Mr. Marco González, Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat.

4. Mr. Oberle said that in the 25 years since the Montreal Protocol had been signed, much success had been seen; several ozone-depleting substances had been banned and the ozone layer was beginning to recover, although it would be at least 50 years until it again reached its original thickness. The success to date had largely been achieved because scientists had laid the foundations of the international community's understanding of the atmosphere and the ozone layer and Governments had understood the need to act quickly to offset the possible disastrous effects of the thinning of the ozone layer on the environment and public health. Also crucial to that success was the fact that developing countries had been greatly assisted in meeting their commitments under the Protocol through the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol.

5. The Montreal Protocol had also led to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Although it had not been known at the time the Protocol was signed, ozone-depleting substances were also greenhouse gases. Despite the regulation of greenhouse gases under the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the concentration in the atmosphere of one, hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), was rising dramatically, threatening the climate benefits already gained. HFCs were being introduced primarily as alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs), an ozone-depleting substance being phased out under the Montreal Protocol. The Government of Switzerland urged parties to halt their use of HFCs and to adopt other alternatives to HCFCs. Acknowledging that proposed amendments to the Protocol aimed at subjecting HFCs to the Montreal Protocol and phasing down their use were viewed critically by a number of parties, his Government proposed that the institutional, financial, and technical implications of the amendments be examined

and that the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund be asked to assess the feasibility of a funding window for minimizing their climate impact. He also suggested that parties could provide voluntary contributions to cover the costs associated with non-HFC alternatives to HCFCs with minimal climate impact.

6. In his remarks the Executive Secretary noted that to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Montreal Protocol, in 1987, several events and activities had been organized by the Secretariat and by Governments. Of particular note was a seminar that had been held in Geneva on 11 November 2012 on the theme of “protecting our atmosphere for generations to come”, which had provided the opportunity to remember all that had been achieved under the ozone treaties and the lessons that could be learned and applied when responding to other environmental threats, including climate change.

7. The Secretariat had produced several materials for the anniversary, including a press kit and new editions of the Montreal Protocol and Vienna Convention handbooks and had also launched a global youth video competition.

8. Despite the achievements of the Montreal Protocol to date, many challenges remained, as could be seen from the items on the agenda of the current meeting. Several issues – such as essential-use and critical-use exemptions, quarantine and pre-shipment and feedstock uses – were often major items of discussion, while new issues continued to appear, demanding the attention of the parties. At the current meeting parties would again be discussing some difficult matters and he urged all delegates, regardless of the outcomes, to participate in the discussions with the bold spirit shown by those who had negotiated the Montreal Protocol twenty-five years earlier, remembering the obligation of all nations, large, small, rich or poor, to act together for the protection of the planet.

9. Following his remarks the Executive Secretary, joined by Professor Mario Molina, presented awards to Mr. Stephen O. Andersen and Mr. Lambert Kuijpers, the two longest serving co-chairs of any of the assessment panels under the Montreal Protocol, for their outstanding contributions to the protection of the ozone layer. The awards recognized the time and effort that the co-chairs had devoted over many years to the protection of the ozone layer and their significant role in the development and evolution of the Protocol.

II. Organizational matters

A. Attendance

10. The Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol was attended by representatives of the following parties: Albania, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

11. Representatives of the following United Nations bodies and specialized agencies also attended: the International Maritime Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the secretariat of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, the secretariat of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, the United Nations Development Programme, the Economic Commission for Europe,

the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Joint Inspection Unit, the World Bank and the World Meteorological Organization.

12. The following individuals and representatives of the following intergovernmental and non-governmental bodies attended the meeting as observers: 3M Electronics, Air-Conditioning & Refrigeration European Association, Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy, Asahi Glass Co. Ltd., Business Council for Sustainable Energy, California Strawberry Commission, Ms. Catherine Campbell, Chemtura Corporation, Coca-Cola Company, Crop Protection Coalition, Daikin Europe NV Ltd., Daikin Industries, Ltd., Danfoss Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Controls, Dow AgroSciences LLC, DuPont International, Emergent Ventures India (EVI), Environmental Investigation Agency, European Partnership for Energy and the Environment, Foam Supplies Inc., Forum for Nature Protection, GIZ Proklima, Greenpeace International, Gujarat Fluorochemicals Limited, Mr. Marc De Hondt, ICF International, Industrial Technology Research Institute, Institute for Governance and Sustainable Development, International Institute of Refrigeration, International Pharmaceutical Aerosol Consortium, Japan Fluorocarbon Manufacturers Association, Japan Industrial Conference for Ozone Layer and Climate Protection, Japan Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Industry Association, Korea Specialty Chemical Industry Association, Manitoba Ozone Protection Industry Association, Mayekawa (MYCOM), Mebrom PTY Ltd., Natural Resources Defense Council, Navin Fluorine International Limited, Öko-Recherche, Pollet Environmental Consulting, Refrigerants Australia, Refrigerants Naturally, Mr. Baazia Riad Riad, Shecco, SRF Limited and Trical.

B. Adoption of the agenda for the preparatory segment

13. The following agenda for the preparatory segment was adopted on the basis of the provisional agenda contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/1:

1. Opening of the preparatory segment:
 - (a) Statements by representative(s) of the Government of Switzerland;
 - (b) Statements by representative(s) of the United Nations Environment Programme.
2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Adoption of the agenda for the preparatory segment;
 - (b) Organization of work.
3. Administrative matters:
 - (a) Consideration of membership of Montreal Protocol bodies for 2013;
 - (b) Financial reports of the trust funds and budgets for the Montreal Protocol.
4. Issues related to exemptions from article 2 of the Montreal Protocol:
 - (a) Nominations for essential-use exemptions for 2013;
 - (b) Nominations for critical-use exemptions for 2014;
 - (c) Quarantine and pre-shipment issues;
 - (d) Feedstock uses.
5. Additional information on alternatives to ozone-depleting substances.
6. Procedural issues related to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its subsidiary bodies.
7. Proposal on trade of controlled substances with ships sailing under a foreign flag.
8. Investigation of carbon tetrachloride discrepancy.
9. Evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol.
10. Proposal on clean production of HCFC-22 through by-product emission control.
11. Proposal on additional funding for the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol to maximize the climate benefit of the accelerated phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons.
12. Proposal on funding of production facilities for hydrochlorofluorocarbons.
13. Proposal on the review by the Scientific Assessment Panel of RC-316c.

14. Proposal on the implications of the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development for small-island developing States with regard to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol.
15. Proposed amendments to the Montreal Protocol.
16. Compliance and data reporting issues:
 - (a) Proposal on the differences between data reported on imports and data reported on exports;
 - (b) Presentation on and consideration of the work and recommended decisions forwarded by the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol.
17. Other matters.

14. During the adoption of the agenda for the preparatory segment the parties agreed to include under agenda item 6, "Procedural issues related to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its subsidiary bodies", the nomination of experts to serve on the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel. The parties further agreed to discuss under agenda item 17, "Other matters", a request for information on existing and planned policies that influenced the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances; the process of recruiting a new Chief Officer of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol; the status of ratification of the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol; and the status of the Bali Declaration on Transitioning to Low Global Warming Potential Alternatives to Ozone-Depleting Substances.

15. During the discussion of the agenda, one representative questioned the inclusion on the agenda of items 4 (d), "Feedstock uses"; 10, "Proposal on clean production of HCFC-22 through by-product emission control"; 11, "Proposal on additional funding for the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol to maximize the climate benefit of the accelerated phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons"; and 15, "Proposed amendments to the Montreal Protocol". The representative, supported by several others, said that, for various reasons, those items did not fall within the purview of the Montreal Protocol and therefore should not be discussed by the Meeting of the Parties. Regarding item 4, he said that feedstock uses of ozone-depleting substances were not covered by the Montreal Protocol and that further measures regarding them should be eschewed out of concern for important economic and confidentiality issues. Regarding item 10, he acknowledged that a very small amount of HFC-23 emissions were formed as a by-product of the production of HCFC-22 but said that such emissions were already controlled under the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol. As to item 11, he recalled decision XIX/6, which envisaged neither maximization of climate benefits nor additional funding for the Multilateral Fund and stated only that the funding available through the Multilateral Fund for accelerated HCFC phase-out should be "stable and sufficient". Concerning item 15, he said that HFCs were not ozone-depleting substances and that the proposed amendment on their phase-out was therefore not appropriate, as the Montreal Protocol did not provide for the phase-out of non-ozone-depleting substances.

16. In response, one representative said that while feedstock uses were excluded from the calculation of consumption and production they were nevertheless covered by the Montreal Protocol. A number of decisions had been taken on feedstocks at previous meetings of the parties and the item thus needed to remain on the agenda. Recalling that the importance of control of HFCs had been underscored during the seminar on protecting our atmosphere for generations to come, the representative also expressed strong support for maintaining the proposed amendments on the agenda and discussing them in a formal contact group.

17. The Co-Chair said that, as there was no consensus to remove them, items 4 (d), 10, 11, and 15 would remain on the agenda, although consideration could be given when they were taken up to the best way to undertake the discussions on them.

C. Officers

18. The preparatory segment of the meeting was co-chaired by Ms. Alkemade and Mr. Odat, co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

D. Organization of work

19. The parties agreed to follow their customary procedure and to establish contact groups as necessary.

III. Administrative matters

A. Consideration of membership of Montreal Protocol bodies for 2013

20. Introducing the sub-item, the Co-Chair requested the regional groups to submit nominations to the Secretariat for several positions in Montreal Protocol bodies for 2013.

21. The parties subsequently agreed on the membership of the Implementation Committee and the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund and on co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group.

22. The representative of China introduced a conference room paper setting out a draft decision endorsing Mr. Shao Min (China) as the new co-chair of the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel and thanking Ms. Tang Xiaoyan (China), the outgoing co-chair of the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel, for her long and outstanding service on behalf of the Montreal Protocol.

23. The representative of the United States of America introduced a conference room paper setting out a draft decision on changes in the membership of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel. He said that the recommendation would endorse the reappointment of five members of the Panel and the selection of Ms. Bella Maranion to replace Mr. Andersen as co-chair of the Panel. He also thanked Mr. Andersen for his long and outstanding service as co-chair of the Panel.

24. The parties approved draft decisions reflecting their agreement on the above positions for further consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

B. Financial reports of the trust funds and budgets for the Montreal Protocol

25. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair noted that it had been the practice of the parties at past meetings to establish a budget committee to review budget-related documents and prepare one or more draft decisions on budgetary matters for consideration by the Meeting of the Parties. In accordance with that practice the parties agreed to establish such a committee, chaired by Mr. Ives Gomez (Mexico) and Ms. Klara Wajdova (Czech Republic).

26. Subsequently, the chair of the budget committee presented a conference room paper setting out a draft decision on the financial reports and budget of the trust fund for the Montreal Protocol, which the parties approved for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

IV. Issues related to exemptions from Article 2 of the Montreal Protocol

A. Nominations for essential-use exemptions for 2013

1. Metered dose inhalers

27. Introducing the sub-item, the Co-Chair recalled that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel had presented its recommendations on the nominations for 2013 exemptions for essential uses of controlled substances at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. Based on its discussion of those recommendations, the Working Group had forwarded to the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties for its consideration a draft decision on essential-use exemption nominations (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8, draft decision XXIV/[A]). Since the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, China had provided to the Panel additional information on its essential-use nomination for the use of CFCs in metered-dose inhalers containing traditional Chinese medicines. The results of the review of that information by the Medical Technical Options Committee were set in the addendum to volume 1 of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's May 2012 progress report.

28. Ms. Helen Tope, co-chair of the Medical Technical Options Committee, gave a presentation on the Committee's review of the additional information provided by China, a summary of which is set out in annex III to the present report. The Committee had concluded that China's proposed use of CFCs was not essential under decision IV/25 owing to the availability of suitable alternatives and was therefore unable to recommend the nominated CFCs for use. For 2013, China might wish to consider allocating CFCs for the proposed use from its authorized quantity to allow time for patient transition to alternatives.

29. Following the presentation, the representative of China said that the party could accept exclusion of 7 of the 9 tonnes nominated for exemption, but exclusion of 2 tonnes manufactured by one company in a remote area of China would create economic, social and human health problems in

the locality. China therefore hoped that the nomination for that amount could be accepted while alternatives were put in place.

30. The representative of the Russian Federation thanked the Medical Technical Options Committee for considering its nomination for the use of CFCs in metered-dose inhalers and for authorizing the requested amount, stating that the party was committed to undertaking the necessary activities to comply with the planned phase-out of CFCs.

31. The representative of Bangladesh drew attention to his party's success in complying with its commitment to phase out the use of CFCs in metered-dose inhalers in 2012.

32. One representative, while noting the progress being made by many parties in eliminating the use of controlled substances under essential-use exemptions, expressed the hope that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel could take into consideration in its deliberations on the nominations the large global stocks of CFCs that already existed and that it explain the obstacles preventing their use for pharmaceutical purposes by parties requesting exemptions.

33. Addressing the issues raised, Mr. Ashley Woodcock, co-chair of the Medical Technical Options Committee, stressed that in considering the case of China the Committee had worked to avoid discriminating in favour of modern medicines and had accordingly based its assessment solely on the criteria set out in decision IV/25. On the matter of international stocks of CFCs, he agreed that such stocks were of critical importance during the phase-out process, and he said that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel would present information on the barriers to their use in its next report.

34. Following the presentation and discussion, it was agreed that an informal group of interested parties would further discuss the draft decision on essential-use nominations for controlled substances for 2013 and report to the parties on its discussions.

35. Following those informal discussions the parties approved a draft decision on the matter for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

2. Aerospace applications

36. The Co-Chair then introduced a draft decision on the nomination for essential-use exemption for CFC-113 for aerospace applications in the Russian Federation (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8, draft decision XXIV/[B]). The nomination had been discussed at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and the draft decision aimed to address the concerns raised by some parties at that meeting.

37. The parties approved the draft decision on the matter for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

3. Marine cooling and refrigeration equipment on naval ships

38. At the request of the Co-Chair, Mr. Lambert Kuijpers of the Refrigeration and Technical Options Committee then introduced an essential-use nomination by the Russian Federation for the use of 130 tonnes of CFC-12 in 2013 for the operation of marine cooling and refrigeration equipment in the party's naval fleet. He said that the nomination previously submitted to the Secretariat had been reviewed by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel during the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and that bilateral discussions had taken place in October 2012, as outlined in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/2/Add.1. Following that discussion additional information had been submitted to the Panel.

39. He said that the nomination had been evaluated by refrigeration experts, following which the Russian Federation had been asked to supply further information, including on whether recycled substances could be obtained on the international market. Insufficient evidence had been provided to justify an essential-use exemption for use of CFC-12 on board ships. Thus, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel was unable to recommend the nomination. The representative of the Russian Federation said that his Government understood the reasons for rejection of the application and thanked the Panel for considering the nomination. Subsequently, the Co-Chair announced that the final report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on the evaluation of the nomination had been posted on the meeting portal.

B. Nominations for critical-use exemptions for 2014

40. Introducing the sub-item, the Co-Chair recalled that the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee had presented the results of its initial review of the 2013 and 2014 critical-use nominations at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. Since then, several nominating parties provided further information, which the Panel had considered in further assessing the nominations.

41. Three of the four co-chairs of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee, Mr. Ian Porter, Ms. Michelle Marcotte and Ms. Marta Pizano, made a detailed presentation on critical-use nominations, including trends in nominations, party reporting on methyl bromide stocks and the final recommendations on the 2013 and 2014 nominations. A summary of the presentation prepared by the presenters is set out in annex III to the present report.

42. During the ensuing discussion, one representative said that the use of methyl bromide was still important to many developing countries, especially those that relied heavily on exports of a limited range of agricultural products, and that the requests of those parties for critical-use exemptions should be considered in that light. In addition, he sought clarification on the extent to which existing stocks of methyl bromide were taken into account in the assessment of critical-use nominations. Another representative said that greater efforts should be made to use existing stocks of methyl bromide and that more evaluation of and exchange of information on phase-out measures undertaken by similar enterprises operating under similar geographical conditions would assist efforts to eliminate methyl bromide use.

43. The representative of Australia said that the party was seeking flexibility by requesting approval for its use, in 2013, of some part of its 2014 critical-use exemption for fumigating packaged rice. That flexibility would allow phase-out to take place one year earlier than planned, following which Australia would submit no further critical-use nominations for methyl bromide in the rice sector. On the matter of his country's critical-use nomination for strawberry runners, he said that the 10 per cent reduction for 2014 proposed by the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee presented difficulties for the party. The strawberry industry had made a considerable research and development investment in commercial scale-up of methyl iodide, which was likely to provide a viable alternative for 100 per cent of the strawberry runner industry. Unfortunately the registration application for methyl iodide had been withdrawn in 2012, and the industry was preparing an alternative research and development strategy focusing on a combination chemical treatment. The 10 per cent reduction recommended by the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee, based on transition to a soilless system in 2014, was not currently feasible as the approach had not been validated for successive runner generations, might not be economically viable and might face environmental and planning restrictions. Accordingly, Australia was requesting approval of its full nominated quantity for 2014. Finally, on the matter of the handbook on critical-use nominations for methyl bromide, he questioned the suggested change in paragraph 2.6.1 whereby the subcommittees of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee could make recommendations to the Meeting of the Parties, saying that any recommendations should come from the Committee itself.

44. The representative of the United States of America said that the party had made considerable progress in reducing its reliance on methyl bromide and that its present request for a critical-use exemption represented less than 2 per cent of its baseline consumption. Agriculture was a central pillar of the United States economy and the party needed to ensure that efforts under the Montreal Protocol did not impede its efforts to provide food to millions of people. The withdrawal of iodomethane from the United States market, however, meant that a significant alternative to methyl bromide had been lost, and as a consequence of this substantial change the party might have to submit a supplemental critical-use nomination for 2014. The representative expressed an interest in exploring with other parties how parties might be able to have the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee review their needs in the event of the loss of a key alternative. Regarding the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee's recommendations, the United States had concerns about the recommended cut in its nomination for artisanal ham, given that there were no feasible alternatives for that use and the cut would make it difficult to comply with national food safety regulations. In addition, the recommended reduction in the nomination for use in strawberry fields with high pest pressures presented difficulties and, given the lack of feasible alternatives to methyl bromide for that purpose, the United States did not agree with the recommended cuts. The United States would therefore be submitting a conference room paper containing a draft decision requesting parties to approve the full amount of the artisanal ham and strawberry nominations. Finally, regarding the handbook, he expressed concern about the alteration by the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee of the economic guidelines referred to in paragraph 6 of decision Ex.I/4 and contained in section 4 of annex I to the report of the Sixteenth Meeting of the Parties,¹ which had been carefully negotiated during an extraordinary meeting of the parties. The economic guidelines should not be changed for the revised handbook. He also expressed agreement with the representative of Australia that recommendations should emanate from the Committee rather than its sub-committees and said that he disagreed with the proposed changes to the handbook.

¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro.16/17.

45. The representative of Canada said that the party was fully committed to phasing out critical-use nominations for methyl bromide where alternatives were registered, technically feasible and could be introduced into the country, and it was pleased to announce that it did not intend to put forward a nomination for flour mills for 2015. The party, however, could not accept the recommendation of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee that it switch in the near future to soilless cultivation of strawberry runners, as that would mean a large change to production methods not yet proven in Canada, presenting significant technical challenges, adding greatly to costs and causing market disruption. The party acknowledged that other parties had phased out the use of methyl bromide for strawberry cultivation, but those parties benefited from regional alternatives not available to Canada. The party had developed an action plan aiming to resolve the issue, but in the meantime it requested that the parties approve the full nomination requested for that use.

46. One representative, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, said that all parties in his region had succeeded in achieving a total phase-out of methyl bromide use for strawberry runners and that other parties should work to develop solutions to the problems identified. He also urged parties to accept the recommendations of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee, which were based on the professional judgement of respected scientists using robust science. He expressed agreement with those parties who said that the large existing stocks of methyl bromide should be taken into account in the assessment of critical-use nominations.

47. Mr. Porter said that he had listened to the concerns expressed and hoped that most could be resolved in bilateral discussions with the parties concerned. He added that the consideration of methyl bromide stocks was an issue for the parties and that stocks were not taken into account in the technical recommendations of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee.

48. Following the presentation and discussion, the Co-Chair suggested that parties with further concerns should consult bilaterally with the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee.

49. Subsequently, a conference room paper containing a draft decision on critical-use exemptions for methyl bromide for 2014 was submitted by Australia, Canada and the United States of America. Introducing the draft decision, the representative of Canada said that in addition to permitting specified levels of production and consumption of methyl bromide it also aimed to address the concerns of some parties by including an operative paragraph discouraging the accumulation of methyl bromide stocks.

50. The parties approved the draft decision for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

C. Quarantine and pre-shipment issues

51. The Co-Chair introduced the sub-item, recalling that the representative of the European Union had put forward a draft decision on quarantine and pre-shipment uses of methyl bromide for consideration at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. A contact group had been set up to consider the draft decision but had not had time to complete its work. The Working Group had therefore requested interested parties to engage in informal consultations on the outstanding issues ahead of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties. The draft decision was presented in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8 (draft decision XXIV/[C]).

52. The representative of the European Union requested more time to finalize the draft decision, pointing out that one of the main issues to be resolved was that of dealing with zeros and blank cells in the reporting formats used by parties in reporting ozone-depleting substance data in accordance with under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol. In response the Co-Chair noted that the issue of zeros in the data reporting formats had been addressed by the Implementation Committee at its forty-ninth meeting, which had approved a draft decision on the matter for consideration by the parties at the current meeting.

53. One representative stressed the importance to exporting and importing countries of considering quarantine and pre-shipment uses of methyl bromide in order to prevent the global spread of pests and diseases.

54. The parties agreed to establish a contact group, co-chaired by Mr. Augustin Sanchez (Mexico) and Ms. Alice Gaustad (Norway), to work further on the draft decision.

55. Subsequently, the co-chair of the contact group introduced a conference room paper setting out a revised version of the draft decision prepared by the contact group. The parties approved the draft decision for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

D. Feedstock uses

56. Introducing the sub-item the Co-Chair recalled that the European Union had put forward a draft decision on feedstock uses of ozone-depleting substances at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The draft decision had been informally discussed and parties had been invited to provide additional comments to the proponents.

57. The representative of the European Union then introduced a revised version of the draft decision submitted by the European Union and Croatia (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8, draft decision XXIV/[D]). He said that in total more than 1 million tonnes of ozone-depleting substances were being used for feedstock and that that amount was expected to grow. Given that, without closer monitoring of the situation there was a risk that significant amounts of ozone-depleting substances could be diverted to uses that were restricted under the Montreal Protocol. Following the discussions at the Open-ended Working Group the proponents had revised their proposal to protect the confidentiality of some of the information being collected. Although that information would be aggregated, both the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and the Ozone Secretariat would require some information in a disaggregated form.

58. One representative, recalling his statement during the adoption of the agenda, reiterated the view that there was no need to discuss feedstock uses as they were not controlled uses for the purposes of the Montreal Protocol. While he agreed that monitoring was an important activity he asked why the issue was being raised at the current time, after twenty-five years and after the phase-out of carbon tetrachloride. He asked for an explanation as to why the proponents of the draft decision considered that feedstock uses fell under the purview of the Montreal Protocol.

59. One representative suggested that feedstock uses should be reported, but another pointed out that the proposed draft decision had only been discussed by interested parties thus far and should be further discussed with regard to the issue of confidentiality, among others.

60. The representative of the European Union said that while controlled substances used entirely for feedstock were excluded from the definition of production under article 1 of the Protocol they were nevertheless controlled substances, and he recalled that the parties had in the past called for the reduction of emissions from feedstock uses. Given that, the parties could adopt further decisions on feedstock uses to protect the ozone layer.

61. One representative said that substances being used for feedstock were not controlled substances within the meaning of the Protocol. The draft decision would call on parties to replace ozone-depleting substances in feedstock uses with alternatives to the extent possible without regard to whether the alternatives were economically viable. The proposal would also request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to continue its work and provide, in its 2013 progress report, information as called for in decision XXI/8, in particular on the identification of alternatives to ozone-depleting substances for feedstock uses, and to assess the technical and economic feasibility of measures to assist parties to reduce or eliminate emissions from such uses. The Panel was being asked to identify alternatives to feedstock uses but the information being collected under decision XXI/8 referred only to the use of carbon tetrachloride. He reiterated that the ozone-depleting substances being used as feedstock were permitted under the Montreal Protocol. Furthermore, they were beneficial to society and their use as feedstocks had had only a minimal environmental impact, as confirmed by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel in its 2011 and 2012 reports.

62. The Co-Chair suggested that given the divergent points of view on the issue the proponents of the draft decision should further discuss the issue with the representatives of interested parties and report on the results of their discussions.

63. Following those discussions the parties approved a draft decision on the matter for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

V. Additional information on alternatives to ozone-depleting substances

64. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, in accordance with decision XXIII/9, had presented a report on alternatives to ozone-depleting substances at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The representative of the United States of America had subsequently put forward a draft decision aimed at enhancing available information on the matter, which had been considered in a contact group. Many issues had remained unresolved at the end of that meeting, however, and the Working Group had agreed to forward the

draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8, draft decision XXIV/[E]), enclosed in square brackets to indicate a lack of consensus, to the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties for further consideration.

65. The parties agreed to establish a contact group, co-chaired by Ms. Annie Gabriel (Australia) and Mr. Leslie Smith (Grenada), to work further on the draft decision.

66. Subsequently, the co-chair of the budget committee presented a conference room paper setting out a draft decision on the matter, which the parties approved for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

VI. Procedural issues related to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its subsidiary bodies

67. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that the Meeting of the Parties had requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to take a number of actions to improve its operation and the procedures for the nomination of experts to the Panel and its subsidiary bodies (decision XXIII/10). A task force set up by the Panel to implement the decision had presented its findings to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-second meeting, and the representative of the United States of America had put forward a draft decision on the matter at that meeting, which had subsequently been considered in a contact group. Despite making considerable progress, the contact group had been unable to complete its task and the Working Group had agreed to forward the draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8, draft decision XXIV/[F]), enclosed in square brackets to indicate a lack of consensus, for consideration by the parties at the current meeting. The task force had also been requested to prepare a matrix showing existing and needed expertise among members of the Panel and its technical options committees; to propose plans for reorganizing those committees, including their operating procedures; and to provide further clarification on the configuration and role of a possible conflict resolution body. Its works on those matters was presented in volume 3 of the May 2012 progress report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel.

68. The co-chair of the task force reported that the task force had prepared revised matrices of existing and needed expertise of Panel and technical options committee members, taking into account the comments made in the contact group at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. It had also drafted a brief discussion paper providing the requested clarification on the proposed conflict resolution body. As for the reorganization plans and proposed operating procedures for the technical options committees, she said that the task force had been unable to complete its work and that it intended to continue striving to finalize a set of proposals to be presented to the parties in the near future. In the meantime, the task force stood ready to answer any questions raised by its report.

69. The parties agreed to establish a contact group, chaired by Mr. Javier Camargo (Colombia) and Ms. Masami Fujimoto (Japan), to work further on the draft decision.

70. Subsequently, the co-chair of the contact group presented a conference room paper setting out a draft decision on the matter, which the parties approved for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

VII. Proposal on trade of controlled substances with ships sailing under a foreign flag

71. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that further to decision XXIII/11 the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel had presented an assessment of ozone-depleting substances used to service ships at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group; that the Secretariat had provided information on how parties regulated and reported on the use of ozone-depleting substance to service ships; and that the European Union had put forward a draft decision aimed, inter alia, at standardizing the treatment of those substances. The Working Group had set up a contact group to discuss the draft decision and, given that a number of issues had remained unresolved, had agreed to forward it (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8, draft decision XXIV/[G]), enclosed in square brackets to indicate a lack of consensus, for consideration by the parties at the current meeting. It had also requested members of the contact group to continue working to resolve the issues during the intersessional period.

72. The representative of the European Union introduced a conference room paper, submitted by the European Union and Croatia, setting out a revised version of the draft decision in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8. It requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to provide a range of additional information that could help to address the complex underlying issues at the national and

global levels and to identify possible alternatives to the ozone-depleting substances used in the maritime sector. One representative expressed an interest in examining the revised version of the draft decision, suggesting that the additional information requested from the Panel might be burdensome and unnecessary.

73. The parties agreed to establish a contact group, co-chaired by Mr. Dwayne Curtis (Bahamas) and Mr. Philippe Chemouny (Canada), to consider the revised draft decision. Mr. Chemouny served as co-chair during the group's first meeting; his compatriot, Mr. Bernard Madé, served as co-chair during the group's second and third meetings. Subsequently, the co-chair of the contact group presented a conference room paper setting out a draft decision on the matter, which the parties approved for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

74. In presenting the draft decision, the contact group co-chair noted that one party had proposed the adoption of a prior informed consent procedure in respect of ozone-depleting substances supplied to ships. While there was no agreement among the members of the group to include provisions on that subject in the draft decision, they did agree to revisit the issue at the next meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

VIII. Investigation of carbon tetrachloride discrepancy

75. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that the parties had decided, in decision XXIII/8, to request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to continue to investigate the reasons for the identified discrepancy between emissions estimates derived from reported production and consumption and those inferred from atmospheric measurements and to report on its work at the current meeting. He then invited Mr. Paul Newman of the Scientific Assessment Panel to report on the progress that had been made in that work.

76. Mr. Newman recalled that the amounts of carbon tetrachloride in the atmosphere continued to decrease but that there was a discrepancy of some 40 gigagrammes between the "bottom-up" emissions estimate derived from the data reported to UNEP, which were highly variable, and the "top-down" estimates inferred from atmospheric measurements. That discrepancy had been difficult to explain, but new information was available that helped to narrow that gap between the two estimates. Losses to the atmosphere of carbon tetrachloride during storage, transport, servicing and other operations had been less than believed and new information suggested that the lifetime of the substance in the atmosphere should be taken as 33 years instead of 26 years. In addition, an Australian study had suggested that the total global emissions of carbon tetrachloride from landfills could be some 8 to 12 gigagrammes annually and that some small emissions could also be ascribed to the chlorination of water. Consequently the discrepancy between the "top-down" and the "bottom-up" estimates had been narrowed but not quite closed as a result of the new information.

77. One representative said that a discrepancy of 40 gigagrammes was significant given that a number of the projects being approved were to phase-out hundreds of tonnes of ozone-depleting substances. He therefore welcomed the new information that narrowed the discrepancy and said that there was a need for a better understanding of the current state of knowledge as it related to carbon tetrachloride used as feedstock. He suggested that it would be important for representatives of the Scientific Assessment Panel and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to participate in the small group that was addressing the issue of feedstocks. Another representative supported that suggestion.

78. Another representative said that during the seminar on protecting our atmosphere for generations to come the presenter had indicated that the use of carbon tetrachloride was trending upward; that assertion, he said, was contrary to the position of the Panel, and he asked for an explanation of the discrepancy. In response the representative of the Scientific Assessment Panel said that the presentation had only addressed the situation in Europe, while the Panel had addressed the global usage of carbon tetrachloride as well as the new information explaining the conflict between the top-down and bottom-up estimates. Another representative said that the issue of feedstock uses should be kept separate from the issue of the discrepancy in the top-down and bottom-up estimates of emissions.

79. The Co-Chair suggested that interested parties should discuss the matter bilaterally and report on the outcome of their discussions.

80. Following those consultations it was agreed that no further discussion of the item was required at the current meeting.

IX. Evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol

81. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that the parties had decided, in decision XXII/2, to conduct an evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol and that they had considered the final draft report on that evaluation at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. At that time they had also agreed on a process for the finalization of the report, which included the submission of further comments by the parties to the consultant, ICF International, that had undertaken the evaluation and prepared the report. An executive summary of the final report, in all six official languages of the United Nations, was set out in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/4, while the full report, in English only, was set out in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/INF/4.

82. Mr. Mark Wagner of ICF International gave an overview of the evaluation process, including the evaluation schedule and the parties interviewed. As a result of the comments received, sections 6.1, and 6.2 of the draft had been updated and an appendix had been added to the report to explain how the consultant had addressed the comments. Section 7.2 of the report, setting forth recommendations, had also been updated.

83. Section 6.1 had been updated to include key features of the Multilateral Fund that had been instrumental to its success, such as its compliance-oriented approach, its straightforward and relatively fast access to project funds, its consistent application of the principle of incremental costs, its transparent business planning model, its continued support for institutional strengthening and capacity-building efforts and its decision-making informed by comprehensive technical analysis.

84. Section 6.2 had been updated to provide lessons learned from the Global Environment Facility (GEF). They included the idea that private entity and government sustainability and commitment were critical drivers in the success of both GEF and the Multilateral Fund. Strong private sector involvement, including through the provision of co-financing, also contributed to the rapid and enduring phase-out of ozone-depleting substances. It had been learned that in countries with economies in transition, national ozone units had ceased to function once GEF support had ended, which might prevent the implementation of measures to address the remaining threats to the ozone layer, including the phase-out of HCFCs and destruction of ozone-depleting substances. It had also been observed that GEF operations had been less cost-effective than those of the Multilateral Fund, in part because GEF projects did not always adhere to incremental financing procedures.

85. All who spoke complimented the consultant on a comprehensive report. One representative, however, said that it was important to do more than simply take note of the report and that a way was needed to move forward with it, perhaps along the lines of decision XVI/36, to allow the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to consider it. Another representative pointed out that previous reviews of the financial mechanism had only taken place on an ad hoc basis and said that a more regular process to evaluate the effectiveness of the financial mechanism was needed.

86. The representative of Brazil said that the report confirmed the role of the Multilateral Fund as a cornerstone of the ozone protection regime. The mechanism had allowed parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 of the Protocol to comply with their obligations through a country-driven approach. He recalled with concern, however, that during the negotiations over the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund at the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties parties not operating under that paragraph had shown great reluctance to agree on the resources that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel had said would be necessary to enable implementation of the Protocol by parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 for the triennium 2012–2014.

87. Two representatives expressed agreement, with one saying that a lack of resources had made it impossible to undertake a more comprehensive review of the financial mechanism and that the parties should continue support for the national ozone units and the implementing agencies of the Multilateral Fund and provide greater resources to the Multilateral Fund.

88. Following the presentation and the discussion, the Co-Chair requested interested parties to consult informally with the aim of preparing a draft decision for the consideration of the parties.

89. Subsequently, one of the interested parties reported on progress in the consultations and presented a conference room paper setting out a draft decision. The parties agreed to establish a contact group, chaired by Mr. Alessandro Peru (Italy), to discuss the draft decision.

90. The chair of the contact group later presented a conference room paper setting out a revised version of the draft decision on the matter, which the parties approved for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

X. Proposal on clean production of HCFC-22 through by-product emission control

91. The Co-Chair introduced a draft decision on clean production of HCFC-22 through by-product emission control (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8, draft decision XXIV/[H]), recalling that it had been discussed at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The representative of the United States of America, one of the proponents of the draft decision, added that parties had held informal consultations on the issue during the intersessional period.

92. The representative of the United States, responding to a request for clarification on a number of issues relating to the draft decision, said first that the term “clean production” was not intended to have a specific definition, but referred in general to the idea of avoiding undesirable impacts on the environment, such as releases of contaminants into the air or water, that might arise from industrial processes. Second, the proposal for demonstration projects to eliminate by-product emissions of HFC-23 during the production of HCFC-22 for facilities not earning emissions reduction credits under the Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism was not intended to result in deferral of the agreed accelerated HCFC phase-out; the purpose of the demonstration projects was to gather information to facilitate a better understanding of the implications of the phase-out of HFCs over the next two decades. Third, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and the Scientific Assessment Panel would not be asked to conduct a very broad study; the study would have a very narrow focus, looking at the costs, benefits and environmental implications of clean production of HCFC-22. Finally, he clarified that the proposal was not intended to further accelerate phase-out, but rather only to give greater consideration to what might be the unintended consequences of the continued production of HCFC-22 over the next two decades.

93. Responding, the representative that had requested those clarifications, supported by two others, said that the principles of the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol focused on protecting the ozone layer and reducing ozone-depleting substances; the elimination of by-product emissions of HFC-23 should therefore not be addressed by the Meeting of the Parties as it was not an ozone-depleting substance and the proposed demonstration project was therefore not eligible for funding from the Multilateral Fund. Further, those emissions were already controlled under the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol. The phase-out of HCFC-22, which did fall within the mandate of the Montreal Protocol, would in time naturally lead to a reduction in HFC-23; as such, the draft decision did not warrant further consideration by the parties.

94. Another representative added that under the Clean Development Mechanism much information was already available on mitigation of emissions and that there was therefore no added value to the proposed demonstration project. Furthermore, the Multilateral Fund had limited funds available and priority should be given to HCFC-22 phase-out.

95. Several representatives expressed the view that, as production of HCFC-22 would not be phased out for two decades, or longer if production plants converted to feedstock uses, consideration needed to be given to mitigating the by-product emissions of HFC-23. It was within the remit of the Meeting of the Parties to take up such a discussion as it was important to assess the cost-effectiveness of the measures available, particularly as it would not be economically feasible to accelerate further the phase-out of HCFC-22. Further, while converting production to feedstock uses could be one of the most cost-effective measures, the parties had a moral obligation to avoid taking any decisions that would have a detrimental impact on achievement of the objectives of the Kyoto Protocol or other multilateral environmental agreements. One representative added that the proposed study would provide valuable information that the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund could take into consideration when deciding on strategy for the phase-out of HCFC production by parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5.

96. One representative proposed that further discussion of the item should be deferred until the parties had opened discussions on agenda item 12, on a proposal for the funding of production facilities for HCFCs, as both items related to the production of HCFCs.

97. As outlined in the section below on item 12, there was considerable discussion on the merits of one contact group dealing with items 10 and 12 together. At the end of that discussion it was agreed that an informal group, led by the United States of America, would continue the discussions on item 10.

98. Subsequently, the representative of the United States reported that, while the contact group had made a number of revisions to the draft decision on the matter (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8, draft decision XXIV/[H]), consensus had not been reached because one party had voiced continued reservations about the text. The representative of that party said that it could not agree to the text

owing to certain technical and political sensitivities. Two other representatives said that they could not support the draft decision because in substance it related to HFCs, which were not within the scope of the Montreal Protocol. At the suggestion of the Co-Chair, the parties agreed to defer further discussion of the item to the next meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

XI. Proposal on additional funding for the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol to maximize the climate benefit of the accelerated phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons

99. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that Switzerland had introduced, at the thirty second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, a proposal on additional funding for the implementation of the Montreal Protocol to maximize the climate benefit of the accelerated phase-out of HCFCs. The proposal would, among other things, request the Executive Committee to assess a number of options related to the establishment of a funding window to maximize climate co-benefits of the HCFC phase-out and agree on procedures and terms of reference for its functioning based on certain specified conditions. Following informal consultations, the Working Group had agreed to forward a draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8, draft decision XXIV/[I]) for consideration by the parties at the current meeting and to invite parties to provide comments to Switzerland to enable progress on the matter intersessionally.

100. The representative of Switzerland said that the intersessional discussions had been fruitful and had provided an opportunity to clarify the issues raised and to achieve a better understanding of the viewpoints of various parties. Regarding the scope of the proposal, he said that it did not seek to create new obligations for, or reduce the present obligations of, those parties that contributed to the Multilateral Fund, but rather aimed to mobilize additional voluntary contributions for activities with minimal climatic impacts.

101. In the ensuing discussion, one representative, referring to decision XIX/6 on adjustments to the Montreal Protocol with regard to HCFCs, said that neither paragraph 5 nor paragraph 11 (b) of that decision, on the funding for parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 to comply with the accelerated HCFC phase-out schedule and the funding criteria for projects and programmes, referred to maximization of climate benefits or additional funding for the Multilateral Fund. Hence there was no need to discuss the draft decision further. Another representative said that the provisions under decision XIX/6 for stable and sufficient funding, including for projects and programmes that minimized impacts on the environment, including climate, should be adequate to ensure that finances were available for projects that took account of climate benefits, arguing that there was therefore no need for further measures that might make the work of the Multilateral Fund more complicated.

102. One representative said that while the proposal was very comprehensive it raised a number of practical difficulties, including with regard to the impact of the proposed funding window on the operations of the Multilateral Fund and the mobilization of voluntary contributions and the relationship with the Multilateral Fund Climate Impact Indicator, discussions on which were continuing. In summary, it was not clear how the proposal would strengthen the functioning of the Multilateral Fund or add to its cost-effectiveness. Another representative said that it was essential to be realistic about available financial resources, bearing in mind the difficulties that had attended the negotiation of the 2012–2014 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund. Several representatives said that any financial resources available to the Fund should be focused on current priorities, including the accelerated phase-out of HCFCs, and that care should be taken not to weaken efforts to protect the ozone layer by considering issues outside the Protocol's mandate.

103. Several other representatives, speaking in favour of the proposal, said that it offered an opportunity to reap climate co-benefits from the HCFC phase-out. On the wording of decision XIX/6, one representative said that while the relevant text did not specify maximization of climate benefits, it did say that minimization of impacts on climate should be taken into account by the Executive Committee when developing and applying funding criteria for projects and programmes. If that potential existed, then the parties had a mandate to explore it. In addition, article 10 of the Protocol, on the financial mechanism of the Protocol, included provision for voluntary funding, meaning that that form of financing had been envisaged at the time the Fund was set up. He agreed that setting up an additional funding window was complex, but said that any difficulties could be resolved through further discussion of the matter. Some representatives stressed that the voluntary funding being suggested was additional to existing funding and would not detract from funds for other purposes or compromise the work of the Multilateral Fund.

104. The parties agreed to establish an informal group, with Mr. Peter Enoh (Cameroon) and Mr. Phillipe Chemouny (Canada) serving as co-conveners, to discuss the proposal further and to clarify the implications of its suggested provisions.

105. Subsequently, the co-chair of the informal group reported that the members of the group had agreed on several key issues pertaining to the item, including that the funding contemplated by the draft decision would come from voluntary contributions only, that such funding should be new and additional and that the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund could be asked to consider receiving and managing contributions for such funding. They had not agreed, however, on several aspects of the purposes for which such funding could be used, and they therefore did not reach agreement on the draft decision as a whole. At the suggestion of the Co-Chair, the parties accordingly agreed to defer further discussion of the item to the next meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

XII. Proposal on funding of production facilities for hydrochlorofluorocarbons

106. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that the proposal on funding of production facilities for HCFCs had been introduced by India at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The proposal, which referred to the funding provisions in decision XIX/6, urged the Executive Committee to finalize the discussions on the guidelines for funding of production facilities and requested it to take into consideration proactive regulatory actions adopted by some parties to limit production. Following informal discussions, the Working Group had agreed to forward the draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8, draft decision XXIV/[L]) for further discussion at the current meeting.

107. Introducing the proposal, the representative of India said that by decision XIX/6 the parties had agreed that funding available through the Multilateral Fund should be stable and sufficient to meet all agreed incremental costs to enable parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 to comply with the accelerated phase-out schedule for both consumption and production of HCFCs. There was very little time left, he said, before the first control measures on HCFCs for those parties came into force, with a freeze at the baseline level to be implemented in 2013 and a 10 per cent reduction from the baseline in 2015, and the inadequate implementation of decision XIX/6, particularly with regard to funding, placed parties with production facilities at risk of non-compliance. Some of those parties, including India, had taken proactive regulatory actions to limit production of HCFCs in facilities in their countries beyond those required for compliance with the relevant control schedule, thus achieving a significant reduction of the potential impact of those substances on the ozone layer.

108. In the ensuing discussion, one representative, supported by others, said that the draft decision was not needed because there was no need to reiterate the elements of decision XIX/6, which had featured prominently in discussions during the current meeting and other meetings, and because the Executive Committee was already working hard to finalize the guidelines for funding of production facilities for HCFCs and other important tasks related to the production sector. In addition, proactive regulatory actions taken by parties to limit production of HCFCs did not come under the category of incremental costs eligible for funding. Another representative said that it was a misconception that funding for HCFC phase-out was dependent upon completion of the guidelines: nothing prevented the Executive Committee from considering applications for funding for the phase-out of HCFC production, although only one project had so far been submitted. Also, while proactive actions to comply with control measures were commendable, it was not part of the mandate of the Multilateral Fund to provide retroactive compensation for such measures.

109. One representative, supported by several others, said that the issues raised by the draft decision were of great relevance to the achievement of the HCFC phase-out targets for parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 and should be given high priority, given the high social and economic implications of possible non-compliance.

110. One representative suggested that the present item could be dealt with in a contact group that also discussed agenda item 10, as both items dealt with production of HCFCs and how activities related to their regulation might be financed. The representative of India said that decision XIX/6 on accelerated phase-out of HCFCs in the production sector dated back to 2007, was considerably more urgent and should be accorded higher priority than clean production of HCFC-22, both in the Executive Committee and at the current meeting. The two issues, he stressed, were unrelated, and should not be addressed in the same forum. Another representative, supported by several others, said that the focus of agenda item 10 was HFCs, while the focus of item 12 was HCFCs, and that it was therefore inappropriate to place the two items together. Another representative, supported by several others, said that there was an overarching similarity of themes and that discussion of the two items in the same forum would present an equitable way forward.

111. The parties decided to establish an informal group, convened by India, to discuss agenda item 12 and, as described in section X above, on agenda item 10, to establish a second informal group, convened by the United States of America, to discuss agenda item 10.

112. Subsequently, the representative of India reported that no consensus had been reached in the informal discussions. Expressing disappointment and asking that his remarks be reflected in the present report, he said that decision XIX/6 provided that funding should be stable and sufficient to enable parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 of the Protocol to meet all agreed incremental costs of complying with the accelerated HCFC phase-out schedule in both the consumption and production sectors. More than five years after the adoption of that decision, he said, and just months before the freeze on consumption and production was to take effect on 1 January 2013, the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund had still not finalized guidelines for funding in the production sector. As a result, parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 would not be in a position to comply with the freeze and in the event of further delay on the part of the Executive Committee might also fail to achieve the 10 per cent reduction due in 2015.

113. Another representative expressed disagreement with the idea that parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 would be unable to meet their obligations under the Protocol, saying that the view articulated by the representative of India was an expression of opinion rather than a statement of fact.

114. At the suggestion of the Co-Chair, the parties agreed to defer further consideration of the item to the next meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, in 2013.

XIII. Proposal on the review by the Scientific Assessment Panel of RC-316c

115. Introducing the item the Co-Chair recalled that at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group the representative of the United States of America had introduced a draft decision requesting parties to provide information on, and the Scientific Assessment Panel to review, the ozone-depleting and global-warming potential of RC-316c. That chemical had been identified by the Chemicals Technical Options Committee during the presentation on the 2012 progress report as a new CFC, not currently controlled by the Montreal Protocol, and the proposal had requested that the Scientific Assessment Panel provide a report on its findings to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-third meeting.

116. The representative of the Russian Federation said that the climate impacts of RC-316c had been investigated by an independent expert group in the Russian Federation. The group had evaluated how the chemical changed in the atmosphere, concluding that it was affected by light of certain wavelengths and took 150–160 years break down. Its ozone-depleting potential had also been examined and it had been found to be similar to that of CFC-12 or CFC-113. The Russian Federation was currently looking at alternatives to CFC-113 for its space industry, some of which were produced in the United States, and had been considering whether to use RC-316c as an alternative to CFC-113 in the cleaning process for rockets. In the light of the findings outlined above, however, the party had decided that it would not do so.

117. At the request of the representative of the United States for further information, the representative of the Scientific Assessment Panel said that the chemical had two isomers, whose atmospheric lifetimes and properties did not appear to differ significantly. The photolytic loss of RC-316c had been evaluated in laboratory studies and it appeared to occur mainly in the stratosphere, with ultraviolet radiation being the major cause. The substance was similar to CFC-12 and CFC-113 although it had a slightly higher cross section in the key “window” of 190 to 210 nanometres. Its lifetime was measured in the laboratory at 81 years, with an ozone-depleting potential of 0.46, both measures being roughly half of what had been observed by the researchers in the Russian Federation. Based on the laboratory data and calculated atmospheric lifetimes, RC-316c appeared to have a global-warming potential roughly half that of CFC-12 and comparable to that of CFC-11.

118. The representative of the United States said that in the light of the information presented by the Scientific Assessment Panel she would consult with the other proponents of the draft decision and report to the parties on their discussions. The representative of the Russian Federation said that although he did not object to the draft decision, in view of his country’s decision not to proceed with the use of RC-316c he suggested that there was no further need to discuss the draft decision.

119. One representative, saying that RC-316c was not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, asked whether the parties could request the Scientific Assessment Panel to carry out a study on it without amending the Protocol. He also said that it was important to consider intentional releases into the

atmosphere and noted that in the past the global-warming-potential of CFCs, carbon tetrachloride and Halons had not been considered when evaluating those substances.

120. Following the discussion the Co-Chair asked the proponents and interested parties to consult informally and report to the parties on the results of their discussions.

121. Following those consultations the parties approved the draft decision for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

XIV. Proposal on the implications of the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development for small island developing States with regard to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol

122. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that a draft decision on Implications of the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development for small island developing States with regard to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol, had been discussed at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and put forward for further consideration by the parties at the current meeting.

123. The representative of Grenada, noting that the original proponents of the proposal – Saint Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago – were not in attendance at the current meeting, said that he had been asked to convey a request from Saint Lucia that discussion of the proposal be deferred to the next meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The Co-Chair agreed that it would be beneficial to postpone discussion on the matter until the proponents were present.

124. One representative queried whether the item automatically qualified for insertion on the provisional agenda of the next meeting of the Open-ended Working Group under the rules of procedure for meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and Meetings of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. The representative of the Secretariat clarified that, under rule 9, any item could be placed on the agenda whose inclusion had been agreed at a previous meeting. Further, as all parties had already discussed the proposal at the previous meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, the request to place it on the agenda of the next meeting did not have to come only from the original proponents, nor would they have to resubmit the text of the proposal.

125. The parties agreed to defer the discussion of the proposal and place it on the agenda of the next meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

XV. Proposed amendments to the Montreal Protocol

126. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair noted that two proposed amendments to the Montreal Protocol had been submitted to the Secretariat in accordance with the provisions of the Vienna Convention and the Protocol by the Federated States of Micronesia and by Canada, Mexico and the United States, respectively. He then requested the proponents to introduce their proposals briefly.

127. The representative of the Federated States of Micronesia said that his country's proposed amendment (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/5) would effect a gradual phase-down of HFCs, an approach that had been supported at the recent United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20). Participants at that Conference had recognized that the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances had resulted in a rapid increase in the use and release of HFCs into the environment and had therefore supported a gradual phase-down in their consumption and production, as indicated in paragraph 222 of the Conference outcome document, entitled "The future we want". The Montreal Protocol, with its experience in efforts to phase out HCFCs and other ozone-depleting substances, had the necessary expertise and moral responsibility to deal with the issue. His delegation was open to other views as it was important to start a discussion on the matter, but it was also important to protect the poor and vulnerable groups that would suffer most from any failure to act.

128. The representatives of Canada, Mexico and the United States presented their proposed amendment (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/6), drawing attention to frequently asked questions, and answers provided by the proponents, that had been compiled in an information document for the benefit of the parties at the current meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/INF/7).

129. The representative of the United States said that the proposal would generate 100 gigatonnes of carbon dioxide equivalents in direct climate benefits by 2050, while gains in energy efficiency through a reduction in the current reliance on high global-warming potential HFCs would enhance the benefits

generated. While the decisions taken by the parties to the Protocol had meant that the ozone layer would recover by the middle of the present century, it was important to address the implications of those decisions for the climate system, as well as the potential of ozone-depleting substances to exacerbate the problem of climate change. The Montreal Protocol was well-suited to tackle the issue of HFCs. Its institutions had addressed other similar problems and served to ensure that policy choices were well informed and could do the same for HFC phase-down because they were used in the very same sectors in which the Montreal Protocol worked so effectively. It also had a successful model for addressing intentionally produced substances through a gradual reduction in their production and consumption.

130. The representative of Canada drew attention to document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/INF/7 and highlighted some of the information provided by the proponents. He said that the Protocol could be amended according to paragraph 2 (b) of Article 2 of the Vienna Convention in order to harmonize policies on ozone-depleting substances and their substitutes. Actions taken under the Montreal Protocol would not interfere with those taken under the Kyoto Protocol or the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, as the proposed amendments were intended to support the global goals of the climate system and did not affect the provisions of those two instruments. Both processes were complementary and there would be no interference with the work of the Framework Convention. As the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund had already approved stage one of HCFC phase-out management plans for many parties, it was important to assist those parties in making the right decisions when selecting alternatives by establishing a long-term framework for the control of HFC-consumption.

131. The representative of Mexico said that the proposal was based on the principles of the Montreal Protocol, which included the recognition of common responsibilities for all sectors. He expressed the hope that the discussion of the proposals would be fruitful and urged the parties not to wait until the issue became a race against time.

A. Questions to the proponents

132. Following the presentations by the proponents representatives posed a number of questions.

133. One representative requested clarification as to whether the proposed amendments would result in any changes to the ozone layer; whether the proponents were suggesting that bodies operating under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change were lacking in relevant expertise; and whether the amendments were an attempt to pre-empt the action taken under the Framework Convention on Climate Change. He also asked why the decisions adopted at Rio+20 should be taken into account, given that they were not legally binding.

134. Responding, the representative of the United States said that the aim of the proposed amendments was not to protect the ozone layer but to address the link between efforts to do so and the effects of those efforts on the climate system, which was entirely consistent with the legal authority afforded by the Montreal Protocol. The proponents of the amendments were not suggesting that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technological Advice and other such bodies lacked the necessary expertise in relation to HFCs. They could not, however, be expected to address the climate change implications of the accelerated phase-out of HCFCs, as they had neither the time nor experience nor to do so. In answer to the second question he said that the proposed amendments, if adopted, would promote action that was additional to, and that would in no way pre-empt or undermine, efforts to tackle HFCs under the Framework Convention on Climate Change. They went well beyond the scope of that Convention, calling for a structured, step-by-step, phase-down involving the gradual introduction of new technologies that would result in significant climate benefits. Furthermore, it would be wrong to suggest that the many States that had signed the agreements reached at Rio+20 would not take them seriously simply because they were not legally binding. The representative of the Federated States of Micronesia added that States were keen to observe them, as they were crucial to the future of the planet, and that the fact that emissions of HFCs were covered by the Kyoto Protocol did not preclude addressing their production and consumption under the Montreal Protocol.

135. One representative asked how the proposed amendments would affect the way in which the Montreal Protocol worked with the Framework Convention on Climate Change. The representative of the Federated States of Micronesia said in response that a compromise would ultimately need to be reached between the various approaches, and that that could be one of the subjects discussed in a contact group.

136. The representative of the United States, responding to a question about HFCs already in use in a number of sectors as a result of efforts to phase out HCFCs, said that the proposed amendment, if adopted, would comprehensively address all HFCs, including the existing base. It presented a number of challenges in terms of technology, which would have to be examined on a sector-by-sector basis. The proposed gradual phase-down would address those challenges, as it recognized that there were already some viable low global-warming-potential alternatives available, such as hydrofluoroolefins (HFOs) and other fluorinated and non-fluorinated substances, that could help to promote energy efficiency. It also sent a message to the private sector that there was a market for new technologies in those areas.

137. One representative asked how the proponents had calculated the cost-effectiveness of alternatives available in developing their proposed schedules for the phase-down of HFCs, requesting further information on alternative substances, including when they might become available and how commercial considerations had been assessed. Responding, the representative of the United States said that one of the key considerations in preparing the proposal had been the availability of fluorinated and non-fluorinated alternatives and that a large amount of information had been provided in, among others, document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/INF/7. Alternatives were already being used in the automobile, domestic refrigeration, air-conditioning, foams and other sectors. Some had been selected on the basis of their average global-warming potential. Those included relatively low-GWP HFCs and HFOs, which could be used and recycled, for example through refrigerant management practices, over a relatively long period of time. In terms of the cost-effectiveness of the transition, while energy-efficiency benefits in areas such as commercial refrigeration had often not been taken into account in the benefit estimates, the removal of high energy-consuming technologies would help to decrease the electricity burden and result in additional benefits.

138. The representative of the Federated States of Micronesia, responding to a question on whether attention had been given to the need to assist developing countries in adopting high-technology alternatives to HFCs, drew attention to the document setting out his delegation's proposal, which included information on the technologies crucial to the phase-down of those substances.

B. General discussion

139. Following the questions and answers there ensued a general discussion in which the parties considered at length the question of whether the proposed amendments should be discussed at the current meeting and how that should be done. Some representatives expressed support for doing so but others were strongly opposed to any formal consideration of the issue.

140. The parties also engaged in an extensive discussion of whether HFCs could be addressed under the Montreal Protocol. Many representatives said that HFCs did not fall within the scope of the Protocol, which should be limited to matters that lay clearly within its own mandate. Several representatives said that there was a need for collaboration on the issue with the Framework Convention on Climate Change. Some warned that taking action on HFCs before they had been addressed by the parties to the Framework Convention might be seen as interfering with the latter's work. Other representatives, however, argued that article 2 of the Vienna Convention allowed the parties to coordinate their policies in managing the phase-out of HCFCs and the introduction of alternatives, including HFCs, and that action to phase down HFCs was clearly appropriate under the Montreal Protocol as the phasing in of those substances was the direct result of the HCFC phase-out implemented under the Protocol. The parties to the Montreal Protocol had a moral responsibility to address the issue and to avoid the adoption of HFCs as alternatives to ozone-depleting substances. One representative said that if the ozone layer were protected at the expense of the climate it would be a hollow victory.

141. Several representatives said that the priorities of the Montreal Protocol did not include climate protection and that the task of phasing out HCFCs was already stretching the resources of many parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 of the Protocol. One representative, however, said that the Protocol should ensure that parties, especially those not operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 of the Protocol, adopted domestic policies to introduce climate-friendly alternatives, while avoiding the phasing in of HFCs. Emphasis should also be placed on encouraging parties not operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 to provide additional technical, technological and financial support for the strengthening of the Multilateral Fund.

142. One representative said that while he understood the desire to use experience acquired under the Montreal Protocol in new areas by regulating the use of HFCs, there were currently no alternatives to a number of uses of HFCs, a situation that would continue for another 20 years. He said that a new and comprehensive global climate regime was required, and he suggested that an ad hoc group could be convened to give interested parties an opportunity to discuss the way forward. Several

representatives supported that suggestion, together with the coordination of activities, in order to promote ambitious commitments in the post-Kyoto period based on shared responsibilities and the outcomes of Rio+20. It was suggested that scientifically based alternatives to the use of HFCs had to be found. One representative, however, expressed concern about the availability of alternative substances, saying that developing countries might have trouble introducing them owing to intellectual property rights.

143. One representative said that her country had sought to adopt alternative technologies that were environmentally friendly, such as natural refrigerants. In some cases, however, especially for small and medium-sized enterprises, there were no alternatives that were technically proven or environmentally safe. The recommendation of the Technical and Economic Assessment Panel on the budget for the periods 2015–2017 and 2018–2020 went well beyond the funding provided by the parties operating under article 2 and it therefore did not seem reasonable to add more demands on parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 when the financial mechanism of the Protocol was short of funds. Furthermore, parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 were focused on the implementation of stage one of their HCFC phase-out management plans and on developing the next stage of those plans, meaning that the proposed amendments would subject them to additional challenges. The proposed amendments could be considered once the parties had implemented stage two of their plans and it was clear what resources remained. For the time being, the priority must be to meet the commitments already made under the Protocol.

144. One representative said that, in view of the difficult financial situation, the resources of the Multilateral Fund should be earmarked for efforts to meet the current commitment to reduce ozone-depleting substances and to provide support for least-developed countries and small-island developing States. Another representative said that while he shared the concern of the proponents that the continued increase in HFCs could become a major concern for the environment, the difficulties in mobilizing funds at the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties raised doubts as to how sufficient resources could be mobilized to fund the phase-down of HFCs.

145. Several representatives expressed support for the proposed amendments. One representative said that they showed that it was legally and technically feasible to address HFCs under the Montreal Protocol. Noting that the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development expressed support for the phase-down of HFCs and the creation of the Climate and Clean Air Coalition, one representative said that his delegation supported the consideration of the proposed amendments in a contact group, bearing in mind that any decision should recognize the primacy of the Framework Convention on Climate Change.

146. Several representatives from countries vulnerable to the effects of climate change, particularly least-developed countries and small-island developing States, emphasized that the risks posed and harm caused by climate change were already occurring. The Montreal Protocol had the expertise needed to address the issue, but it was also important to develop synergies between the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Montreal Protocol and their secretariats. Resources had to be made available to fund the phase-out of HFCs. Developing countries needed scientific and financial support, which was an issue that the parties had a moral duty to address.

147. One representative said that he had put three questions to the proponents and based on the responses HFCs clearly did not modify the ozone layer and should not be discussed at the current meeting. While the Montreal Protocol had expertise in dealing with ozone-depleting substances, the Framework Convention on Climate Change had expertise in the control of greenhouse gases. Neither mechanism had had such expertise when they had been formed and had only developed it over time. The outcomes of Rio+20 were not legally binding and therefore not relevant. If parties had concerns about HFCs they should raise them within the mechanism of the Framework Convention, as the mandate of the Montreal Protocol was to phase out ozone-depleting substances. He urged the parties to spend no more time in plenary discussing the issue and said that interested parties could, if they wished, discuss the issue in the margins of the meeting. Another representative, drawing attention to the situation of high ambient temperature countries and pointing out that there were currently no alternatives to HFCs in those countries, said that the Meeting of the Parties should confine itself to discussing issues related to compliance with the Montreal Protocol and ozone-depleting substances instead of using its time to discuss global warming-related issues, which were under the purview of the Framework Convention. Furthermore, HFCs represented just 2 per cent of the substances causing global warming and dealing with them in isolation would not be sufficient to address the problem.

148. Another representative said that while HFCs were covered under the Kyoto Protocol they could also be dealt with through a phase-down/phase-out approach, which was not provided for under the Framework Convention. He said that the States participating in the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol produced less than 20 per cent of world emissions, meaning that a significant proportion of gases would not be covered in the period 2013–2020; nor would there be any phase-down/phase out of, or any focus on, HFCs. Those issues might be addressed in the negotiations for the post-2020 period but no such proposals had yet been made, possibly because the financial mechanism was not conducive to the compliance-oriented approach of the Multilateral Fund. Stressing the need for mutual support between the Montreal Protocol and the Framework Convention, he asked whether a focus on the phase-down/phase-out approach would result in other gases that did not affect the ozone layer also being addressed under the Montreal Protocol. Regardless of the merits of the proposals, those issues needed further discussion.

149. One representative said that it was crucial to capitalize on every possible means of imposing stricter controls on greenhouse gases. The Montreal Protocol represented the most suitable framework for that purpose as it had extensive experience and expertise, as well as the mechanisms to provide parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 with the necessary technical and financial support. Many parties had expressed a need for further clarification and the current meeting was an ideal opportunity to ascertain exactly what information was required to meet that need.

C. Discussion group

150. Following the discussion, the Co-Chair observed that many parties had expressed divergent views, both in favour of the amendments and the need to take action on the HFCs, and in opposition to the amendments for a variety of reasons. A number of questions had also been raised, including on the appropriate institutional framework for addressing increased emissions of HFCs and the possibility of a mutually supportive approach among the climate change and ozone layer protection regimes. Other questions concerned the need for further information on the costs of the proposals and on the availability of alternatives in different circumstances.

151. Various views had also been expressed on the best way forward in dealing with the issue. Arguments had been put forward both supporting and opposing the establishment of a contact group. Some parties had also expressed the wish to establish a panel or forum to discuss the questions raised regarding the proposed amendments and to address the need for an exchange views among the parties.

152. Considering all those factors, the Co-Chairs proposed to forgo the establishment of a formal contact group and instead to establish a discussion group to enable an exchange of views on the issues, including questions on the institutional framework, costs, financial support and the availability of alternatives, bearing in mind that many questions related to the availability of alternatives were already being discussed under other agenda items. Participation of parties in the proposed discussion group would in no event imply that they agreed with the ideas suggested by the proposed amendments, or the proposals themselves, and would not pre-empt any outcomes of the discussions under the climate regime. To enable the efficient use of time and a focused discussion, the discussions would be limited to two hours. In the first 10 minutes the group would select two convenors to moderate the discussions. The group would report briefly on its discussions to the parties.

153. Following some discussion on whether convenors were needed, the role they might play, and the correct terminology that might apply to them (convenors, moderators or facilitators), the parties agreed to the proposal of the Co-Chairs.

154. Subsequently one of the co-convenors of the discussion group gave the following account of the discussions in the discussion group, which the parties agreed should be reflected in the present report:

“The co-convenors suggested that the discussion would address four main themes in order to encourage and stimulate discussion. The themes presented were: availability of alternatives, scientific aspects, funding aspects and institutional aspects.

A few parties were not in agreement with having a structured discussion. Nonetheless the co-chairs were able to guide the discussions along the aforementioned themes.

On the issue of alternatives there were different perspectives from article 5 parties and non-article 5 parties regarding the availability of alternatives.

However, the Parties generally felt that the workshop held in Bangkok had provided valuable information on where alternatives were readily available and where they were not.

It was mentioned that until recently non-article 5 parties had replaced ozone-depleting substances with HFCs in a relatively large proportion.

Issues relative to flammability and unsatisfactory performance of HFOs in the mobile air-conditioning sector were highlighted.

It was also mentioned that several non-article 5 parties and one regional economic organization had introduced controls and restrictions on the marketing and use of HFCs, including taxes and incentives, based on assessments of the availability of environmentally sound alternatives.

There were also different views expressed regarding the expectations for the development and penetration of non-HFC technologies. It was also indicated that in several HCFC phase-out management plans non-HFC alternatives had been identified for replacing HCFCs.

Some representatives offered to share their countries' experiences with policies that had been successfully implemented. Reference to information available on alternatives in particular from the European Union and the United States were made.

Scientific aspects

Regarding the scientific aspects, an interesting discussion took place involving the Scientific Assessment Panel about the evolution of emissions and concentrations of HFCs in the atmosphere. It was mentioned that the concentrations were still low but had increased very rapidly during the past years.

The Scientific Assessment Panel was called upon on occasion to offer clarifications and updates to several parties with respect to (1) scientific observations of HFCs (2) total global predictions over time relative to baseline data (3) future radiative forcing and (4) atmospheric lifetime of HFCs.

Finance aspects

With limited time remaining, the group attempted to discuss financial issues. The Multilateral Fund Secretariat was called upon to provide information at the request of some parties, such as the number of parties that went to low-GWP alternatives in their HCFC phase-out management plans.

It was also mentioned that the Fund Secretariat was ably positioned to handle the phase-down and that the Clean Development Mechanism might not be equipped to provide comprehensive assistance.

In summary it was expressed by one member of the group that a phase-down of HFCs would result in adverse effects on industry and countries economies.

Another felt that there should be a collaborative approach between the Montreal Protocol and the Framework Convention on Climate Change in handling the phase-down of HFCs.

The group did not have enough time to discuss institutional issues.

At the end the co-chairs were generally satisfied with the spirit of the group and the cordial manner in which the discussions took place."

XVI. Compliance and data reporting issues

A. Proposal on the differences between data reported on imports and data reported on exports

155. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group the European Union had put forward a draft decision with a view to reducing the burden of clarifying discrepancies between reports of imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances and helping to identify illegal trade. The proposal had been discussed in a contact group and the Working Group had agreed to forward the draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8, draft decision XXIV/[M]), including text enclosed in square brackets to indicate a lack of consensus, for consideration by the parties at the current meeting. The draft decision invited parties to use a revised reporting format for imports and exports, to improve data collection and help identify discrepancies in import and export data, and to consider participation in the "iPIC" informal prior informed consent mechanism. The Working Group had also agreed that interested parties could provide comments on the matter to the European Union before the current meeting.

156. The representative of the European Union said that those parties that had expressed views at the Open-ended Working Group had provided further suggestions intersessionally and that the co-convenors of the contact group had incorporated their suggestions into a revised text, which had been circulated to interested parties. No comments had been received, and the revised draft decision was before the parties at the current meeting.

157. The parties agreed to establish a contact group on the matter, co-chaired by Mr. Arumugam Duraisamy (India) and Mr. Federico San Martini (United States of America), the co-chairs of the contact group established at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, to work to finalize the draft decision.

158. Subsequently, the chair of the contact group presented a conference room paper setting out a revised version of the draft decision on the matter, which the parties approved for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

B. Presentation on and consideration of the work and recommended decisions forwarded by the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol

159. Mr. W.L. Sumathipala (Sri Lanka), President of the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol, gave a presentation on the work of the Committee at its forty-eighth and forty-ninth meetings, which took place in Bangkok on 29 and 30 July 2012 and Geneva on 8 and 9 November 2012, respectively. The full report of the forty-eighth meeting was available on the Ozone Secretariat website, while that of the forty-ninth meeting would be available in due course. The Committee, at those meetings, had developed a total of six draft decisions, which had been forwarded for consideration by the parties at the current meeting.

160. The Implementation Committee, he said, had been pleased at the excellent progress of the parties in meeting the data reporting obligations of the Protocol, and only four parties of the 196 parties that should have reported data for 2011 had failed to do so, namely, Israel, Mali, Sao Tome and Principe and South Africa. The first draft decision dealt with data reporting and urged those four parties to report the required data as soon as possible. The decision also noted with appreciation that 99 parties had reported their data by 30 June 2012 in accordance with decision XV/15, enabling the Committee to carry out much useful work at its July meeting, and encouraged parties to submit their data as early as possible. In addition, 173 parties had reported data by 30 September 2012, as required under Article 7 of the Protocol, an improvement on previous years.

161. The second draft decision dealt with requests from parties for the revision of their HCFC consumption baseline data for 2009, 2010 or both, in accordance with decision XIII/15. The Committee considered that there was sufficient evidence to approve the requests of Algeria, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Haiti, the Niger, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey.

162. The third draft decision concerned the reporting of zero in article 7 data reporting forms, and reflected concern in the Committee over some inconsistencies in the reporting of data for production, imports, exports and destruction of ozone-depleting substances in accordance with article 7 of the Montreal Protocol. The draft decision requested parties to enter a number in each cell in the data reporting forms that they submitted, including zero, where appropriate, rather than leaving the cell blank, and asked the Secretariat to request clarification from any party that submitted a reporting form containing a blank cell.

163. The fourth draft decision, on reporting of information on the use of process agents, noted with appreciation that 195 of the 197 parties to the Protocol had reported such information in accordance with decisions X/14 and XXI/3, and urged the two parties that had not submitted their information to do so as a matter of urgency. The Committee would review the situations of those parties at its fiftieth meeting.

164. The fifth draft decision, dealing with the status of the establishment of licensing systems under Article 4B of the Protocol, noted with appreciation that 191 of the 192 parties to the Montreal Amendment to the Protocol had established import and export licensing systems for ozone-depleting substances, as required by the amendment, and that 190 of those parties had provided disaggregated information on their licensing systems detailing which annexes and groups of substances under the Montreal Protocol were subject to those systems. The operative paragraphs of the draft decision congratulated South Sudan for having recently ratified all amendments to the Montreal Protocol and requested it to establish an import and export licensing system; asked Tajikistan and Gambia to undertake measures regarding their licensing systems; and encouraged Botswana to ratify the Montreal Amendment.

165. The final draft decision concerned non-compliance of Ukraine with the control measures of the Montreal Protocol for the consumption of HCFCs in 2010 and 2011. The draft decision recorded with appreciation the submission by Ukraine of a plan of action for reducing its consumption of HCFCs, returning to compliance in 2015 and attaining total phase-out by 2020, save for some consumption in the servicing of refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment until 2030. The Committee, he said, had appreciated the attendance of the representatives of Ukraine at its forty-ninth meeting to discuss the matter.

166. The President of the Committee then turned to the issue of those parties that had yet to ratify one or more of the amendments to the Protocol, noting in particular the difficulties that might be faced by those parties that had not ratified the Beijing Amendment with regard to the trade restrictions on HCFCs that would become operative on 1 January 2013. Great efforts had been made by the Secretariat to encourage those parties to ratify, and he noted that some of those parties had submitted a draft decision on their situation for consideration by the parties at the current meeting.

167. In conclusion, he thanked all those who had assisted the Committee in its work during the previous year.

168. Following that presentation, the parties approved the draft decisions submitted by the Committee for further consideration and adoption during the high-level segment on the understanding that if, in the meantime, any party with outstanding non-compliance situation reported to the Secretariat the required information and data before the adoption of the relevant decision, the names of those parties would be removed from the decisions.

XVII. Other matters

A. Status of ratification of the Beijing Amendment: application of paragraph 8 of Article 4 of the Montreal Protocol with respect to the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol

169. The Co-Chair introduced the matter, drawing attention to a draft decision on the application to Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Haiti and Nicaragua of paragraph 8 of Article 4 of the Montreal Protocol with respect to the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, which had been submitted by those parties in a conference room paper for consideration by the Meeting of the Parties.

170. The representative of Ecuador said that its purpose was to outline the current situation of the four parties listed with regard to ratification of the Beijing Amendment and to request that the exceptions provided for in paragraph 8 of Article 4 be applied to those parties. The representative of Nicaragua added that all four were at advanced stages in their national ratification processes and were working hard to complete them but were not in a position to do so before the trade restrictions of article 4 took effect in respect of HCFCs on 1 January 2013. The representative of Bolivia added the parties had already demonstrated that they were working in full compliance with the Beijing Amendment and had established the necessary HCFC controls, including licensing systems.

171. Several representatives welcomed the draft decision but indicated that they would require time to study it. It was agreed that interested parties would discuss the matter informally and report on the outcome of their discussions.

172. Subsequently the representatives of Kenya and Chad explained the situations in their countries and introduced a draft decision on the application paragraph 8 of Article 4 of the Protocol with respect to the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol to their countries. The representative of Kenya said that that his country was experiencing technical problems with the implementation of the Beijing Amendment and the representative of Chad said that his country expected to ratify the Beijing Amendment by the end of the current year.

173. The representative of Ecuador said that the two draft decisions were similar and informed the parties that he had consulted with the representative of Kenya during the informal consultations that had taken place on the draft decision that he had presented. Another representative said that it would be useful to merge the two draft decisions into a single document and suggested that the draft decision presented by Ecuador be the formal basis for discussion as some slight textual changes had already been made to it as a result of the informal consultations.

174. Several representatives expressed the wish to have their countries added to any decision adopted and one representative said that he also wished to add the name of at least one country that was not present at the meeting.

175. One representative said that in principle the situations facing the proponents of the draft decisions should have been considered by the Implementation Committee before being addressed by the Meeting of the Parties. In the present case he did not object to considering the issue on an exceptional basis but suggested that in view of the large number of parties that wished to be covered by the proposed decisions, further discussion should take place in a contact group.

176. The parties agreed to establish a contact group to discuss the draft decisions further.

177. Subsequently, the chair of the contact group presented a conference room paper setting out a draft decision combining and revising the two draft decisions, which the parties approved for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

B. Information on ozone-depleting substance transition policy measures

178. The Co-Chair introduced the sub-item, drawing attention to a conference room paper containing a draft decision on information on ozone-depleting substance transition policy measures, proposed by Australia, Canada, Croatia, the European Union, New Zealand and the United States of America.

179. The representative of the United States of America then summarized the draft decision and said that the proponents believed it would be valuable to compile all of the available information on approaches to the transition from ozone-depleting substances aimed to minimize the negative climate effects of that transition. Responding to a request for clarification, he said that the intention behind the draft decision was to provide parties with information on policy, control measures and other initiatives aimed at avoiding a transition from ozone-depleting substances to alternatives with high global warming potential. On the proposed coordination with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, he said that it could be beneficial but was not an integral part of the proposal and could be discussed further with interested parties.

180. In response, the representative who had sought clarification questioned the timing and equity of the proposal, noting that it came as the HCFC phase-out by parties not operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 of the Montreal Protocol was set to begin and saying that no such proposal had been contemplated for the phase-out by parties not so operating, many of whom had indeed adopted high-GWP alternatives. He also said that the proposal did not accord with decision XIX/6 and that he therefore had no mandate to agree to it. Should information of the sort contemplated by the proposal be collected, he continued, it should be collected from parties not operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 with the aim of facilitating the transfer of technology to parties operating under that paragraph.

181. Several representatives expressed support for the idea behind the draft decision but said that they would require time to study it. One said that it was a timely initiative while another said that her country would be happy to provide information on its own experiences and measures undertaken in the transition from ozone-depleting substances to alternatives.

182. At the suggestion of the Co-Chair, it was agreed that interested parties would meet informally to discuss the draft decision and then report to the parties on the outcome of their discussions.

183. Subsequently, the representative of the United States reported that, despite a range of views among participants and concerns over some parts of the text, the group had reached consensus on a revised version of the draft decision, contained in a conference room paper.

184. One representative said that, when the proposal had first been introduced, he had not received a satisfactory clarification of the rationale for the proposal and for that reason he had not participated in the informal group. He had strong reservations regarding the draft decision, as it would probably affect parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 disproportionately and raised issues of technical and political sensitivity. Furthermore, as any information on ozone-depleting substance transition would be provided by parties on a voluntary basis, he did not see the need for such action to be prescribed by a draft decision.

185. Responding, the representative of the United States and several other representatives expressed disappointment that the representative was blocking adoption of the draft decision, given that he had not participated in the informal group, where clear explanations of the rationale for the decision had been given and where he could have voiced his concerns and joined discussions on ways to address them, as other participants with reservations had done. Many representatives said they did not understand why an information collection exercise should be so contentious, as it was aimed at benefiting all parties, not least those parties that had already expressed a wish to have such information at their disposal as they sought to move to environmentally sound alternatives to ozone-depleting substances.

186. One representative said that, while he had participated in the informal discussions and agreed with the purpose of the draft decision, a number of sensitive issues had been raised, including with regard to the merit of collecting information gathered under other environmental multilateral agreements. Saying that the draft decision raised complex issues that would benefit from further discussion, and supported by another representative, he suggested that the parties should take up the matter again at the next meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

187. The parties agreed to defer further consideration of the matter to the next meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The Co-Chair encouraged parties to engage in intersessional bilateral discussions on the matter.

C. Tribute to Ms. Maria Nolan

188. The representative of the United States of America paid tribute to Ms. Maria Nolan, who would soon be retiring as Chief Officer of the Multilateral Fund. He said that the recent review of the Financial Mechanism had demonstrated that for the past twenty years the Multilateral had been an extremely effective and efficient institution. That was due in large measure to the staff of the Multilateral Fund, which had been ably led by Ms. Nolan. He said that it was important to ensure that the future of the Multilateral Fund was in good hands and that the United States looked forward to working with UNEP and other members of the Fund's Executive Committee on the selection of the new Chief Officer, consistent with the terms of reference for the Committee. He informed the parties that the process of selecting a new Chief Officer was already under way.

D. Update on the status of the Bali Declaration

189. Introducing the item, the representative of Indonesia recalled the Bali Declaration on Transitioning to Low Global Warming Potential Alternatives to Ozone Depleting Substances, which had been adopted at the combined ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. That declaration resulted from the understanding that the parties to the Montreal Protocol should not ignore the impact on the environment, including the climate system, of their efforts to protect the ozone layer. She said that regardless of the outcome of the current debate on amending the Protocol, it was important to work toward a transition to low-GWP alternatives to ozone-depleting substances. A total of 105 parties had provided their written support for the Declaration to date, and a number of others had verbally indicated their support. That number was expected to increase in the future, and she encouraged all parties to support the move towards alternatives that had minimal effect on the environment.

Part two: high-level segment

I. Opening of the high-level segment

190. The high-level segment of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties was opened at 10.30 a.m. on Thursday, 15 November 2012, with a performance of traditional Swiss music.

191. Opening statements were delivered by Ms. Doris Leuthard, Minister of the Environment, Transport, Energy and Communications of Switzerland; Mr. Marco González, Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat; Ms. Amina Mohamed, Deputy Executive Director of UNEP; and Mr. Syanga Abilio (Angola), President of the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

192. Ms. Leuthard welcomed the representatives to Geneva, saying that Switzerland was dedicated to a strong and effective chemicals regime. Her Government, which had always been very committed to strengthening the governance of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, considered those conventions to be close partners to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Montreal Protocol. Switzerland was very proud to host the secretariat of the chemicals and waste cluster, as well as the secretariat of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, in Geneva.

193. She described the Montreal Protocol, which had been ratified by every country in the world and had contributed to the phase-out of 98 per cent of controlled ozone-depleting substances, as the most successful agreement in international environmental policymaking. In addition to harming the ozone layer, ozone-depleting substances were also potent greenhouse gases, meaning that the Protocol was also delivering significant climate benefits. It had shown how global problems could be resolved if all local stakeholders joined forces with a framework for clear, legally binding commitments and a financial mechanism that was directly linked to compliance. Lessons could be learned to overcome the

obstacles to global legally binding instruments in other areas such as mercury and the post-2020 climate change regime. Care must be taken, however, to avoid undermining climate benefits through the use of high-global-warming-potential substances as replacements for ozone-depleting substances. Switzerland therefore supported the proposed amendments to the Protocol aimed at phasing down the production and consumption of HFCs adopted as alternatives to HCFCs. The reservations that some parties had expressed about such measures being a matter for action under other instruments were understandable, but every opportunity should be taken to achieve climate targets. Her Government, which remained committed to a strong chemicals-control regime, and whose chemicals industry had become a reliable partner to policymakers, was optimistic that the remaining barriers could be overcome. She wished the parties every success in their deliberations.

194. Mr. González thanked the Government of Switzerland for hosting the meeting. He recalled that the Montreal Protocol had been adopted twenty-five years previously in line with the precautionary principle to take firm, science-based action to protect the ozone layer, without waiting for incontrovertible evidence of the causes of its depletion or for alternatives to CFCs and halons to become available for all uses. The Protocol's commitment to the principle of common but differentiated responsibility, recognizing the different needs and circumstances of countries at differing stages of development, had been crucial, and its effective data collection and reporting system had made it possible to judge compliance and to provide assistance to parties experiencing difficulty in meeting their obligations. Having enabled the phase-out of the vast majority of ozone-depleting substances, the Protocol had done more to protect the climate system than any other international agreement and, with just 14 countries yet to ratify all four amendments to the Protocol, the spirit of cooperation among public and private-sector stakeholders had helped it to deliver major achievements for sustainable development. That spirit of cooperation, and the Protocol's continuing ability to innovate and adapt, would continue to enable it to meet and overcome new and emerging challenges, including those that had been the subject of discussions at the current meeting.

195. Ms. Mohamed began her statement by paying tribute to her predecessor, Ms. Angela Cropper, who had passed away on 12 November 2012. Ms. Cropper, she said, had been a morally upright, selfless soldier for the environment, fully committed to public service, until the day she died.

196. The Meeting of the Parties observed a minute's silence in memory of Ms. Cropper.

197. Commending the parties on the commitment and foresight that had contributed to the Montreal Protocol's success, she said that credit must be given to the Governments, private-sector companies, civil society organizations and academics that had worked hard in partnership with conviction and tireless dedication. At the current rate, the ozone layer would return to its pre-1980 state by 2050, thereby achieving the goal of protecting life on earth from harmful ultraviolet radiation. She urged all parties to continue to choose low-global-warming-potential alternatives wherever possible in order to ensure an ozone-safe world for future generations. Achieving such a world required intergenerational responsibility; application of the precautionary principle, based on sound science, and the principle of common but differentiated responsibility; and efforts to lay the foundations for a sustainable future, building on the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, held in Rio de Janeiro in June 2012. The lessons learned from the 25 years of the Protocol's history, the national and international governance and institutional structures established to implement it, and the cooperation demonstrated by its parties had made the Protocol a model and an inspiration for tackling other global challenges. One major challenge, as had been recognized at the Conference on Sustainable Development, was the phase-down of HFCs, the subject of proposed amendments to the Montreal Protocol on the agenda for the current meeting. The negotiations had not been easy and would require the same global partnership and commitment that had led to the Protocol's adoption. UNEP pledged its continued commitment and support in the efforts needed to reach agreement on the proposed amendments and the many other critical issues on the agenda for the current meeting.

198. Mr. Abilio thanked the Government of Switzerland for hosting the meeting. Expressing his appreciation to the parties for having entrusted his country with the presidency, he said that the Bureau had met on 10 November 2012 to review implementation of the decisions adopted at the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties and that he had been pleased to see that those decisions had been implemented; the parties, the assessment panels, the Implementation Committee and the Secretariat were currently engaged in follow-up action. A key decision had been to replenish the Multilateral Fund for the next three years, and the parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol were about to begin implementing the first measure to accelerate the phase-out of HCFCs, based on the adjustments agreed in 2007.

199. Congratulating the world's newest State, South Sudan, for having become a party to the Protocol in January 2012 and for having ratified all four amendments in October, he expressed the hope that the other parties, the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund and the implementing agencies would all work together to assist it in complying with its obligations. He wished the parties every success in their deliberations.

Video message from the Queen of Bhutan

200. The Executive Secretary recalled that Her Majesty, the Queen of Bhutan, had undertaken to mobilize support for ozone layer protection, to promote the Montreal Protocol and to support parties in their implementation of the Protocol, in particular through the Ozone Officers Network. Earlier in the year she had been recognized by all countries in the Asia and the Pacific regional networks as an ambassador for the ozone layer. In a video message to the Meeting of the Parties, the Queen expressed her gratitude for the recognition of her work and reiterated her commitment to the cause of ozone layer protection.

II. Organizational matters

A. Election of officers for the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

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

President:	Mr. Mehmood Alam	Pakistan (Asia-Pacific)
Vice-Presidents:	Mr. Alain Wilmart	Belgium (Western Europe and others)
	Mr. Dmytro Mormul	Ukraine (Eastern Europe)
	Mr. Leslie Smith	Grenada (Latin America and the Caribbean)
Rapporteur:	Mr. Wylbur Simuusa	Zambia (Africa)

B. Adoption of the agenda for the high-level segment

202. The following agenda for the high-level segment was adopted on the basis of the provisional agenda contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/1:

1. Opening of the high-level segment:
 - (a) Statements by representative(s) of the Government of Switzerland;
 - (b) Statements by representative(s) of the United Nations Environment Programme;
 - (c) Marking the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Montreal Protocol;
 - (d) Statement by the President of the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.
2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Election of officers for the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda for the high-level segment;
 - (c) Organization of work;
 - (d) Credentials of representatives.
3. Status of ratification of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, the Montreal Protocol and the amendments to the Montreal Protocol.
4. Presentations by the assessment panels on the status of their work, including the latest developments.
5. Presentation by the Chair of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on the work of the Executive Committee, the Multilateral Fund secretariat and the Fund's implementing agencies.

6. Statements by heads of delegation.
7. Report by the co-chairs of the preparatory segment and consideration of the decisions recommended for adoption by the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties.
8. Dates and venue for the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.
9. Other matters.
10. Adoption of decisions by the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.
11. Adoption of the report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.
12. Closure of the meeting.

C. Organization of work

203. The parties agreed to follow their customary procedures.

D. Credentials of representatives

204. The Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol approved the credentials of the representatives of 102 of the 147 parties represented. The Bureau provisionally approved the participation of other parties on the understanding that they would forward their credentials to the Secretariat as soon as possible. The Bureau urged all parties attending future meetings of the parties to make their best efforts to submit credentials to the Secretariat as required under rule 18 of the rules of procedure. The Bureau also recalled that under the rules of procedure credentials had to be issued either by a head of State or Government or by a minister for foreign affairs or, in the case of a regional economic integration organization, by the competent authority of that organization. The Bureau further recalled that representatives of parties not presenting credentials in the correct form could be precluded from full participation in the meetings of the parties, including the right to vote.

III. Status of ratification of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, the Montreal Protocol and the amendments to the Montreal Protocol

205. The President said that since the previous Meeting of the Parties there had been much progress in the status of ratification of the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and the amendments to the Protocol. He drew attention to the draft decision on the status of ratification of the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and the London, Copenhagen, Montreal and Beijing amendments to the Montreal Protocol (see UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/8), which was a standard decision of the kind that was usually taken by the Meeting of the Parties to record the status of ratifications and to encourage further ratifications, modified slightly to include the names of parties to the Protocol that had not yet ratified one or more amendments to the Protocol.

IV. Presentations by the assessment panels on the status of their work, including the latest developments

206. Under the item presentations were made by representatives of the Scientific Assessment Panel, the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its Halons Technical Options Committee.

207. Mr. Paul Newman outlined the status of the 2014 assessment of the Scientific Assessment Panel and summarized the topics that would be addressed therein. He also provided a summary of new information on carbon tetrachloride and on the chlorofluorocarbon RC-316c.

208. Mr. Nigel Paul presented an update on the status of the 2014 assessment of the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel and outlined the topics that it would cover.

209. Mr. Lambert Kuijpers gave an overview of the status of the 2014 assessment of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and presented an update on the work of the Flexible and Rigid Foams Technical Options Committee, the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee and the Refrigeration, Air-Conditioning and Heat Pumps Technical Options Committee.

210. Mr. Daniel Verdonik then reported on the work of the Halons Technical Options Committee and its cooperation with the International Civil Aviation Organization with regard to the phase-out of halon production.
211. Summaries of the presentations prepared by the presenters are set out in annex III to the present report.
212. The parties took note of the information presented.

V. Presentation by the Chair of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on the work of the Executive Committee, the Multilateral Fund secretariat and the Fund's implementing agencies

213. Mr. Xiao Xuezhong (China), chair of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund, delivered a presentation on the Committee's activities since the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties, encompassing the Committee's sixty-sixth and sixty-seventh meetings. He summarized the report (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/9) and said that at its sixty-sixth and sixty-seventh meetings the Executive Committee had approved a total of 101 additional projects and activities with a planned phase-out of 522 ODP-tonnes of controlled substances. The funds approved for projects and activities had totalled \$40,379,077, including \$3,273,203 for agency support costs. He also reported that an agreement had been reached on a new administrative cost regime for the Multilateral Fund that would encourage implementing agencies to continue their engagement in the Montreal Protocol process and ensure the cost-effective and efficient implementation of phase-out projects in countries operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5.
214. Further progress had also been made regarding the outstanding contributions of the Russian Federation and, after further discussions, the Russian Federation stood ready to start paying, at the earliest from 2013, its pledges to the Multilateral Fund as soon as the financial processes and agreement had been finalized. He also drew the attention of the parties to annex II to the report of the Multilateral Fund (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/9), which had been provided in response to decision XVI/36. He said that in view of the current evaluation of the Financial Mechanism that component of the annual report of the Executive Committee was considered to have been completed and that future annual reports of the Executive Committee would therefore no longer contain that annex.
215. Recognizing that the first control measure for HCFC reduction was fast approaching, the Executive Committee had focused its attention on ensuring that funding was provided for HCFC phase-out management plans in as many countries as possible. As of the sixty-seventh meeting, 126 parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 of the Montreal Protocol had put the infrastructure in place to implement those activities. Twenty of those HCFC phase-out management plans had been approved during the reporting period, and following the submissions to the sixty-eighth meeting of the Executive Committee there would remain only six outstanding stage 1 HCFC phase-out management plans to be funded.
216. The Executive Committee had also undertaken activities to implement decisions of the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties, some of which affected the efficient implementation of HCFC phase-out activities in developing countries. The Executive Committee had consequently taken a number of policy decisions, which were more fully described in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/9 and some of which are as described below.
217. The results of projects demonstrating low-cost alternatives to HCFCs in the foam sector had allowed the Executive Committee to examine potential replacements that appeared to be feasible solutions meeting the objective of a cost-effective, zero ozone-depleting potential and low-global-warming-potential replacement technology. In the case of hydrocarbons, however, additional investigation and the development of a costing concept on pre-blended hydrocarbon polyols was required. For enterprises in the foam sector that had received funding for moving away from CFCs, full funding of eligible incremental costs for second stage conversion to non-HCFC technology would be limited to new lines and equipment established before September 2007. Full funding for eligible incremental costs for second stage conversion to phase-out HCFC-141b in imported polyols would be considered on a case-by-case basis, provided that parties committed to banning the import of HCFC-141b in bulk or in fully formulated systems.
218. The Executive Committee had also looked at tracking projects that used HCFC-141b-based pre-blended polyols in order to avoid double counting them. The Executive Committee was considering ways of discounting the amount, or average amount of HCFC-141b contained in

pre-blended polyols that countries exported for a given year or years, from its starting point for eligible consumption. Deliberations on that issue would be concluded at the sixty-eighth meeting of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee had also concluded that, depending on the alternative technology selected, some costs related to retooling for manufacturing heat exchangers in the refrigeration and air conditioning sector might be eligible as incremental costs. The extent to which those costs were eligible and incremental, however, was still to be decided. Ways to maximize the climate benefits from the phase-out of HCFCs in the refrigeration servicing sector had also been considered, although more effective means of maximizing climate benefits in the refrigeration servicing sector needed to be agreed upon. Implementing agencies also continued to look for creative ways to mobilize resources for maximizing the climate benefit of the accelerated phase-out of HFCs.

219. Although there were still some policy issues pending for the HCFC production sector, discussions on the outstanding matters had taken place with the aim of finalizing the HCFC production sector guidelines, and the draft final report on the technical audit of China's HCFC production sector had been reviewed during the reporting period. Those were urgent issues that posed for the Government of China, and Chinese industry, the challenge of meeting the 2013 and 2015 HCFC control targets of the Montreal Protocol.

220. He then spoke on behalf of the implementing agencies. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) was operating a programme in over 106 countries that had resulted in the phase-out 65,495 ODP-tonnes of ozone-depleting substances and had a cumulative Multilateral Fund grant value of \$630 million, of which 87.4 per cent had been disbursed. UNDP continued to assist its partner countries to stay in, or return to, compliance, thus contributing to the effective implementation of the Montreal Protocol. UNDP had also been entrusted with the preparation of HCFC phase-out management plans for 42 countries, all of which were currently being implemented. It had also completed the assessment of the viability of different climate-friendly alternatives to blowing agents in the polyurethane and extruded polyurethane sectors.

221. UNEP was implementing the largest number of HCFC phase-out management plans for low-volume consuming countries. Under its Compliance Assistance Programme, UNEP continued to provide support to parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 of the Montreal Protocol for compliance-related issues and to build the capacity of national ozone units to implement their ozone programmes.

222. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) had developed HCFC phase-out management plans for 69 countries operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 of the Protocol to help them meet the HCFC consumption freeze targets of 1 January 2013 and 1 January 2015. Since the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties, the Executive Committee had approved funding for 59 new projects to be implemented by UNIDO for the phase-out of 391.90 ODP-tonnes of controlled substances in 41 countries operating under paragraph 1 of article 5. It had also prepared and implemented projects, funded through the Multilateral Fund, on environmentally sound disposal of stockpiles of waste ozone-depleting substances and equipment containing ozone-depleting substances.

223. The World Bank, together with its partner countries, had phased out some 300,000 ODP-tonnes of ozone-depleting substances under the Multilateral Fund and a further 230,000 ODP-tonnes under the Global Environment Facility. The net phase-out of ozone-depleting substances, once the global-warming-potential impact of the alternatives being phased in was accounted for, was the equivalent of approximately 1.22 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions averted. Since the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties, the World Bank had focused on the development of a new HCFC production phase-out management plan for China, as timely phase-out of HCFC production supply was critical for consumer countries operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 to meet the phase-out targets of stage 1 of their HCFC phase-out management plans.

224. In conclusion he said that all agencies had held significant celebrations in honour of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Montreal Protocol and that as Chair of the Multilateral Fund he had been struck by the effective cooperation between the parties that was the hallmark of the Montreal Protocol. It was that spirit of cooperation that made the Montreal Protocol stand out from among the other multilateral environmental agreements.

225. The parties took note of the information presented.

VI. Statements by heads of delegation

226. During the high-level segment statements were made by heads of delegation of the following parties, listed in the order in which they spoke: Madagascar, China, United States of America, the European Union and its member States, Zambia, Bolivia, Japan, Ukraine, Indonesia, Holy See,

Burundi, Fiji, Cambodia, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Brazil, Jordan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Uganda, Maldives, Nepal, Sudan, Kiribati, Yemen, Guinea, Philippines, Mozambique, Croatia, Dominican Republic, Malawi, United Republic of Tanzania, Serbia, Timor-Leste, Canada, Bangladesh, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Pakistan, Iraq, Nicaragua, Malaysia, Mongolia, Palau, Panama, Côte d'Ivoire, Chile and India.

227. Statements were also made by the representative of the African group of countries, the representative of the World Meteorological Organization and the Secretary of the International Plant Protection Convention.

228. Representatives of all parties who spoke thanked the Government and people of Switzerland for their hospitality in hosting the current meeting. Many thanked UNEP and the Ozone Secretariat, the Multilateral Fund Secretariat and implementing agencies, industrial countries, the assessment panels, international organizations and other stakeholders for their roles in ensuring the success of the meeting and the successful development and implementation of the Protocol.

229. Many representatives reiterated their commitment to the objectives of the Protocol and amendments. Many described their countries' efforts to meet their obligations under the Protocol, outlining the policy, legislative, institutional and programmatic measures that they had put in place in order to support those efforts. Several representatives expressed their countries' pride in achieving the Protocol's phase-out milestones for various ozone-depleting substances, for example CFCs and halons, often ahead of the stipulated schedules, and indicated their determination to continue in the same vein, including with regard to the planned phase-out of HCFCs. In that regard, several parties said that their HCFC management plans were in place and operational. A wide range of initiatives to support the elimination of ozone-depleting substances were described, including the establishment of import/export licensing and quota systems, the enhancement of institutional coordination, training and capacity-building, the development of public-private partnerships, the establishment of funding mechanisms, and the raising of public awareness, including through the educational system. Several representatives indicated that their efforts to control ozone-depleting substances under the Protocol were part of a wider commitment to sustainable development and the protection of the environment and human health, and some noted the need for a holistic approach by which environmental protection, including care of the ozone layer, was woven into the social, economic and aspirational fabric of society as a whole. Finally, several parties expressed gratitude to the international partners and donors who had assisted them in their endeavours.

230. There was fulsome praise and congratulations for the Montreal Protocol on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the agreement on 16 September 1987. Many representatives highlighted the remarkable achievement of the Protocol in attaining universal ratification and putting in place a regulatory framework that had been impressively successful in achieving its aim of reversing the damage to the ozone layer, to the benefit of present and future generations. The degree of success had been such that the Protocol was held up as a model for the operation of other multilateral environmental instruments. There was broad recognition that robust science had underpinned the accomplishments of the Protocol, in which the role of the Protocol's assessment panels had been crucial. One representative highlighted the elements that had contributed to the Protocol's success, including the setting of legally binding commitments, while providing for flexibility; its dynamic structure, allowing for the accommodation of technological progress; and the operation of efficient compliance and financial support mechanisms.

231. Several representatives said that the past success of the Protocol should not cause the parties to the Protocol to drop their guard, as considerable work was still needed to ensure the continued protection of the ozone layer into the future. A number of representatives said that, in keeping with current institutional trends, activities under the Protocol should be increasingly coordinated with those of other instruments, including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, given the climate co-benefits that had been delivered by the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances and the growing urgency of the climate change threat.

232. Many representatives highlighted the role of the Multilateral Fund as a mechanism by which parties with developing or transitional economies could avail themselves of financing and other forms of assistance for phase-out projects. A number also praised the implementing agencies for their crucial work at the country level. Some representatives drew encouragement from the conclusions of an independent evaluation confirming the value of the Multilateral Fund as a key institution for the success of the ozone protection regime. Several representatives urged the developed countries to make greater efforts to ensure that the Fund, as a mainstay of the success of the Protocol, had sufficient resources at its disposal to support the objectives of the Protocol, particularly as the start of the accelerated phase-out schedule for HCFCs was imminent. One representative said that the economic

conditions of individual countries should be taken into account in considering the cost of projects under the Multilateral Fund, rather than treating developing countries as a single large group.

233. A theme figuring prominently in many country statements was the next major objective of the Protocol, namely, the phase-out of HCFCs. A number of representatives of parties operating under paragraph 1 of article 5 of the Protocol expressed concern as to whether there was sufficient time and resources to comply fully with the imminent 2013 freeze and 10 per cent reduction of HCFCs by 2015 under the accelerated phase-out schedule. Several highlighted the need for such supportive elements as capacity-building, technology transfer and strengthening of national ozone units. In addition, it was crucial to ensure the adoption of environmentally friendly technologies that reduced ozone-depleting substances without causing harm to other components of the environment. One representative said that a sustained effort by Government and industry was essential, including in the promotion of new technologies and research into and development of alternatives. Another representative said that the existence of many small and medium-sized enterprises in developing countries was a particular challenge in the application of alternative technologies. Another representative said that the individual situation of parties should be taken into account, along with the economic and technical feasibility of alternatives, to ensure a realistic transition period. Several representatives stressed the continuing importance of the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, while several urged donor countries to fulfil their responsibilities during the upcoming crucial period by ensuring the provision of stable and predictable resources.

234. Many representatives expressed concern at the contribution to global warming caused by the adoption of HFCs technologies in the conversion from HCFCs technologies. There were divergent views on the role of the Montreal Protocol in that regard, with one group of opinions urging the parties to accept their responsibilities and take relevant measures under the Protocol and, in cooperation with other instruments, to address the situation, while another group of opinions stated that substances with high global-warming potential came under the purview of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol and should be dealt with in that forum. One representative highlighted the Bali Declaration, an outcome of the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties, as embodying an approach to the issue that deserved attention, in that it promoted the use of alternatives to ozone-depleting substances that had low global-warming-potential and were economically viable, environmentally benign, technologically feasible and readily available on the market. He added that discussion of the matter should not be confined to whether or not to amend the Protocol, but should focus on working more holistically to develop safer alternatives to ozone-depleting substances. One representative of a small island developing State said that such States were at the forefront of climate change impacts and were challenged enormously, with heightening environmental impacts giving rise to economic and social hurdles. Given the urgency of the matter, it was disheartening to hear parties brush off their responsibilities when strong co-benefits for the climate and the ozone layer could be realized through appropriate action.

235. A number of representatives spoke of the challenges that lay ahead for the Montreal Protocol. Among the specific issues raised were the urgent need to find alternatives for certain uses of methyl bromide, the continuing existence of large banks and stockpiles of ozone-depleting substances, the need to improve systems for recovery and recycling, the growing problem of illicit trade and dumping, the need for further institutional strengthening, the challenge of incorporating innovative solutions in the field of alternative technologies, and the problems faced by countries with hot climates in the refrigeration and air-conditioning sectors. Some representatives of small-island developing States drew attention to the consumption of HCFCs by foreign ships coming into their ports as a growing compliance-related challenge.

236. On a broader level, several representatives considered what might be the future role of the Protocol in a rapidly changing environmental, economic and social context. There was recognition of the importance of increased partnership, greater cooperation between international instruments and more effective regional cooperation. Sourcing finance and other resources for particular activities in an increasingly complex and crisis-ridden global environment was a matter of concern. One representative spoke of the crises currently facing the human family, including poverty, forced migration and sea-level rise, and urged environmental treaties and instruments, including the Montreal Protocol, to employ creative thinking to ensure that human rights issues were given full cognizance in their deliberations, including through adoption of a more synergistic approach involving a wide range of stakeholders.

237. The representatives of Côte d'Ivoire and Ukraine expressed their Governments' willingness to host the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in 2013.

238. The representative of the World Meteorological Organization noted the effective collaboration that had taken place between the organization and the Montreal Protocol, and underlined the contribution of observation and research to the success of that collaboration. He said that the recently established Global Framework for Climate Services promised to be a powerful tool for the provision of climate services and the building of partnerships for coordinated and systematic action at different scales, from the global to the local.

239. The Secretary of the International Plant Protection Convention explained that the objective of the Convention was to protect the world's wild plants and crops while promoting food security, trade, development and environmental protection. He announced with pleasure that after years of cooperation between the secretariats of the Convention and the Montreal Protocol on the use of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes, the relationship between the secretariats had recently been formalized in a memorandum of understanding. While the parties to the Convention continued to provide for the use of methyl bromide, they had also adopted a decision aimed at minimizing its negative effects on the ozone layer, and various steps were being taken at the national, regional and international levels to implement that decision. Both the secretariat and the parties to the Convention were committed to maximizing further collaboration with the Protocol on that subject. Whatever the two secretariats did, however, would count for nothing without action by Governments and other stakeholders at the national level. Without such action the memorandum between the secretariats was simply a piece of paper.

VII. Report by the co-chairs of the preparatory segment and consideration of the decisions recommended for adoption by the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties

240. Thanking the parties for their great efforts, the contact group chairs for their leadership, the Secretariat for its excellent work and professionalism and the interpreters and other behind-the-scenes staff for facilitating the work of the parties, the co-chairs of the preparatory segment commended the draft decisions approved during the segment for adoption by the Meeting of the Parties.

VIII. Dates and venue for the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

241. In their statements during the high-level segment, the representatives of Côte d'Ivoire and Ukraine conveyed offers by their Governments to host the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. In consultations between those representatives and the Executive Secretary, Côte d'Ivoire graciously agreed to yield to Ukraine the privilege of hosting the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties in 2013 and offered instead to host the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Parties in 2014. The parties accordingly agreed that the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties would take place from 21 to 25 October 2013 in Ukraine.

IX. Other matters

242. The parties took up no other matters during the high-level segment.

X. Adoption of decisions by the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

243. *The Meeting of the Parties decides:*

Decision XXIV/1: Status of ratification of the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and the London, Copenhagen, Montreal and Beijing amendments to the Montreal Protocol

1. To note with satisfaction the universal ratification of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, the London Amendment to the Montreal Protocol and the Copenhagen Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, each with 197 parties;

2. To note also that, as at 16 November 2012, 193 parties had ratified the Montreal Amendment to the Montreal Protocol and 183 parties had ratified the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol;

3. To urge Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Chad, Djibouti, Ecuador, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kenya, Libya, Mauritania, Papua New Guinea and Saudi Arabia to ratify, approve or accede to the Montreal and Beijing Amendments, taking into account that universal participation is necessary to ensure the protection of the ozone layer;

Decision XXIV/2: Application to Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chad, Ecuador, Haiti, Kenya and Nicaragua of paragraph 8 of Article 4 of the Montreal Protocol with respect to the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol

Considering paragraph 8 of Article 4 of the Montreal Protocol, which reads:

“Notwithstanding the provisions of this Article, imports and exports referred to in paragraphs 1 to 4 of this Article may be permitted from, or to, any State not party to this Protocol, if that State is determined, by a meeting of the Parties, to be in full compliance with Article 2, Articles 2A to 2I and this Article, and have submitted data to that effect as specified in Article 7”;

Acknowledging that Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chad, Ecuador, Haiti, Kenya and Nicaragua have notified the Secretariat that their ratification processes of the Beijing Amendment are under way and that they will do all that is possible to complete the procedures as expeditiously as possible,

Expressing regret that despite their best efforts, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chad, Ecuador, Haiti, and Kenya will not be able to ratify the Beijing Amendment before the last day of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties,

Noting that although the Implementation Committee has not specifically considered the situation of Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chad, Ecuador, Haiti, and Kenya in the context of paragraph 8 of Article 4 of the Montreal Protocol, the report of the Implementation Committee to the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties indicates that all of those parties are in full compliance with Article 2, Articles 2A to 2I and Article 4 of the Protocol, including its Beijing Amendment, and have submitted data to that effect as specified in Article 7,

1. That on the basis of the data submitted under Article 7 of the Protocol, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chad, Ecuador, Haiti, Kenya and Nicaragua are in full compliance with Articles 2, Articles 2A to 2I and Article 4 of the Protocol, including its Beijing Amendment;
2. That the exceptions provided for in paragraph 8 of Article 4 of the Protocol shall apply to Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chad, Ecuador, Haiti, Kenya and Nicaragua from 1 January 2013;
3. That the determination in paragraph 1 of the present decision and the exceptions referred to in paragraph 2 of the present decision shall expire at the end of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties;
4. That the term “State not party to this Protocol” in Article 4, paragraph 9 applies to those States operating under Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Protocol that have not agreed to be bound by Beijing Amendment and that are not listed in paragraph 2 of the present decision, unless such a State has by 31 March 2013:
 - (a) Notified the Secretariat that it intends to ratify, accede to or accept the Beijing Amendment as soon as possible;
 - (b) Certified that it is in full compliance with Articles 2, 2A to 2I and Article 4 of the Protocol, as amended by the Copenhagen Amendment;
 - (c) Submitted data under subparagraphs (a) and (b) above to the Secretariat, in which case that State shall fall outside the definition of a “State not party to this Protocol” until the conclusion of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties and the information so submitted will be posted by the Ozone Secretariat on its website within a week of receipt;
5. That the term “State not party to this Protocol” includes all other States and regional economic integration organizations that have not agreed to be bound by the Beijing Amendment;
6. That any State that has not agreed to be bound by the Beijing Amendment and that seeks an exception as provided for in paragraph 8 of Article 4 of the Protocol beyond the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties may do so by submitting a request to the Ozone Secretariat prior to the

beginning of the meeting of the Implementation Committee that immediately precedes the Meeting of the Parties, that the Secretariat will notify the Committee of any such request, that the Committee will review relevant data submitted in accordance with Article 7 and develop a recommendation for consideration by the parties and that such requests seeking the exception provided for in paragraph 8 of Article 4 will be considered on an annual basis;

Decision XXIV/3: Essential-use nominations for controlled substances for 2013

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

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

Noting the Panel's conclusion that technically satisfactory alternatives to CFC-based metered-dose inhalers are available for some therapeutic formulations for treating asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease,

Taking into account the Panel's analysis and recommendations for essential-use exemptions for controlled substances for the manufacture of metered-dose inhalers used for asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease,

Welcoming the continued progress in several parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in reducing their reliance on CFC-based metered-dose inhalers as alternatives are developed, receive regulatory approval and are marketed for sale,

Taking into account the additional information provided to the parties by China during the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties concerning the use of CFCs in traditional Chinese medicine in remote areas,

1. To authorize the levels of production and consumption for 2013 necessary to satisfy essential uses of CFCs for metered-dose inhalers for asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease specified in the annex to the present decision;
2. To request nominating parties to supply to the Medical Technical Options Committee information to enable assessment of essential-use nominations in accordance with the criteria set out in decision IV/25 and subsequent relevant decisions as set out in the handbook on essential-use nominations;
3. To encourage parties with essential-use exemptions in 2013 to consider sourcing required pharmaceutical-grade CFCs initially from stockpiles where they are available and accessible, provided that such stockpiles are used subject to the conditions established by the Meeting of the Parties in paragraph 2 of its decision VII/28;
4. To encourage parties with stockpiles of pharmaceutical-grade CFCs potentially available for export to parties with essential-use exemptions in 2013 to notify the Ozone Secretariat of such quantities and of a contact point by 31 December 2012;
5. To request the Secretariat to post on its website details of the potentially available stocks referred to in the paragraph 4 of the present decision;
6. That the parties listed in the annex to the present decision shall have full flexibility in sourcing the quantity of pharmaceutical-grade CFCs to the extent required for manufacturing metered-dose inhalers, as authorized in paragraph 1 of the present decision, from imports, from domestic producers or from existing stockpiles;
7. To request parties to consider domestic regulations to ban the launch or sale of new CFC-based metered-dose inhaler products, even if such products have been approved;
8. To encourage parties to fast-track their administration processes for the registration of metered-dose inhaler products in order to speed up the transition to chlorofluorocarbon-free alternatives;
9. To request China, if it should nominate again in 2013 the use of CFC to be used in traditional Chinese medicine in remote areas, to provide more information about the absence of

alternatives in the region, the phase out efforts undertaken for this use and other relevant information necessary to allow the Medical Technical Options Committee to evaluate the case fully;

Annex

Essential-use authorizations for 2013 of chlorofluorocarbons for metered-dose inhalers

(Metric tonnes)

<i>Parties</i>	<i>2013</i>
China	388.82
Russian Federation	212

Decision XXIV/4: Essential-use exemption for chlorofluorocarbon-113 for aerospace applications in the Russian Federation

Noting that the Chemical Technical Options Committee has concluded that the nomination of the Russian Federation satisfies the criteria to qualify as essential use under decision IV/25, including the absence of available technically and economically feasible alternatives or substitutes that are acceptable from the standpoint of environment and health,

Noting also that the Chemical Technical Options Committee recommended the acceleration of efforts to introduce appropriate alternatives to investigate materials compatible with alternatives and the adoption of newly designed equipment to complete the phase-out of chlorofluorocarbon-113 (CFC-113) within agreed time schedule,

Noting that the Russian Federation provided in its essential-use exemption nomination a final phase-out plan and nominated 2016 as the final date for CFC-113 use in this application,

Noting also that the Russian Federation is continuing its efforts to introduce alternative solvents in order to gradually reduce consumption of CFC-113 in the aerospace industry to a maximum of 75 metric tonnes in 2015,

1. To authorize an essential-use exemption for the production and consumption in 2013 of 95 metric tonnes of CFC-113 in the Russian Federation for chlorofluorocarbon applications in its aerospace industry;

2. To request the Russian Federation to continue its efforts to follow up the CFC-113 final phase-out plan and explore further the possibility of importing CFC-113 of the required quality for its aerospace industry needs from available global stocks as recommended by the Chemical Technical Options Committee of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel;

Decision XXIV/5: Critical-use exemptions for methyl bromide for 2014

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

Recognizing the significant reductions made in critical-use nominations for methyl bromide in many parties,

Recalling paragraph 10 of decision XVII/9,

Recalling also that all parties that have nominated critical-use exemptions are to report data on stocks using the accounting framework agreed to by the Sixteenth Meeting of the Parties,

Recognizing that the production and consumption of methyl bromide for critical uses should be permitted only if methyl bromide is not available in sufficient quantity and quality from existing stocks of banked or recycled methyl bromide,

Recognizing also that parties operating under critical-use exemptions should take into account the extent to which methyl bromide is available in sufficient quantity and quality from existing stocks of banked or recycled methyl bromide in licensing, permitting or authorizing the production and consumption of methyl bromide for critical uses,

Recognizing also that Australia will not seek any further critical-use nominations of methyl bromide for use in the rice sector and therefore that the approval to use part of its 2014 allocation in 2013 is to be seen as exceptional and non-recurring,

Noting that soilless systems for strawberry runners are not yet fully economically or technically feasible throughout Australia and Canada,

Noting also that the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee has a “bottom up” approach for calculating the area concerned by methyl bromide in California in the United States of America and that the regulatory authorities have a ‘top down’ approach and that these varying approaches give rise to a difference of 150 hectares,

Acknowledging that the Technical and Economic Assessment Panel, and specifically its Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee, produce reports that are science based, independent and robust and that all Parties should strive to respect the results of this work,

1. To permit, for the agreed critical-use categories for 2014 set forth in table A of the annex to the present decision for each party, subject to the conditions set forth in the present decision and in decision Ex.I/4 to the extent that those conditions are applicable, the levels of production and consumption for 2014 set forth in table B of the annex to the present decision, which are necessary to satisfy critical uses, with the understanding that additional levels of production and consumption and categories of use may be approved by the Meeting of the Parties in accordance with decision IX/6;
2. As part of a final transition out of the rice sector, to approve Australia bringing forward up to 1.187 tonnes of methyl bromide from its critical use exemption to 2013 for fumigating packaged rice, with any quantity brought forward to 2013 deducted from its allocation in 2014 and for Australia to ensure that this amount is reported in full transparency to the Ozone Secretariat;
3. That parties shall endeavour to license, permit, authorize or allocate quantities of methyl bromide for critical uses as listed in table A of the annex to the present decision;
4. To recognize the continued contribution of the expertise of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee and to agree that in accordance with section 4.1 of the terms of reference of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel the Committee should ensure that it develops its recommendations in a consensus process that includes full discussion among all available Committee members and should ensure that members with relevant expertise are involved in developing its recommendations;
5. That each party that has an agreed critical-use exemption shall renew its commitment to ensuring that the criteria in paragraph 1 of decision IX/6, in particular the criterion laid down in paragraph 1 (b) (ii) of decision IX/6, are applied in licensing, permitting or authorizing critical uses of methyl bromide, with each party requested to report on the implementation of the present provision to the Ozone Secretariat by 1 February for the years to which the present decision applies;
6. To request that Canada and Australia take all reasonable steps to explore further the possibility of transitioning to technically and economically feasible alternatives, including soilless culture in the case of strawberry runners and to ensure that the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee is fully aware of these efforts;
7. To request that the United States of America takes all reasonable steps to explore further the possibility of transitioning to technically and economically feasible alternatives in the case of strawberry fruits and to ensure that the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee is fully aware of these efforts;
8. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to ensure that its consideration of nominations analyse the impact of national, subnational and local regulations and law on the potential use of methyl bromide alternatives and to include a description of the analysis in the critical use nomination report;
9. To urge parties operating under critical-use exemptions to put in place effective systems to discourage the accumulation of methyl bromide produced under the exemptions;

Annex

Table A
Agreed critical-use categories for 2014
 (Metric tonnes)

Australia	Strawberry runners (29.760), rice (1.187)
Canada	Mills (5.044), strawberry runners (Prince Edward Island) (5.261)
United States of America	Commodities (0.740), mills and food processing structures (22.800), cured pork (3.730), strawberry – field (415.067)

Table B
Permitted levels of production and consumption for 2014
 (Metric tonnes)

Australia	30.947
Canada	10.305
United States of America	442.337 ^a

^a Minus available stocks.

Decision XXIV/6: Feedstock uses

Recalling Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, which mandates, inter alia, reporting on amounts of controlled substances used for feedstock,

Recalling paragraph 1 of decision VII/30, in which, inter alia, the parties specified that importing countries shall report the quantities of ozone-depleting substances imported for feedstock uses and that importers shall, prior to export, provide exporters with a commitment that the substances imported shall be used for this purpose,

Recalling also decision IV/12, in which the parties clarified that insignificant quantities of ozone-depleting substances originating from inadvertent or coincidental production during a manufacturing process, from unreacted feedstock, or from their use as process agents which are present in chemical substances as trace impurities, or that are emitted during product manufacture or handling, shall be considered not to be covered by the definition of an ozone-depleting substance contained in paragraph 4 of Article 1 of the Montreal Protocol,

Recalling further that in decision IV/12, the parties were urged to take steps to minimize emissions of such substances, including such steps as avoidance of the creation of such emissions and reduction of emissions using practicable control technologies or process changes, containment or destruction,

1. To encourage parties to exchange information on known alternatives being applied to replace ozone-depleting substances in feedstock uses;
2. To encourage parties with feedstock uses to exchange information on systems they have in place for qualifying a specific ozone depleting substance use as feedstock use and for identification and/or monitoring of containers placed on the market and intended for feedstock uses, for example reporting or labelling requirements;
3. To confirm that the use of carbon tetrachloride in the production of vinyl chloride monomer by pyrolysis of ethylene dichloride in the processes evaluated by the Panel in its 2012 progress report is considered to be a feedstock use;
4. To request parties with vinyl chloride monomer production facilities in which carbon tetrachloride is used and that have not yet reported the information requested by the parties in decision XXIII/7 to provide such information to the Panel before 28 February 2013 to allow it to clarify whether the use in a particular facility is a feedstock use or process agent use;

Decision XXIV/7: Additional information on alternatives to ozone-depleting substances

Recalling the report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons in the refrigeration and air-conditioning sector in parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 with high ambient temperatures and unique operating conditions, submitted to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirtieth meeting pursuant to decision XIX/8,

Noting with appreciation volume 2 of the 2012 progress report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel which responded to Decision XXIII/9,

1. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel in consultations with experts from outside the Panel with the relevant expertise if necessary, to update information on alternatives and technologies in various sectors and prepare a draft report for consideration by the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-third meeting and a final report to be submitted to the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties that would by end use:

(a) Describe all available alternatives to ozone-depleting substances that are commercially available, technically proven, environmentally-sound, taking into account their efficacy, health, safety and environmental characteristics, cost-effectiveness, and their use including in high ambient temperatures and high urban density cities;

(b) Update information provided by previous Panel reports on alternatives under development;

(c) Identify barriers and restrictions to the adoption and commercial use of certain environmentally-sound alternatives to ozone-depleting substances;

(d) Estimate, if possible, the approximate amount of alternatives with negative environmental impacts that could be or could have been avoided or eliminated by both non-Article 5 and Article 5 parties in the process of phasing-out ozone-depleting substances;

(e) Identify the opportunities for the selection of environmentally-sound alternatives to HCFCs in the future;

2. To invite the Panel to take into account any information relevant for the report to be prepared under paragraph 1 of the present decision provided by parties to the Secretariat;

Decision XXIV/8: Terms of reference, code of conduct and disclosure and conflict of interest guidelines for the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its technical options committees and temporary subsidiary bodies

Taking note of paragraph 17 of decision XXIII/10, in which the parties requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to revise its draft guidelines on recusal, taking into account similar guidelines in other multilateral forums, and provide them to the Open-ended Working Group for consideration at its thirty-second meeting,

Taking note also of the terms of reference of the Panel as set out in annex V of the report of the Eighth Meeting of the Parties, as amended by decision XVIII/19,

Taking note further of decision XXIII/10, in which the parties requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to propose an update to its terms of reference,

Recalling decision VII/34 on the organization and functioning of the Panel and specifically on efforts to increase the participation of experts from parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in order to improve geographical expertise and balance,

Noting that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has established a conflict of interest committee and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee has adopted a procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest,

Bearing in mind that the role of the Panel, its technical options committees and its temporary subsidiary bodies makes it essential to avoid even the appearance of any conflict between individual members' interests and their duties as Panel members,

Bearing in mind also that it is in the interest of the Panel, its technical options committees and its temporary subsidiary bodies to maintain public confidence in its integrity by adhering closely to its terms of reference,

1. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to make recommendations on the future configuration of its technical options committees to the Open-Ended Working Group at its thirty-third meeting, bearing in mind anticipated workloads;
2. To approve the terms of reference and the conflict of interest and disclosure policy for the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, its technical options committees and any temporary subsidiary bodies set up by those bodies set out in the annex to the present decision in place of the terms of reference set out in annex V to the report of the Eighth Meeting of the Parties, as amended;
3. To request that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its technical options committees make available to the parties their standard operating procedures;

Annex

Terms of reference of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its technical options committees and temporary subsidiary bodies

1. Scope of work

The tasks undertaken by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) are those specified in Article 6 of the Montreal Protocol in addition to those requested from time to time at Meetings of the Parties. TEAP analyses and presents technical information and recommendations when specifically requested. It does not evaluate policy issues and does not recommend policy. TEAP presents technical and economic information relevant to policy. Furthermore, TEAP does not judge the merit or success of national plans, strategies, or regulations.

To carry out its work programme, technical options committees (TOCs) are established and agreed to by a decision of the parties. TEAP may also establish temporary subsidiary bodies (TSBs), as needed. These bodies *generally* will not last for more than one year and are aimed at responding to specific requests made by the parties.

2.1 Size and balance

2.1.0

The overall goal is to achieve a representation of about 50 per cent for Article 5(1) Parties in the TEAP and TOCs and appropriate representation of expertise in the different alternatives.

2.1.1 TEAP

The membership size of the TEAP should be about 18-22 members, including 2 or 3 co-chairs to allow it to function effectively. It should include the co-chairs of the TOCs; there should be two co-chairs per TOC and 2-4 Senior Experts for specific expertise not covered by the TEAP co-chairs or TOC co-chairs, taking into account gender and geographical balance.

At least one and preferably all of the TEAP co-chairs should not simultaneously serve as a TOC co-chair.

2.1.2 TOCs

Each TOC should have two co-chairs. The positions of TOC co-chairs must be filled to promote a geographical, gender and expertise balance. TEAP, through its TOC co-chairs, shall compose its TOCs to reflect a balance of appropriate and anticipated expertise so that their reports and information are comprehensive, objective and policy-neutral.

2.1.3 TSBs

TEAP, in consultation with the TSB co-chairs, shall compose its TSBs to reflect a balance of appropriate expertise so that their reports and information are comprehensive, objective and policy-neutral. TEAP, acting through the TSB co-chairs, shall provide a description in reports by TSBs on how their composition was determined. TSB members, including co-chairs, who are not already members of the TEAP, do not become members of the TEAP by virtue of their service on the TSB.

2.2 Nominations

2.2.1 TEAP

Nominations of members to the TEAP, including co-chairs of the TEAP and TOCs, must be made by individual Parties to the Secretariat through their respective national focal points. Such nominations will be forwarded to the Meeting of the Parties for consideration. The TEAP co-chairs

shall ensure that any potential nominee identified by TEAP for appointment to the Panel, including co-chairs of TEAP and the TOCs, is agreed to by the national focal points of the relevant party. A member of TEAP, the TOCs or the TSBs shall not be a current representative of a party to the Montreal Protocol.

2.2.2. TOCs and TSBs

All nominations to TOCs and TSBs shall be made in full consultation with the national focal point of the relevant party.

Nominations of members to a TOC (other than TOC co-chairs) may be made by individual parties or TEAP and TOC co-chairs may suggest to individual parties experts to consider nominating. Nominations to a TSB (including TSB co-chairs) can be made by the TEAP Co-chairs

2.3 Appointment of members of TEAP

In keeping with the intent of the parties for a periodic review of the composition of the assessment panel, the Meeting of the Parties shall appoint the members of TEAP for a period of no more than four years. The Meeting of the Parties may re-appoint Members of the Panel upon nomination by the relevant party for additional periods of up to four years each. In appointing or re-appointing members of TEAP, the parties should ensure continuity, balance as well as a reasonable turnover.

2.4 Co-chairs

In nominating and appointing co-chairs of the TEAP/TOCs/TSBs, parties should consider the following factors:

- (a) Co-chairs should have experience or skills in managing, coordinating, and building consensus in technical bodies, in addition to possessing technical expertise in relevant areas;
- (b) The co-chairs of a TOC should not normally act as co-chairs of another TOC; and
- (c) The co-chairs of TEAP should not be co-chairs of a TOC;
- (d) The TEAP and TOC co-chairs may suggest to individual parties experts to consider nominating.

2.5 Appointment of members of TOCs

Each TOC should have about 20 members. The TOC members are appointed by the TOC co-chairs, in consultation with TEAP, for a period of no more than four years. TOC members may be re-appointed following the procedure for nominations for additional periods of up to four years each.

2.6 Subsidiary bodies

Temporary Subsidiary Technical Bodies (TSBs) can be appointed by TEAP to report on specific issues of limited duration. TEAP may appoint and dissolve, subject to review by the parties, such subsidiary bodies of technical experts when they are no longer necessary. For issues that cannot be handled by the existing TOCs and are of substantial and continuing nature, TEAP should request the establishment by the parties of a new TOC. A decision of the Meeting of the Parties is required to confirm any TSB that exists for a period of more than one year.

2.7 Termination of appointment

Members of TEAP, a TOC or a TSB may relinquish their position at any time by notifying in writing as appropriate the co-chairs of the TEAP, TOC or TSB and the relevant party.

TEAP can dismiss a member of TEAP, the TOCs and the TSBs, including co-chairs of those bodies, by a two-thirds majority vote of TEAP. A dismissed member has the right to appeal to the next Meeting of the Parties through the Secretariat. The TEAP co-chairs will inform the relevant party if TEAP is dismissing members.

2.8 Replacement

If a member of TEAP, including TOC co-chairs, relinquishes or is unable to function including if he or she was dismissed by TEAP, the Panel, after consultation with the nominating party, can temporarily appoint a replacement from among its bodies for the time up to the next Meeting of the Parties, if necessary to complete its work. For the appointment of a replacement TEAP member, the procedure set out in paragraph 2.2 should be followed.

2.9 Guidelines for nominations and matrix of expertise

The TEAP/TOCs will draw up guidelines for nominating experts by the parties. The TEAP/TOCs will publicize a matrix of expertise available and the expertise needed in the TEAP/TOCs so as to facilitate submission of appropriate nominations by the parties. The matrix must include the need for geographic and expertise balance and provide consistent information on expertise that is available and required. The matrix would include the name and affiliation and the specific expertise required including on different alternatives. The TEAP/TOCs, acting through their respective co-chairs, shall ensure that the matrix is updated at least once a year and shall publish the matrix on the Secretariat website and in the Panel's annual progress reports. The TEAP/TOCs shall also ensure that the information in the matrix is clear, sufficient and consistent as far as is appropriate between the TEAP and TOCs and balanced to allow a full understanding of needed expertise.

3. Functioning of TEAP/TOCs/TSBs

3.1 Language

TEAP/TOCs/TSBs meetings will be held and reports and other documents will be produced only in English.

3.2 Meetings

3.2.1 Scheduling

The place and time of the TEAP/TOCs/TSBs meetings will be fixed by the co-chairs.

3.2.2 Secretariat

The Ozone Secretariat should attend the meetings of the TEAP whenever possible and appropriate to provide ongoing institutional advice on administrative issues when necessary.

3.2.3 Operating procedures

Co-chairs of the TOCs should organize meetings in accordance with operating procedures developed by the TOCs in consultation with the Secretariat to ensure full participation of all members, sound and appropriate decision-making and record keeping. The procedures should be updated periodically and made available to the parties.

3.3 Rules of procedure

The rules of procedure of the Montreal Protocol for committees and working groups will be followed in conducting the meetings of the TEAP/TOCs/TSBs, unless otherwise stated in these terms of reference for TEAP/TOCs/TSBs or other decisions approved by a Meeting of the Parties.

3.4 Observers

No observers will be permitted at TEAP, TOC or TSB meetings. However, anyone can present information to the TEAP/TOCs/TSBs with prior notice and can be heard personally if the TEAP/TOCs/TSBs consider it necessary.

3.5 Functioning by members

The TEAP/TOCs/TSBs members function on a personal basis as experts, irrespective of the source of their nominations and accept no instruction from, nor function as representatives of Governments, industries, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or other organizations.

4. Report of TEAP/TOCs/TSBs

4.1 Procedures

The reports of the TEAP/TOCs/TSBs will be developed through a consensus process. The reports must reflect any minority views appropriately.

4.2 Access

Access to materials and drafts considered by the TEAP/TOCs/TSBs will be available only to TEAP/TOCs members or others designated by TEAP/TOCs/TSBs.

4.3 Review by TEAP

The final reports of TOCs and TSBs will be reviewed by the TEAP and will be forwarded, without modification (other than editorial or factual corrections which have been agreed with the co-chairs of the relevant TOC or TSB) by TEAP to the Meeting of the Parties, together with any comments TEAP may wish to provide. Any factual errors in the reports may be rectified through a corrigendum following publication, upon receipt by TEAP or the TOC of supporting documentation.

4.4 Comment by public

Any member of the public can comment to the co-chairs of the TOCs and TSBs with regard to their reports and they must respond as early as possible. If there is no response, these comments can be sent to the TEAP co-chairs for consideration by TEAP.

5. Code of conduct for Members of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its bodies

Code of Conduct

Members of TEAP, the TOCs and the TSBs have been asked by the parties to undertake important responsibilities. As such, a high standard of conduct defined in accordance with the principles of transparency, predictability, accountability, trustworthiness, integrity, responsibility and disclosure is expected of members in discharging their duties. In order to assist members, the following guidelines have been developed as a Code of Conduct that must be followed by the members of TEAP, the TOCs and the TSBs.

1. This Code of Conduct is intended to protect Members of TEAP, the TOCs and the TSBs from conflicts of interest in their participation. Compliance with the measures detailed in these guidelines is a condition for serving as a Member of TEAP, the TOCs or the TSBs.
2. The Code is to enhance public confidence in the integrity of the process while encouraging experienced and competent persons to accept TEAP, TOC and/or TSB membership by:
 - (a) Establishing clear guidelines respect to conflict of interest and disclosure while and after serving as a member; and
 - (b) Minimizing the possibility of conflicts arising between the private interest and public duties of members and by providing for the resolution of such conflicts, in the public interest, should they arise.
3. In carrying out their duties, members shall:
 - (a) Perform their official duties and arrange their private affairs in such a manner that public confidence and trust in the integrity, objectivity and impartiality of TEAP, the TOCs and the TSBs are conserved and enhanced;
 - (b) Act in a manner that will bear the closest public scrutiny, an obligation that is not fully discharged by simply acting within the law of any country;
 - (c) Act in good faith for the best interest of the process;
 - (d) Exercise the care, diligence and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances;
 - (e) Not give preferential treatment to anyone or any interest in any official manner related to TEAP, the TOCs or the TSBs;
 - (f) Not solicit or accept significant gifts, hospitality or other benefits from persons, groups or organizations having or likely to have dealings with TEAP, the TOCs or the TSBs;
 - (g) Not accept transfers of economic benefit, other than incidental gifts, customary hospitality or other benefits of nominal value, unless the transfer is pursuant to an enforceable contract or property right of the member;
 - (h) Not represent or assist any outside interest in dealings before TEAP, the TOCs or the TSBs;
 - (i) Not knowingly take advantage of, or benefit from, information that is obtained in the course of their duties and responsibilities as a member of TEAP, the TOCs and the TSBs, and that is not generally available to the public; and

(j) Not act, after their term of office as members of TEAP, the TOCs or the TSBs in such a manner as to take improper advantage of their previous office.

4. To avoid the possibility or appearance that members of TEAP, the TOCs or the TSBs might receive preferential treatment, members shall not seek preferential treatment for themselves or third parties or act as paid intermediaries for third parties in dealings with TEAP, the TOCs or the TSBs.

6. Conflict of Interest and Disclosure Guidelines for the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, Its Technical Options Committees and Temporary Subsidiary Bodies

Definitions

1. For the purposes of these Guidelines:

(a) “Conflict of interest” means any current interest of a member, or of that member’s personal partner or dependant which, in the opinion of a reasonable person does or appears to:

(i) Significantly impair that individual’s objectivity in carrying out their duties and responsibilities for TEAP, the TOC or the TSB; or

(ii) Create an unfair advantage for any person or organization;

(b) “Member” means member including co-chairs of TEAP, the TOCs and/or the TSBs;

(c) “Recusal” means that a member does not participate in particular elements of TEAP, TOC or TSB work because of a conflict of interest; and

(d) “Conflict resolution advisory body” means the body appointed under paragraph 22.

Purposes

2. The overall purpose of these Guidelines is to protect the legitimacy, integrity, trust, and credibility of the TEAP, TOCS and TSBs and of those directly involved in the preparation of reports and activities.

3. The role of the TEAP, TOCs and TSBs demands that they pay special attention to issues of independence and bias in order to maintain the integrity of, and public confidence in, their products and processes. It is essential that the work of TEAP and its TOCs and TSBs is not compromised by any conflict of interest.

4. Written agreement to comply with these Guidelines is a condition for service as a Member.

5. These Guidelines are to enhance public confidence in the process, while encouraging experienced and competent persons to serve on the TEAP, TOC and/or TSB, by:

(a) Establishing clear guidance with respect to disclosure and conflict of interest while serving as a Member;

(b) Minimizing the possibility of conflicts of interest arising with respect to Members, and by providing for the resolution of such conflicts, in the public interest, should they arise; and

(c) Finding the balance between the needs:

(i) To identify the appropriate disclosure requirements, and

(ii) To ensure the integrity of the TEAP process.

6. These Guidelines are principle-based and do not provide an exhaustive list of criteria for the identification of conflicts.

7. TEAP, the TOCS, the TSBs and their members should not be in a situation that could lead a reasonable person to question, and perhaps discount or dismiss, their work because of the existence of a conflict of interest.

Disclosure

8. Members are to disclose annually any potential conflicts of interest. They must also disclose the source of any funding for their participation in the work of the TEAP, TOC and/or TSB.

An illustrative list of other interests that should be disclosed is provided in Annex A to these Guidelines.

9. Members are to disclose any material change to previously submitted information within 30 days of any such change.
10. Notwithstanding paragraphs 8 and 9, a member may decline to disclose information related to activities, interests and funding where its disclosure would adversely and materially affect:
 - (a) Defence, national security or imminent public safety;
 - (b) The course of justice in prospective or current court cases;
 - (c) The ability to assign future intellectual property rights; or
 - (d) The confidentiality of commercial, government, or industrial information.
11. Members who decline to disclose information under paragraph 10 must declare that they are doing so in their disclosure of interest under paragraphs 8 or 9 and must be completely excluded from discussions and decisions on related topics.

Conflict of interest

12. A member's strong opinion (sometimes referred to as bias), or particular perspective, regarding a particular issue or set of issues does not create a conflict of interest. It is expected that the TEAP, TOCs and TSBs will include members with different perspectives and affiliations, which should be balanced so far as possible.
13. These Guidelines apply only to current conflicts of interest. They do not apply to past interests that have expired, no longer exist and cannot reasonably affect current assessment. Nor do they apply to possible interests that may arise in the future but that do not currently exist, as such interests are inherently speculative and uncertain. For example, a pending application for a particular job is a current interest, but the mere possibility that one might apply for such a job in the future is not a conflict of interest.

Procedures

14. All of the bodies involved in advising on and deciding conflict of interest issues under these Guidelines should consult the relevant member where the body has concerns about a potential conflict of interest and/or where it requires clarification of any matters arising out of a member's disclosure. Such bodies should ensure that the relevant individuals and, where appropriate, the nominating Party, have an opportunity to discuss any concerns about a potential conflict of interest.
15. In the event that an issue regarding a potential conflict of interest arises, the relevant member and co-chairs should attempt to resolve the issue through consultations, including consultations with the advisory body. If the consultations reach an impasse, TEAP could request the Executive Secretary to select an outside mediator to assist in resolving the matter. The mediator should not be a member and should not otherwise have any current affiliation with the relevant individuals, bodies or issues.
16. At any point, the conflict resolution advisory body may be consulted by members or potential members regarding issues related to:
 - (a) Member disclosures;
 - (b) Potential conflicts of interest or other ethics issues; or
 - (c) Potential recusal of members.
17. The conflict resolution advisory body must promptly inform a member if it has been asked to advise on an issue regarding the member. Any information provided to and any advice provided by the conflict resolution advisory body will be considered confidential and will not be used for any purpose other than consideration of conflict of interest issues under these Guidelines without the express consent of the individual providing the information or requesting the advice, as appropriate.
18. If an issue under these Guidelines cannot be resolved through the procedures in paragraphs 14 through 17:
 - (a) A TEAP member, including TEAP and TOC co-chairs, may be recused from a defined area of work only by a three-fourths majority of TEAP (excluding the individual whose recusal is at issue).

(b) A TOC or TSB member, excluding TEAP and TOC co-chairs, may be recused from a defined area of work by the co-chairs of the relevant TOC or, upon appeal, by a three-fourths majority of TEAP.

19. In the event of the procedure under the previous paragraph taking place, the Member whose recusal is at issue may not participate. In the event that the matter is brought to the TEAP consistent with paragraph 18, the Member whose recusal is under discussion, should be excluded from those discussions.

Recusal

20. When a conflict of interest is determined to exist with respect to a particular Member, the Member should, depending on what is appropriate in the circumstances, be:

- (a) Excluded from decision-making and discussions related to a defined area of work;
- (b) Excluded from decision-making but may participate in discussions related to a defined area of work; or
- (c) Excluded from participation in the matter in any other manner deemed appropriate.

21. A Member who is recused completely or partially from an area of work may nevertheless answer questions with respect to that work at the request of the TEAP, TOC or TSB.

Conflict resolution advisory body

22. The conflict resolution advisory body is not envisioned as a body that will meet on any regular basis but will come together, physically or virtually, as needed to provide advice to members or potential members and assist with resolving issues. It shall consist of Co-Chairs of the Open-Ended Working Group and the President of the Bureau of the Meeting of the Parties, with the Ozone Secretariat providing logistical, technical legal and administrative support and advice to the body. No additional travel support or other financial support will be provided to members serving on the body.

Annex to the terms of reference

The following is an illustrative list of the types of interests that should be disclosed:

- (a) A current proprietary interest of a member or his/her personal partner or dependent in a substance, technology or process (e.g., ownership of a patent) to be considered by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel or any of its technical options committees or temporary subsidiary bodies;
- (b) A current financial interest of a member or his/her personal partner or dependent, e.g., shares or bonds in an entity with an interest in the subject matter of the meeting or work (but not shareholdings through general mutual funds or similar arrangements where the expert has no control over the selection of shares);
- (c) A current employment, consultancy, directorship or other position held by a Member or his/her personal partner or dependent, whether or not paid, in any entity which has an interest in the subject matter of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel. This element of disclosure also includes paid consultancy efforts performed on behalf of an implementing agency to assist developing countries to adopt alternatives;
- (d) The provision of advice on significant issues to a government with respect to its implementation of the Montreal Protocol or engaging in the development of significant policy positions of a government for a Montreal Protocol meeting;
- (e) Performance of any paid research activities or receipt of any fellowships or grants for work related to a proposed use of an ozone-depleting substance or an alternative to a proposed use of an ozone depleting substance;

Decision XXIV/9: Controlled substances used on ships

Noting with appreciation the report provided by the Ozone Secretariat in response to decision XXIII/11,

1. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to provide together with its 2013 progress report an updated version of the information provided in its previous progress reports on transport refrigeration in the maritime sector;

2. To invite parties to encourage relevant stakeholders to minimize the use of controlled substances in newly built ships and to consider environmentally benign and energy-efficient alternatives wherever they are available;
3. To revisit the issue at the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group;

Decision XXIV/10: Review by the Scientific Assessment Panel of RC-316c

Recalling decisions IX/24, X/8, XI/19 and XIII/5 of the Meeting of the Parties pertaining to new substances,

Noting that the Scientific Assessment Panel has developed procedures for assessing the ozone-depletion potential of new substances,

1. To invite parties in a position to do so to provide environmental assessments of RC-316c (1,2-dichloro-1,2,3,3,4,4-hexafluorocyclobutane, CAS 356-18-3), a chlorofluorocarbon not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, and any guidance on practices that can reduce intentional releases of the substance;
2. To request the Scientific Assessment Panel to conduct a preliminary assessment of RC-316c and report to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-third meeting on the ozone-depletion potential and global-warming potential of the substance and other factors that the Panel deems relevant;

Decision XXIV/11: Evaluation of the financial mechanism

Noting that the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol is an efficient and effective instrument for enabling compliance with the Protocol by parties operating under paragraph 1 of its Article 5,

Recognizing that parties consider periodic evaluations of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol an important means of ensuring the continued efficiency and effectiveness of the Multilateral Fund,

Recognizing also the role of the Multilateral Fund as a cornerstone of the Montreal Protocol and as a key mechanism for the success of the ozone layer regime,

1. To note with appreciation the report on the 2012 evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol;¹
2. To request the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund, within its mandate, to consider the report on the 2012 evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol, as appropriate, in the process of continuously improving the management of the Multilateral Fund;

Decision XXIV/12: Differences between data reported on imports and data reported on exports

Noting differences in data on imports and exports of controlled substances submitted by the parties under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, and recognizing that while such shipments may have plausible explanations such as shipments over the end of a calendar year or the submission of incomplete data, they may also result from illegal trade activities or from not complying with domestic legislation without criminal intent,

Noting also that in the Article 7 data reporting format, as last revised by decision XVII/16, parties exporting controlled substances are requested to submit to the Ozone Secretariat information on countries of destination, while there is no request for parties importing controlled substances with regard to the country of origin,

Noting further that the absence of a request for importing countries to submit information on source countries makes the process of clarification of differences complex and burdensome for both importing and exporting countries,

Mindful that the further improvement of data reporting systems will facilitate the prevention of the illegal trade in controlled substances,

¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/INF/4, annex.

Recalling decisions IV/14 and IX/34, which provided some clarification on how to report transshipments and imports for re-export and thereby provided an indication on what country is to be considered as country of origin,

1. To request the Ozone Secretariat to revise, before 1 January 2013, the reporting format resulting from decision XVII/16 to include in the data forms an annex indicating the exporting party for the quantities reported as import, and noting that the annex is excluded from the reporting requirements under Article 7 and that the provision of the information in the annex would be done on a voluntary basis;
2. To request the Ozone Secretariat to compile every January aggregated information on controlled substances by annex and group received from the importing/re-importing party and to provide this uniquely and solely to the exporting party concerned when requested, in a manner that will maintain information deemed to be confidential in accordance with decision I/11;
3. To invite parties to enhance cooperation with the view to clarifying any differences in import and export data as provided by the Ozone Secretariat in accordance with paragraph 2 above;
4. To invite parties to consider participation in the informal Prior Informed Consent (iPIC) scheme as a means to improve information about their potential imports of controlled substances;

Decision XXIV/13: Data and information provided by the parties in accordance with Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol

Noting with appreciation that 194 parties of the 196 that should have reported data for 2011 have done so, and that 99 of those parties reported their data by 30 June 2012 in accordance with decision XV/15,

Noting further that 173 of those parties reported their data by 30 September 2012 as required under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol,

Noting with concern, however, that the following parties have not reported 2011 data: Mali, and Sao Tome and Principe,

Noting that their failure to report their 2011 data in accordance with Article 7 places those parties in non-compliance with their data-reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol until such time as the Secretariat receives their outstanding data,

Noting also that a lack of timely data reporting by parties impedes effective monitoring and assessment of parties' compliance with their obligations under the Montreal Protocol,

Noting further that reporting 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 of the Protocol to comply with the Protocol's control measures,

1. To urge the parties listed in the present decision, where appropriate, to work closely with the implementing agencies to report the required data to the Secretariat as a matter of urgency;
2. To request the Implementation Committee to review the situation of those parties at its fiftieth meeting;
3. 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;

Decision XXIV/14: Reporting of zero in Article 7 data reporting forms

Recalling the need for consistent reporting of production, imports, exports and destruction of ozone-depleting substances in accordance with article 7 of the Montreal Protocol,

Noting that the forms for reporting in accordance with article 7 submitted by parties sometimes contain blank cells, in which no numbers indicating quantities of ozone-depleting substances are entered,

Noting also that such blank cells could be intended by a party in a given case to indicate zero controlled substances or, alternatively, could represent non-reporting by that party in respect of those substances,

1. To request parties, when reporting production, imports, exports or destruction, to enter a number in each cell in the data reporting forms that they submit, including zero, where appropriate, rather than leaving the cell blank;
2. To ask the Secretariat to request clarification from any party that submits a reporting form containing a blank cell;

Decision XXIV/15: Reporting of information on quarantine and pre-shipment use of methyl bromide

Recalling the need for improved reporting on methyl bromide consumption for quarantine and pre-shipment uses,

Recalling also decision XXIII/5, in particular its paragraph 2, in which the Meeting of the Parties invited parties in a position to do so, on a voluntary basis, to submit information to the Ozone Secretariat by 31 March 2013 on:

- (a) The amount of methyl bromide used to comply with phytosanitary requirements of destination countries; and
- (b) Phytosanitary requirements for imported commodities that must be met through the use of methyl bromide,

Recalling further decision XXIII/5, in particular its paragraph 3, in which the Meeting of the Parties urged parties to comply with the reporting requirements of Article 7 and to provide data on the amount of methyl bromide used for quarantine and pre-shipment applications annually and invited parties in a position to do so, on a voluntary basis, to supplement such data by reporting to the Secretariat information on methyl bromide uses recorded and collated pursuant to the recommendation of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures,

1. To consider at the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group whether to ask the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to undertake an analysis of trends in Article 7 data on methyl bromide use for quarantine and pre-shipment, taking into account the information submitted in accordance with decision XXIII/5 and how to improve the information;
2. To request the Ozone Secretariat to remind parties that they are invited to submit information by 31 March 2013, on a voluntary basis, in accordance with paragraph 2 of decision XXIII/5;
3. To invite parties that have not yet established procedures for data collection on methyl bromide use for quarantine and pre-shipment or wish to improve existing procedures to consider using the elements identified as essential by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel in section 10.4.4 of its 2012 progress report;
4. To request the Ozone Secretariat to upload to its website the forms that have been provided as examples in section 10.4.2 of the 2012 progress report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel;

Decision XXIV/16: Requests for the revision of baseline data by Algeria, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Haiti, the Niger, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey

Noting that, in accordance with decision XIII/15, by which the Thirteenth Meeting of the Parties decided that parties requesting the revision of reported baseline data should present such requests to the Implementation Committee, which in turn would work with the Secretariat and the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol to confirm the justification for the changes and present them to the Meeting of the Parties for approval,

Noting also that decision XV/19 sets out the methodology for the submission of such requests,

1. That Algeria, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Haiti, the Niger, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey have presented sufficient information, in accordance with decision XV/19, to justify their requests for the revision of their consumption data for hydrochlorofluorocarbons for 2009, 2010 or both, which are part of the baseline for parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5;

2. To approve the requests of the parties listed in the preceding paragraph and to revise their baseline hydrochlorofluorocarbon consumption data for the respective years as indicated in the following table:

Party	Previous HCFC data				New HCFC data			
	(metric tonnes)		(ODP-tonnes)		(metric tonnes)		(ODP-tonnes)	
	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010
1. Algeria	497.75	497.75	30.2	30.2	1 061.6	1 122.5	60.35	63.88
2. Ecuador	379.89	261.8	20.7	14.3	469.01	386.45	25.74	21.24
3. Equatorial Guinea	253	-	13.9	-	113	-	6.22	-
4. Eritrea	1.8	1.9	0.1	0.1	19.1	20.31	1.05	1.12
5. Haiti	35.308	33.41	1.9	1.8	70	62	3.85	3.41
6. Niger	660	-	36.3	-	290	-	15.95	-
7. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia ^a	57.332	-	4	-	41.632	-	2.29	-
8. Turkey	-	8 900.721	-	606.0	-	7 041.25	-	493.03

^a The request for a revision of baseline data from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia relates only to the exclusion of HCFCs contained in imported pre-blended polyols from its HCFC consumption.

Decision XXIV/17: Status of the establishment of licensing systems under Article 4B of the Montreal Protocol

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

Noting with appreciation that 191 of the 192 parties to the Montreal Amendment to the Protocol have established import and export licensing systems for ozone-depleting substances as required by the Amendment and that they have provided disaggregated information on their licensing systems detailing which annexes and groups of substances under the Montreal Protocol are subject to those systems,

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

Recognizing also that the successful phase-out of most ozone-depleting substances by parties is largely attributable to the establishment and implementation of licensing systems to control the import and export of ozone-depleting substances,

1. To congratulate South Sudan for having recently ratified all amendments to the Montreal Protocol, and to request the party to establish an import and export licensing system for ozone-depleting substances consistent with Article 4 B of the Protocol and to report to the Secretariat by 30 September 2013 on the establishment of that system;

2. To urge the Gambia, which operates a licensing system for ozone-depleting substances that does not include export controls, to ensure that that system is structured in accordance with Article 4 B of the Protocol and that it provides for the licensing of exports and to report thereon to the Secretariat;

3. To encourage Botswana, which is non-party to the Montreal Amendment to the Protocol and has not yet established a licensing system to control imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances, to ratify the Amendment and to establish such a licensing system;

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

Decision XXIV/18: Non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol by Ukraine

Noting that Ukraine ratified the Montreal Protocol on 20 September 1988, the London Amendment on 6 February 1997, the Copenhagen Amendment on 4 April 2002 and the Montreal and Beijing amendments on 4 May 2007 and is classified as a party not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol,

Noting also that the Global Environment Facility has approved funding in the amount of \$26,777,501 to facilitate Ukraine's compliance with its Montreal Protocol obligations,

Noting further the consultations between the Implementation Committee and representatives of Ukraine regarding that party's non-compliance with its Protocol obligations,

Acknowledging with appreciation Ukraine's significant efforts to return to compliance with the Montreal Protocol,

1. That Ukraine's reported annual consumption for the controlled substances in Annex C, group I (hydrochlorofluorocarbons, or HCFCs) of 86.9 ODP-tonnes for 2010 and 93.3 for 2011 exceeds the party's maximum allowable consumption of 41.1 ODP-tonnes for those controlled substances for those years and that the party was therefore in non-compliance with the consumption control measures under the Montreal Protocol for HCFCs in 2010 and 2011;

2. To record with appreciation the submission by Ukraine of a plan of action to ensure its prompt return to compliance with the Protocol's HCFC control measures, under which, without prejudice to the operation of the Global Environment Facility, Ukraine specifically commits itself:

(a) To reducing its HCFC consumption to no greater than:

(i) 86.90 ODP-tonnes in 2013;

(ii) 51.30 ODP-tonnes in 2014;

(iii) 16.42 ODP-tonnes in 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019;

(iv) Zero by 1 January 2020, save for consumption restricted to the servicing of refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment between the period 2020 and 2030 as prescribed in the Protocol;

(b) To implementing its system for licensing imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances and a quota system for such imports and exports, and to making it operational;

(c) To introducing as soon as possible a gradual ban on imports of equipment containing or relying on ozone-depleting substances and to monitoring its operation once introduced;

(d) To pursuing the passage of new legislation to more closely control ozone-depleting substances;

3. To note that the measures listed in paragraph 2 above should enable Ukraine to return to compliance with the Protocol's HCFC control measures in 2015, and to urge the party to work with the relevant implementing agencies to implement its plan of action to phase out its consumption of HCFCs;

4. To monitor closely the progress of Ukraine with regard to the implementation of each of the parts of its plan of action to phase out HCFCs, as outlined in paragraph 2 above. To the degree that the party is working toward and meeting the specific Protocol control measures, it should continue to be treated in the same manner as a party in good standing. In that regard, Ukraine should continue to receive international assistance to enable it to meet those commitments in accordance with item A of the indicative list of measures that may be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance;

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

Decision XXIV/19: Membership changes on the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel

1. To thank the Technology and Assessment Panel for its outstanding reports and to thank the individual members of the panel for their outstanding service and dedication;

2. To thank Mr. Stephen O. Andersen for his long and outstanding service as Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel as he transitions to a role as a Senior Expert of the Panel;

3. To endorse the selection of Mr. Andersen as a Senior Expert of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel for a term of one year in accordance with section 2.3 of the terms of reference of the Panel;
4. To endorse the selection of Ms. Bella Maranion as Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel for a term of four years in accordance with section 2.3 of the terms of reference of the Panel;
5. To endorse the reappointment of Mr. Lambert J. M. Kuijpers as Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and Co-Chair of the Refrigeration, Air Conditioning and Heat Pumps Technical Options Committee for a term of two years in accordance with section 2.3 of the terms of reference of the Panel;
6. To endorse the reappointment of Mr. Daniel P. Verdonik to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel as Co-Chair of the Halons Technical Options Committee for a term of four years in accordance with section 2.3 of the terms of reference of the Panel;
7. To endorse the reappointment of Mr. Ashley Woodcock to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel as Co-Chair of the Medical Technical Options Committee for a term of four years in accordance with section 2.3 of the terms of reference of the Panel;
8. To endorse the reappointment of Mr. David Catchpole to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel as Co-Chair of the Halons Technical Options Committee for a term of four years in accordance with section 2.3 of the terms of reference of the Panel;
9. To endorse the reappointment of Mr. Paul Ashford to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel as Co-Chair of the Flexible and Rigid Foams Technical Options Committee for a term of four years in accordance with section 2.3 of the terms of reference of the Panel;

Decision XXIV/20: Endorsement of the new co-chair of the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel

1. To thank Ms. Tang Xiaoyan (China), who served as co-chair of the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel, for her long and outstanding service on behalf of the Montreal Protocol;
2. To endorse the selection of Mr. Shao Min (China) as the new co-chair of the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel.

Decision XXIV/21: Membership of the Implementation Committee

1. To note with appreciation the work done in 2012 by the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol;
2. To confirm the positions of Lebanon, Poland, Saint Lucia, the United States of America and Zambia as members of the Committee for one further year and to select Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cuba, Italy and Morocco as members of the Committee for a two-year period beginning 1 January 2013;
3. To note the selection of Mr. Janusz Kozakiewicz (Poland) to serve as President and of Ms. Azra Rogovic-Grubic (Bosnia and Herzegovina) to serve as Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Committee for one year beginning 1 January 2013;

Decision XXIV/22: Membership of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund

1. To note with appreciation the work done by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol with the assistance of the Fund secretariat in 2012;
2. To endorse the selection of Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Finland, Japan, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America as members of the Executive Committee representing parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol and the selection of India, Kuwait, Mali, Nicaragua, Serbia, Uganda and Uruguay as members representing parties operating under that paragraph, for one year beginning 1 January 2013;
3. To note the selection of Ms. Fiona Walters (United Kingdom) to serve as Chair and Mr. Vladan Zdravkovic (Serbia) to serve as Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee for one year beginning 1 January 2013.

Decision XXIV/23: Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

To endorse the selection of Mr. Patrick McInerney (Australia) and Mr. Javier Camargo (Colombia) as Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in 2013;

Decision XXIV/24: Financial reports of the trust funds and budgets for the Montreal Protocol

Recalling decision XXIII/17 on financial matters,

Taking note of the financial report on the Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer for the biennium 2010-2011, ended 31 December 2011,

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

Welcoming the continued efficient management by the Secretariat of the finances of the Montreal Protocol Trust Fund,

1. To approve the revision of the 2012 budget in the amount of \$4,920,762 United States dollars and the budget of \$4,927,420 for 2013, as set out in annex I to the report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol;
2. To authorize the Secretariat to draw down \$643,829 in 2012 and \$650,487 in 2013, and to note the proposed drawdown of \$493,049 in 2014;
3. To approve, as a consequence of the drawdowns referred to in paragraph 2 above, total contributions to be paid by the parties of \$4,276,933 for 2012 and 2013, and to note the contributions of \$4,276,933 for 2014, as set out in annex II to the report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol;
4. That the contributions of individual parties for 2012 and 2013 shall be listed in annex II to the report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties;
5. To reaffirm an operating cash reserve at a level of 15 per cent of the annual budget to be used to meet the final expenditures under the Trust Fund;
6. To request the Secretariat to indicate, in future financial reports of the trust funds for the Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Montreal Protocol, the amounts under "Total reserves and fund balances" which are associated with contributions that have not yet been received;
7. To encourage parties, non-parties and other stakeholders to contribute financially and with other means to assist members of the three assessment panels and their subsidiary bodies with their continued participation in the assessment activities under the Protocol;
8. To note with concern that a number of parties have not paid their contribution for 2011 and prior years, and to urge those parties to pay both their outstanding contributions and their future contributions promptly and in full;
9. To authorize the Executive Secretary to enter into discussions with any party whose contributions are outstanding for two or more years with a view to finding a way forward, and to request that the Executive Secretary report to the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties on the outcome of the discussions;
10. To reaffirm the importance of the full participation of non-Article 5 parties and Article 5 parties in the activities of the Meeting of the Parties;
11. To encourage parties that are still receiving hard copies of meeting documents to access such documentation through the Ozone Secretariat website instead;

Decision XXIV/25: Dates and Venue of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

To convene the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in Kyiv, Ukraine, in October 2013.

XI. Adoption of the report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

244. The parties adopted the present report on Friday, 16 November 2012, on the basis of the draft report set out in documents UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/L.1 and add.1-3.

XII. Closure of the meeting

245. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the meeting was declared closed at 10.10 p.m. on Friday, 16 November 2012.

Annex I

**Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer
Approved 2012 and 2013 and proposed 2014 budgets**

		w/m	2012 (US\$)	w/m	2013 (US\$)	2014 (US\$)
10	PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT					
1100	Project personnel					
	1101 Executive Secretary (D-2) (shared with the Vienna Convention, VC)	6	166,000	6	170,980	185,980
	1102 Deputy Executive Secretary (D-1)	12	302,538	12	311,614	320,962
	1103 Senior Legal Officer (P-5)	12	208,711	12	214,972	214,972
	1104 Senior Scientific Affairs Officer (P-5) (shared with VC)	6	110,000	6	113,300	116,699
	1105 Senior Administrative Officer (P-5) (paid by UNEP)		0		0	0
	1106 Programme Officer (Information System & Technology - P-4)	12	154,618	12	159,257	164,035
	1107 Programme Officer (Communication & Information - P-3) (paid from VC)	12	0	12	0	0
	1108 Programme Officer (Monitoring and Compliance - P-4)	12	193,640	12	199,449	205,432
	1109 Webmaster (P-2) ¹	12		12	0	0
1199	Sub-total		1,135,507		1,169,572	1,208,081
1200	Consultants					
	1201 Assistance in data-reporting, analysis and promotion of the implementation of the Protocol		75,000		75,000	75,000
1299	Sub-total		75,000		75,000	75,000
1300	Administrative Support					
	1301 Administrative Assistant (G-7) (shared with VC)	6	21,888	6	22,545	23,221
	1302 Administrative Assistant (G-6)	12	28,350	12	29,768	31,256
	1303 Programme Assistant (G-6) (paid from VC)	12	0	12	0	0
	1304 Programme Assistant (Data)(G-6) (shared with VC)	6	18,452	6	19,375	19,375
	1305 Research Assistant (G-6) (shared with VC)	6	16,295	6	16,295	16,295
	1306 Information Management Assistant (G-6)	12	28,387	12	29,239	29,239
	1307 Data Assistant (Computer Information)	12	44,704	12	47,386	47,386

		w/m	2012 (US\$)	w/m	2013 (US\$)	2014 (US\$)
	Systems Assistant) (G-7)					
1308	Administrative Assistant - Fund (G-7) - paid by UNEP-(approved for upgrade to P-2 - Associate Administrative Officer) ²	12	0	12	0	0
1309	Team Assistant/Logistics Assistant (G-4) (paid by UNEP)	12	0	12	0	0
1310	Meetings Services Assistant/Bilingual Senior Secretary (G-6) (paid from VC)	12	0	12	0	0
1320	Temporary Assistance		21,300		21,300	21,300
1321	Open-ended Working Group Meetings		490,000		490,000	490,000
1322	Preparatory and Parties Meetings (shared with VC every three years, applies to the twenty-third and twenty-sixth Meetings of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol and Ninth and Tenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention in 2011 and 2014)		500,000		500,000	350,000
1323	Assessment Panel Meetings		75,000		75,000	75,000
1324	Bureau Meeting		20,000		20,000	20,000
1325	Implementation Committee Meetings		111,200		111,200	111,200
1326	MP informal consultation meetings		10,000		10,000	10,000
1399	Sub-total		1,385,575		1,392,107	1,244,272
1600	Travel on Official Business					
1601	Staff travel on official business		210,000		210,000	210,000
1602	Conference Services staff travel on official business		15,000		15,000	15,000
1699	Sub-total		225,000		225,000	225,000
1999	COMPONENT TOTAL		2,821,083		2,861,679	2,752,353
20	CONTRACTS					
2300	Subcontracts ³					
2301			57,134		0	0
2399	Sub-total		57,134		0	0

		w/m	2012 (US\$)	w/m	2013 (US\$)	2014 (US\$)
2999	COMPONENT TOTAL		57,134		0	0
30	MEETING/PARTICIPATION COMPONENT					
3300	Support for Participation					
3301	Assessment Panel Meetings ⁴		400,000		450,000	420,000
3302	Preparatory and Parties Meetings (Montreal Protocol bears the cost of the participation of MP & VC delegates from A5 countries at the joint 23rd MOP and 9th COP in 2011)		350,000		350,000	350,000
3303	Open-ended Working Group Meetings		300,000		300,000	300,000
3304	Bureau Meeting		20,000		20,000	20,000
3305	Implementation Committee Meetings		125,000		125,000	125,000
3306	Consultations in an informal meeting		10,000		10,000	10,000
3399	Sub-total		1,205,000		1,255,000	1,225,000
3999	COMPONENT TOTAL		1,205,000		1,255,000	1,225,000
40	EQUIPMENT AND PREMISES COMPONENT					
4100	Expendable Equipment (items under \$1,500)					
4101	Miscellaneous expendables (shared with VC)		20,000		20,000	20,000
4199	Sub-total		20,000		20,000	20,000
4200	Non-Expendable Equipment					
4201	Personal computers and accessories		5,000		5,000	5,000
4202	Portable computers		5,000		5,000	5,000
4203	Other office equipment (server, fax, scanner, furniture etc.)		5,000		5,000	5,000
4204	Photocopiers (for external use)		5,000		5,000	5,000
4205	Equipment and peripherals for paperless conferences		10,000		5,000	5,000
4299	Sub-total		30,000		25,000	25,000
4300	Premises					
4301	Rental of office premises (shared with VC)		49,440		51,870	51,870
4399	Sub-total		49,440		51,870	51,870
4999	COMPONENT TOTAL		99,440		96,870	96,870
50	MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT					
5100	Operation and Maintenance of Equipment					
5101	Maintenance of equipment and others (shared with VC)		20,000		20,000	20,000
5199	Sub-total		20,000		20,000	20,000
5200	Reporting Costs					

		w/m	2012 (US\$)	w/m	2013 (US\$)	2014 (US\$)
	5201	Reporting	20,000		25,000	25,000
	5202	Reporting (Assessment Panels)	10,000		10,000	10,000
	5203	Reporting (Protocol Awareness)	5,000		5,000	5,000
5299		Sub-total	35,000		40,000	40,000
5300		Sundry				
	5301	Communications	20,000		20,000	20,000
	5302	Freight charges	25,000		25,000	25,000
	5303	Training	12,000		12,000	12,000
	5304	Others (International Ozone Day)	40,000		10,000	10,000
5399		Sub-total	97,000		67,000	67,000
5400		Hospitality				
	5401	Hospitality	20,000		20,000	20,000
5499		Sub-total	20,000		20,000	20,000
5999	COMPONENT TOTAL		172,000		147,000	147,000
99	TOTAL DIRECT PROJECT COST		4,354,657		4,360,549	4,221,223
	<i>Programme support costs (13%)</i>		566,105		566,871	548,759
	GRAND TOTAL (inclusive of programme support costs)		4,920,762		4,927,420	4,769,982
	Operating cash reserve exclusive of PSC		0		0	0
	TOTAL BUDGET		4,920,762		4,927,420	4,769,982
	Draw down ⁵		643,829		650,487	493,049
	Contribution from the Parties		4,276,933		4,276,933	4,276,933

¹ For the substantive and technical operations, as well as the maintenance of the different web sites managed by the Secretariat for the delivery of essential communications services which is envisaged to be discharged by a dedicated webmaster, the Parties request the Secretariat to explore the possibility of collaborating with UNEP, other organizations in the United Nations system, as well as external services to deliver the required website services, and report the findings to the next meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

² The upgrade of this post from G-7 level to P-2 (Associate Administrative Officer) is not intended to set a precedent for future decisions.

³ In accordance with decision XXII/2, and under the decision created by that decision, the Secretariat entered into a contract with ICF International for the preparation of an evaluation of the financial mechanism.

⁴ Budget line covers participation of Article 5 TEAP experts to enable the timely completion of the work requested by the Parties.

⁵ Draw down levels were set with a view to maintaining the level of contributions constant through 2013.

Explanatory notes for the approved 2012 and 2013, and proposed 2014 budgets of the Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

Budget line	Comment
Personnel component 1101–1108	Indicative Professional salary costs applicable to the relevant duty stations have been used for the budget proposals. Where information on actual staff costs is available, however, the figures have been adjusted accordingly, as in budget lines 1102 and 1104. Unspent commitments normally revert to the Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol.
1105	The post of the Senior Administrative Officer continues to be paid by UNEP from the 13 per cent programme support costs.
1109	Webmaster post – For the substantive and technical operations, as well as the maintenance of the different web sites managed by the Secretariat for the delivery of essential communications services which is envisaged to be discharged by dedicated webmaster, the Parties requested the Secretariat to explore the possibility of collaborating with UNEP, other organizations in the United Nations system, as well as external services to deliver the required website services, and report the findings to the next meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.
Consultants – 1201	Assistance in data reporting, updating of publications, translation of essential features of the Ozone Secretariat website and the maintenance of a fully interlinked digital system at the Secretariat will continue to be required. Funds under this line may be transferred to line 1100 to create or support short-term Professional posts if necessary.
Administrative support/personnel 1301- 1309 1308	Standard General Service salary costs applicable to the Nairobi duty station have been used for the 2013–2014 budget proposals. The upgrade of this post from G-7 level to P-2 level (Associate Administrative Officer) is not intended to set a precedent for future decisions.
1310	The post of Bilingual Secretary is funded from the Vienna Convention Trust Fund. Necessary funds may be transferred from the conference servicing budget lines (1321–1326) should such services be required, either through individual consultancies or corporate contracts.
Administrative support/Conference services – 1321–1326	The current conference servicing costs have been based on the following reasons and assumptions: 1321: The budget proposed is for one meeting of the Open-ended Working Group to be held each year in 2013 and 2014 in Nairobi or at another United Nations venue, in the six official United Nations languages; 1322: The Montreal Protocol budget for 2014 will be shared with the Vienna Convention budget for the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention; The budgeted amount is based on the estimated cost of holding the Meeting of the Parties in Nairobi in 2013 and 2014, in the six official United Nations languages. Any additional costs arising from holding the meetings in a location other than Nairobi will be borne by the Governments hosting the meetings; 1323: The budget allocation in 2013 and 2014 will cover the costs of organizing annual meetings of the assessment panels and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel’s technical options committees, together with communication and other sundry costs related to the work of Panel members from developing countries and countries with economies in transition;

Budget line	Comment
	1324: One Bureau meeting is scheduled for each of the years 2013 and 2014, with provision for interpretation and document translation into the appropriate languages based on the membership of the Bureau;
	1325: At least two Implementation Committee meetings of three days' duration are scheduled for each of the years 2013 and 2014, with interpretation and document translation as required, to be held back-to-back with the Open-ended Working Group meetings and the meetings of the parties in those years;
	1326: At least one informal consultation meeting per year, expected to take place in Nairobi, is envisaged for 2013 and 2014 to facilitate the work of assisting the parties and promoting ratification of and compliance with the Montreal Protocol and its amendments.
Travel on official business – 1601–1602	Travel on official business for 2013 and 2014 is being maintained at the 2012 level.
Meetings/Participation component – 3300	Participation of representatives of developing countries The participation of representatives of parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in the various Protocol meetings is budgeted at \$5,000 per meeting per representative, taking into account no more than one person's travel costs per country, using the most appropriate and advantageous economy-class fare and United Nations daily subsistence allowances.
3301	The budget provision requested in 2012 for travel of members and experts of the assessment panels and the technical options committees attending assessment panel meetings has been reduced by \$50,000 to reflect the expected level of expenditure for the year. Additional funds will be requested as required for the next assessment process.
3302	In 2014, the total participation costs based on some 80 participants attending the joint meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, will be borne fully by the Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol.
3303	Participation costs are based on some 60 participants attending the Open-ended Working Group meetings in both 2013 and 2014.
3304	Participation costs are based on one Bureau meeting per year for four Bureau members from developing countries or countries with economies in transition at each meeting.
3305	The participation costs for the two Implementation Committee meetings per year are based on eight members from developing countries and countries with economies in transition at each meeting and one representative each from three or four countries invited by the Implementation Committee at each meeting. Provision has also been made for travel by the Implementation Committee President or Vice-President from a country operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 to attend three Executive Committee meetings a year.
3306	Funds have been allocated to finance the participation of two participants from developing countries and countries with economies in transition in informal consultations in 2013 and 2014 on critical issues relating to the Montreal Protocol. It is expected that these consultations will be held in Nairobi.
Equipment and premises component	A small amount has been allocated to provide for increased server capacity, as required, to cope with the demands of paperless meetings and to enable the Secretariat to replace equipment as required.
Non-expendable equipment – 4203	
Premises (rent) – 4300	The allocation for rental of premises in 2013 and 2014 has been based on Nairobi rental rates imposed by the United Nations Controller.

Budget line	Comment
Miscellaneous component	
Reporting costs (including editing, translation, duplication, publication and printing) – 5201–5203	General reporting costs for the Secretariat are provided for under these lines. Line 5201 is being reduced minimally in 2012 to reflect projected savings due to reduced duplication, publication and printing. Line 5202 is reserved for reporting of assessment panels. A small amount is allocated in line 5203 for any editing, translation, duplication, publication and printing related to Protocol awareness campaigns.
Sundry – Communications – 5301	Careful monitoring of telecommunications resources and the use of electronic mail instead of facsimile communications enable the Secretariat to maintain a relatively low budget provision under this line. Line 5301 is being reduced minimally in 2012 to reflect projected savings due to increased usage of communications facilities available within the computing systems.
Training – 5303	The provision for training will be maintained to meet evolving training needs and to cater for training schemes introduced by the United Nations as a result of its continuing human resources reform programme and guidelines for continuous training to encourage high performance delivery of staff.
Others (International Ozone Day) – 5304	The Ozone Secretariat will continue to provide assistance to specific countries during 2012 and 2013 to assist in their preparations for the celebration of the International Day for the Preservation of the Ozone Layer. In 2012, this line is being increased by \$30,000 from the originally approved level of \$10,000 to augment the funds required to support celebrations of International Ozone Day and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Montreal Protocol at the national level.

Annex II**Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol on the Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer****Scale of contributions by the parties for 2012 and 2013 based on the United Nations scale of assessments****(General Assembly resolution 64/248 of 24 December 2009 with a maximum assessment rate of 22 per cent)****(United States dollars)**

NAME OF PARTY	UN scale of assessment for years 2010-2012	Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors	Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered	2012 & 2013 CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTIES	INDICATIVE 2014 CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTIES
Afghanistan	0.004	0.000	0.000	0	0
Albania	0.010	0.000	0.000	0	0
Algeria	0.128	0.128	0.128	5,465	5,465
Andorra	0.007	0.000	0.000	0	0
Angola	0.010	0.000	0.000	0	0
Antigua and Barbuda	0.002	0.000	0.000	0	0
Argentina	0.287	0.287	0.287	12,255	12,255
Armenia	0.005	0.000	0.000	0	0
Australia	1.933	1.933	1.930	82,537	82,537
Austria	0.851	0.851	0.850	36,337	36,337
Azerbaijan	0.015	0.000	0.000	0	0
Bahamas	0.018	0.000	0.000	0	0
Bahrain	0.039	0.000	0.000	0	0
Bangladesh	0.010	0.000	0.000	0	0
Barbados	0.008	0.000	0.000	0	0
Belarus	0.042	0.000	0.000	0	0
Belgium	1.075	1.075	1.073	45,901	45,901
Belize	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Benin	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Bhutan	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Bolivia Plurinational State of)	0.007	0.000	0.000	0	0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.014	0.000	0.000	0	0
Botswana	0.018	0.000	0.000	0	0
Brazil	1.611	1.611	1.608	68,788	68,788
Brunei Darussalam	0.028	0.000	0.000	0	0
Bulgaria	0.038	0.000	0.000	0	0
Burkina Faso	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Burundi	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Cambodia	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Cameroon	0.011	0.000	0.000	0	0
Canada	3.207	3.207	3.202	136,935	136,935

NAME OF PARTY	UN scale of assessment for years 2010-2012	Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors	Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered	2012 & 2013 CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTIES	INDICATIVE 2014 CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTIES
Cape Verde	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Central African Republic	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Chad	0.002	0.000	0.000	0	0
Chile	0.236	0.236	0.236	10,077	10,077
China	3.189	3.189	3.184	136,167	136,167
Colombia	0.144	0.144	0.144	6,149	6,149
Comoros	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Congo	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Cook Islands	-	0.000	0.000	0	0
Costa Rica	0.034	0.000	0.000	0	0
Cote d' Ivoire	0.010	0.000	0.000	0	0
Croatia	0.097	0.000	0.000	0	0
Cuba	0.071	0.000	0.000	0	0
Cyprus	0.046	0.000	0.000	0	0
Czech Republic	0.349	0.349	0.348	14,902	14,902
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.007	0.000	0.000	0	0
Democratic Republic of Congo	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Denmark	0.736	0.736	0.735	31,426	31,426
Djibouti	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Dominica	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Dominican Republic	0.042	0.000	0.000	0	0
Ecuador	0.040	0.000	0.000	0	0
Egypt	0.094	0.000	0.000	0	0
El Salvador	0.019	0.000	0.000	0	0
Equatorial Guinea	0.008	0.000	0.000	0	0
Eritrea	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Estonia	0.040	0.000	0.000	0	0
Ethiopia	0.008	0.000	0.000	0	0
European Union	2.500	2.500	2.496	106,747	106,747
Fiji	0.004	0.000	0.000	0	0
Finland	0.566	0.566	0.565	24,168	24,168
France	6.123	6.123	6.113	261,445	261,445
Gabon	0.014	0.000	0.000	0	0
Gambia	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Georgia	0.006	0.000	0.000	0	0
Germany	8.018	8.018	8.005	342,360	342,360
Ghana	0.006	0.000	0.000	0	0
Greece	0.691	0.691	0.690	29,505	29,505
Grenada	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Guatemala	0.028	0.000	0.000	0	0
Guinea	0.002	0.000	0.000	0	0
Guinea-Bissau	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0

NAME OF PARTY	UN scale of assessment for years 2010-2012	Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors	Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered	2012 & 2013 CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTIES	INDICATIVE 2014 CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTIES
Guyana	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Haiti	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Holy See	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Honduras	0.008	0.000	0.000	0	0
Hungary	0.291	0.291	0.291	12,425	12,425
Iceland	0.042	0.000	0.000	0	0
India	0.534	0.534	0.533	22,801	22,801
Indonesia	0.238	0.238	0.238	10,162	10,162
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.233	0.233	0.233	9,949	9,949
Iraq	0.020	0.000	0.000	0	0
Ireland	0.498	0.498	0.497	21,264	21,264
Israel	0.384	0.384	0.383	16,396	16,396
Italy	4.999	4.999	4.991	213,452	213,452
Jamaica	0.014	0.000	0.000	0	0
Japan	12.530	12.530	12.509	535,017	535,017
Jordan	0.014	0.000	0.000	0	0
Kazakhstan	0.076	0.000	0.000	0	0
Kenya	0.012	0.000	0.000	0	0
Kiribati	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Kuwait	0.263	0.263	0.263	11,230	11,230
Kyrgyzstan	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Latvia	0.038	0.000	0.000	0	0
Lebanon	0.033	0.000	0.000	0	0
Lesotho	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Liberia	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Libya	0.129	0.129	0.129	5,508	5,508
Liechtenstein	0.009	0.000	0.000	0	0
Lithuania	0.065	0.000	0.000	0	0
Luxembourg	0.090	0.000	0.000	0	0
Madagascar	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Malawi	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Malaysia	0.253	0.253	0.253	10,803	10,803
Maldives	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Mali	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Malta	0.017	0.000	0.000	0	0
Marshall Islands	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Mauritania	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Mauritius	0.011	0.000	0.000	0	0
Mexico	2.356	2.356	2.352	100,599	100,599
Micronesia (Federated State of)	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Monaco	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0

NAME OF PARTY	UN scale of assessment for years 2010-2012	Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors	Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered	2012 & 2013 CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTIES	INDICATIVE 2014 CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTIES
Mongolia	0.002	0.000	0.000	0	0
Montenegro	0.004	0.000	0.000	0	0
Morocco	0.058	0.000	0.000	0	0
Mozambique	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Myanmar	0.006	0.000	0.000	0	0
Namibia	0.008	0.000	0.000	0	0
Nauru	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Nepal	0.006	0.000	0.000	0	0
Netherlands	1.855	1.855	1.852	79,206	79,206
New Zealand	0.273	0.273	0.273	11,657	11,657
Nicaragua	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Niger	0.002	0.000	0.000	0	0
Nigeria	0.078	0.000	0.000	0	0
Niue	-	0.000	0.000	0	0
Norway	0.871	0.871	0.870	37,191	37,191
Oman	0.086	0.000	0.000	0	0
Pakistan	0.082	0.000	0.000	0	0
Palau	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Panama	0.022	0.000	0.000	0	0
Papua New Guinea	0.002	0.000	0.000	0	0
Paraguay	0.007	0.000	0.000	0	0
Peru	0.090	0.000	0.000	0	0
Philippines	0.090	0.000	0.000	0	0
Poland	0.828	0.828	0.827	35,355	35,355
Portugal	0.511	0.511	0.510	21,819	21,819
Qatar	0.135	0.135	0.135	5,764	5,764
Republic of Korea	2.260	2.260	2.256	96,499	96,499
Republic of Moldova	0.002	0.000	0.000	0	0
Romania	0.177	0.177	0.177	7,558	7,558
Russian Federation	1.602	1.602	1.599	68,404	68,404
Rwanda	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Saint Lucia	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Samoa	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
San Marino	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Sao Tome and Principe	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Saudi Arabia	0.830	0.830	0.829	35,440	35,440
Senegal	0.006	0.000	0.000	0	0
Serbia	0.037	0.000	0.000	0	0
Seychelles	0.002	0.000	0.000	0	0
Sierra Leone	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0

NAME OF PARTY	UN scale of assessment for years 2010-2012	Adjusted UN scale to exclude non-contributors	Adjusted UN scale with 22% maximum assessment rate considered	2012 & 2013 CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTIES	INDICATIVE 2014 CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTIES
Singapore	0.335	0.335	0.334	14,304	14,304
Slovakia	0.142	0.142	0.142	6,063	6,063
Slovenia	0.103	0.103	0.103	4,398	4,398
Solomon Islands	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Somalia	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
South Africa	0.385	0.385	0.384	16,439	16,439
Spain	3.177	3.177	3.172	135,654	135,654
Sri Lanka	0.019	0.000	0.000	0	0
Sudan	0.010	0.000	0.000	0	0
Suriname	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Swaziland	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Sweden	1.064	1.064	1.062	45,432	45,432
Switzerland	1.130	1.130	1.128	48,250	48,250
Syrian Arab Republic	0.025	0.000	0.000	0	0
Tajikistan	0.002	0.000	0.000	0	0
Thailand	0.209	0.209	0.209	8,924	8,924
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0.007	0.000	0.000	0	0
Timor-Leste	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Togo	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Tonga	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	0.044	0.000	0.000	0	0
Tunisia	0.030	0.000	0.000	0	0
Turkey	0.617	0.617	0.616	26,345	26,345
Turkmenistan	0.026	0.000	0.000	0	0
Tuvalu	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Uganda	0.006	0.000	0.000	0	0
Ukraine	0.087	0.000	0.000	0	0
United Arab Emirates	0.391	0.391	0.390	16,695	16,695
United Kingdom	6.604	6.604	6.593	281,983	281,983
United Republic of Tanzania	0.008	0.000	0.000	0	0
United States of America	22.000	22.000	21.964	939,375	939,375
Uruguay	0.027	0.000	0.000	0	0
Uzbekistan	0.010	0.000	0.000	0	0
Vanuatu	0.001	0.000	0.000	0	0
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	0.314	0.314	0.313	13,407	13,407
Viet Nam	0.033	0.000	0.000	0	0
Yemen	0.010	0.000	0.000	0	0
Zambia	0.004	0.000	0.000	0	0
Zimbabwe	0.003	0.000	0.000	0	0
Total	102.501	100.165	100.000	4,276,933	4,276,933

Annex III

Summaries of presentations by members of the assessment panels and technical options committees

I. Medical Technical Options Committee

1. Ms. Helen Tope, co-chair of the Medical Technical Options Committee, presented the Committee's addendum report on its review of additional information provided by China for its 2013 essential use-nomination of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) for metered-dose inhalers. Following bilateral discussions during the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, China had provided additional information supporting its nomination regarding CFC metered-dose inhalers containing traditional Chinese medicines as active ingredients. Ms. Tope stated that while traditional Chinese medicine had its own rationale not subjectable to the same scientific discipline as modern medicine, evidence had not been provided that demonstrated the improved efficacy of CFC metered-dose inhalers containing traditional Chinese medicines as compared with other, CFC-free forms of traditional Chinese medicines for asthma. She concluded that, owing to the availability of alternatives, the Medical Technical Options Committee did not consider CFCs for that use to be essential under decision IV/25 and that it was unable to recommend the CFCs nominated for those products. She suggested that for 2013, China might wish to consider allocating CFCs for those products from within its authorized quantity to allow time for patient transition.

II. Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee

2. Mr. Ian Porter, speaking on behalf of the three other Co-Chairs of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (Mr. Mohamed Besri, Ms. Michelle Marcotte and Ms. Marta Pizano), provided a summary of the final assessment of the critical use nominations in the 2012 round as set out in the final report of the Technical and Economic Assessment Panel of October 2012.

3. The number of nominations submitted by non-Article 5 parties had continued to decline, from a peak of 143 in 2003 to 8 in 2012. The amount of methyl bromide nominated and exempted had also continued to fall, from a peak of 16,050 tonnes in 2005 to 454 tonnes recommended for 2014. Only three non-Article 5 parties - Australia, Canada and the United States of America - were continuing to apply for critical-use nominations. Japan had ceased applying for nominations in the present round.

4. Regarding the available methyl bromide stocks, he said that Canada, Japan and the United States had reported, respectively, 0.6 tonnes, 9.7 tonnes and 1,249 tonnes. He explained that the Committee's critical-use recommendations did not take stocks into account. He noted that stocks reported by the United States were greater than the annual critical-use nominations. Table 1.3 of the final report of the Technical and Economic Assessment Panel showed the amount of stocks used and authorized by parties in 2011.

5. He then presented an overview of nominations received for pre-plant soil use of methyl bromide in 2014. Following the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, three parties had requested reassessments of their individual critical-use nominations. Consensus had not been achieved on one nomination.

6. Of the 450.088 tonnes requested, 421.474 tonnes was recommended for nominations from three parties (Australia, Canada and the United States).

7. With regard to Australian strawberry runners, the Committee considered that the transition to substrates had been successful to date in many countries. After a reassessment of further information provided by the party, a reduction of 10 per cent was still considered possible for the uptake of soilless production in early-generation nursery runners.

8. With regard to Canadian strawberry runners, the Committee also recommended soilless production as being technically feasible for 10 per cent of the nomination. Information regarding differences in the physiological performance of plants and the lack of cost-effectiveness of soilless systems were identified by the Committee as potential issues of concern for strawberry runner systems moving to soilless production.

9. With regard to United States strawberry fruit, following the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, the party had requested full reinstatement on the basis of the withdrawal of registration of methyl iodide and the unavailability of all other chemicals owing to a range of

regulations. The majority (all but one member) agreed that 45.9 tonnes should be reinstated, as methyl iodide was now unavailable, while maintaining that a reduction for the adoption of such alternatives as barrier films (totally impermeable films) would allow for a reduction in dosage rates, which, in turn, would allow for greater use alternatives, presently restricted by regulations.

10. He explained that one member had expressed a minority view that an amount of no more than 381.310 tonnes should be granted on the United States strawberry fruit nomination (i.e., 8.3 tonnes less than the majority). The minority view was that alternatives were available for a greater proportion (at least 470 ha) of the nomination than that considered by the majority (421 ha) and that too much methyl bromide had been recommended for critical uses than was justifiable under decision IX/6.

11. Key issues were the fact that most remaining critical-use nominations did not use emission control with barrier films as required by decision IX/6 and the withdrawal of methyl iodide worldwide (except in Japan) had put pressure of finding new chemical alternatives, in particular with regard to nursery issues.

12. Ms. Marcotte, Co-Chair of the Committee, presented the final assessment results of the evaluation of critical-use nominations for post-harvest uses of methyl bromide. There had been five such nominations in 2012; two for mills and food processing structures in Canada and the United States, and three for commodities in Australia and the United States. Japan had completed its adoption of alternatives for the treatment of fresh chestnuts and had not sent a critical-use nomination in 2012.

13. Australia has indicated that 2012 would be the final year for the submission of its rice critical-use nomination, as its rice processors were completing the process of adopting alternatives. Canada had indicated that if its mills continued to need methyl bromide after 2014, they would apply individually, not as an industry sector.

14. She then presented charts showing the downward trend of critical-use nominations and critical-use exemptions for each of the remaining controlled uses; in addition, a summary of the party's reasons for the application and of the Committee's review and recommendation of the critical-use nomination was given.

15. With regard to Australian rice, the Committee recommended the full nomination, which was 50 per cent of the amount granted by the parties for 2013. The Committee advised the party on steps to achieve success with phosphine fumigation, including improved temperature control.

16. With regard to Canadian flour mills, the Committee recommended the full amount, which was a 35 per cent decrease in the amount granted by the parties for 2013. The Committee noted that sulfuryl fluoride was still not approved for food contact and that pests in mills were unacceptable.

17. With regard to United States mills and food processors, the Committee recommended the full nomination, which was a 10 per cent decrease in the amount granted by the parties for 2013. The recommendation was disaggregated as follows: rice milling, 2.220 t; pet food facilities, 4.199 t; and mills, 16.38 t. In view of the slowing pace of the adoption of alternatives, the Committee requested an updated phase-out plan.

18. With regard to United States dried fruits and nuts, the Committee's interim recommendation was a 34 per cent decrease taken from the dried fruit sector of that critical-use nomination; the party had originally nominated a 10 per cent decrease over the amount nominated for 2013. Following the party's request to re-evaluate and the submission of further information, the Committee had been able to recommend the full amount. The Committee had asked for an updated phase-out plan.

19. With regard to United States dry-cure pork, the Committee had been unable to make an assessment in its interim report pending the receipt of further information. The party had conducted a survey of methyl bromide use in the sector and had submitted it, together with additional information, to the Committee. The critical-use nomination was then re-reviewed. The Committee made the following comments: while there were no effective and registered alternatives to methyl bromide, it was concerned that the variability of the frequency of fumigation between facilities was not reflective of an appropriate use of methyl bromide. The Committee recommended that those facilities having the highest number of fumigations should reduce by one fumigation per year, plus a 10 per cent contingency amount. A spreadsheet reflecting the recommendation on a facility basis was provided in the text box. The resulting recommendation was a 34 per cent decrease in the amount nominated.

20. Ms. Marta Pizano, co-chair of the Committee, presented changes made to the handbook of critical use nominations. She said the seventh draft version had been revised by the Committee in time for the submission of the remaining critical-use nominations by non-Article 5 parties and by Article 5 parties seeking methyl bromide use after 2015. Selected sections had been moved within the document to facilitate information flow and simplify the critical-use nomination process; the section relating to

the code of conduct removed, as the Committee did not consider that it belonged in the document; and the nomination forms updated so that only one form was proposed for both new and continuing nominations, for both soils and structures and commodities.

21. She explained that requests included in the handbook for information that was rarely or never supplied by the parties had been removed from the structures and commodities sections, such as potential market penetration of newly deployed alternatives and alternatives that may be used in the future to bring forward the estimated time when methyl bromide consumption could be reduced or eliminated; and that section 14 of the structures and commodities form on “use/ emission minimization measures” had been simplified.

22. Ms. Pizano then highlighted the fact that standard assumptions used to evaluate critical-use nominations had not been changed, although their position within the document had, and that economic indicators had been clarified to reflect standard agricultural economic practice and accommodate differences between soils and structures and commodities. She said that the Committee had suggested updating deadlines applying to non-Article 5 parties for the annual submission of critical-use nominations, in accordance with decision Ex. I/4 to reflect the situation of Article 5 parties, and that parties might wish to amend that decision to reflect those dates or simply adopt them through the new version of the handbook.

23. In finalizing her presentation, Ms. Pizano presented the workplan of the Committee for the coming year, highlighting deadlines relating to the critical-use nomination process and tentative meeting dates for the Committee.

III. Scientific Assessment Panel

24. Mr. Paul Newman, co-chairs of the Scientific Assessment Panel, spoke on three topics: (a) the status of the 2014 assessment report of the Scientific Assessment Panel; (b) issues relating to carbon tetrachloride; and (c) preliminary findings relating to a potential new emission, R-316c.

25. In November 2011, the parties had defined the terms of reference (decision XXIII/13) for the next scientific assessment of ozone depletion. The co-chairs had met in Paris from 15 to 17 October to discuss the outline of the new assessment and had drafted a communication to the parties seeking nominations of participants for the assessment. The co-chairs would solicit comments from the science community on the outline and begin recruiting chapter lead authors (to be completed by February 2013). The main preparation process would occur in 2013, with a first draft to be completed by November. The final review of the assessment would occur in June or July 2014, and the document would be made electronically available to the parties by 31 December 2014.

26. The co-chairs reported new findings on carbon tetrachloride (CCl₄). In the Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2010 (WMO/UNEP, 2011) it was reported that the “top-down” estimates of emissions from atmospheric observations were approximately 40 Gg per year higher than the “bottom-up” emission from production and destruction reports. New work on the lifetime of CCl₄ had reduced the atmospheric estimates of “top-down” emissions by 10-20 Gg per year, while measurements of landfills and contaminated sites provided a crude global additional “bottom-up” emission estimate of 8-12 Gg per year. Hence, the gap between the “top-down” and “bottom-up” emission estimates might be smaller than reported earlier. However, it was not currently possible either to state for certain that there were unreported emissions or to rule them out.

27. The co-chairs also reported on the proposed new chlorofluorocarbon compound R-316c. The molecule had two isomers, but they had very similar properties. Laboratory measurements had shown that tropospheric removal of the compound was too slow to destroy substantial amounts of R-316c. The compound was mainly lost in ultraviolet (190-210 nanometer wavelength range) photolysis in the stratosphere (similar to many other CFCs, such as CFC-11 and CFC-12). On the basis of model calculations, the lifetime was estimated to be in the 81-86 year range, and the ozone-depletion potential was approximately 0.5. Infrared measurements indicated that the 20-year global warming potential (GWP) was 4340, the 100-year GWP was 4300 and the 500-year GWP was 2050. In summary, R-316c was long-lived, a powerful ozone-depleting substance and a powerful greenhouse gas.

IV. Environmental Effects Assessment Panel

28. Mr. Nigel Paul, co-chair of the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel (EEAP), gave an overview of the progress made with regard to the 2014 EEAP report. The Panel had identified key priorities and new information in relation to decision XXIII/13 and started to develop the content of

the report with a view to making it available for independent review by December 2013. The Panel would meet in 2014 to discuss revisions with reviewers and develop the final text for November 2014.

29. The co-chair also summarized some of the latest developments in understanding the environmental effects of ozone depletion and changes in solar ultraviolet (UV) radiation. It was noted that recent progress in modelling changes in UV radiation over the next four or five decades predicted decreases at high latitudes but increases in many mid-low latitude countries. The magnitude of the environmental effects of such changes in UV radiation would depend not only on location but also on the effect being considered. New information was improving the understanding of the relationship between UV and key effects, such as the human immune system. This would contribute to the 2014 assessment of the balance between the adverse and beneficial effects of solar UV radiation on human health, a balance which varied among different diseases. Similarly, the recent identification of the molecule responsible for sensing short-wavelength UV radiation (UV-B) in plants would contribute to assessing how changes in solar UV radiation would affect terrestrial ecosystems, including crops and their interactions with pests and diseases. With regard to aquatic systems there was new understanding of interactions and feedback in connection with the effects of solar UV and those of other environmental changes (e.g., stratification and acidification). This progress in research into the effects of UV changes in ecosystems would contribute to the assessment of how changes in solar UV radiation would affect the carbon cycle and the chemistry of trace gases (including tropospheric ozone) and aerosols that affected air quality. Assessments of the effects of solar UV radiation would focus on new classes of materials (e.g., photovoltaics and plastics using nano-scale fillers or bio-fillers) and new information on the interaction of solar UV radiation and temperature on the degradation of materials.

V. Technology and Economic Assessment Panel

30. Mr. Lambert Kuijpers, co-chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP), began the Panel presentation by noting that all six technical options committees under the Panel were making preparations for the 2014 assessment, in which all TEAP and technical options committee (TOC) experts – 150 in total – would be involved. The expertise required to complete the assessment reports was being considered in the final composition of the committees for the 2014 assessment. The TEAP 2014 assessment report would include all the TOC executive summaries as well as the key messages contained in them. He also gave a slide presentation showing all of the names of the TEAP members in 2012.

31. Mr. Kuijpers continued by presenting a number of observations relating to progress and essential elements as submitted by three TOCs, beginning with essential elements for the foam sector. The vast majority of the HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs) were complete and had been approved by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund. The first phase of many HPMPs featured foam transitions because of the prioritization of the HCFC-141b phase-out on a “worst first” basis (see decision XIX/6). He said that there was no single technology solution for all uses of HCFC-141b and other HCFCs, but that sufficient choices were available in most sectors and regions. He also noted that conversion at small and medium-sized enterprises would present the major challenge in view of the technical and economic constraints involved. The emergence of unsaturated (low global warming potential) HFCs and HCFCs had created additional options with improved thermal performance, and a full-scale commercial plant to produce the first of those new chemicals had been announced for 2014.

32. On methyl bromide, Mr. Kuijpers stated that less than 1 per cent of the aggregate baseline in non-Article 5 parties was being requested for critical uses and that 80 per cent of its use in Article 5 parties had been phased out from the aggregate baseline in advance of the 2015 deadline. Article 5 parties could submit critical-use nominations at the beginning of 2013, two years ahead of the phase-out. Sectors where alternatives to methyl bromide were proving difficult were similar to those in non-Article 5 parties. He also said that parties had been invited to provide more detailed information by March 2013 (under decision XXIII/5) to help identify more detailed information on quarantine and pre-shipment uses.

33. Mr. Kuijpers continued by making a number of remarks related to the progress in refrigeration and air conditioning. Blends (with a global-warming potential smaller than 600) consisting of very low-global-warming-potential HFCs with saturated HFCs were being proposed for certain refrigeration and air conditioning equipment. Manufacturing of HFC-32 equipment had started in one non-Article 5 party and it was predicted to start in certain Article 5 parties in 2013. The rejection of HFC-1234yf by several car manufacturers owing to flammability concerns could result in the application of other low-global-warming-potential alternatives in future mobile air conditioning equipment. Mr. Kuijpers noted that the European Commission F regulation, as proposed in early

November 2012, included a ban on HFCs with a global-warming-potential greater than 2,500 by 2020 and that that might impact the application of those high-global-warming-potential refrigerants globally. Efforts to replace HFC-134a with HFC-1234yf were continuing in certain refrigeration and air conditioning sectors and subsectors. He also noted that the number of supermarkets using trans-critical CO₂ systems was steadily increasing, in particular in Europe, and that CO₂ cascade systems were also being developed in Article 5 countries, including in Brazil, where there were 31 installations. He concluded by noting that cogeneration systems driven by natural gas for single buildings or district cooling (using absorptions systems) were being evaluated in several countries.

34. Mr. Daniel Verdonik, co-chair of the Halons Technical Options Committee, provided a follow-on update on decision XXII/11 on the efforts of the Panel and the Committee in engaging with the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) in the transition from the use of halon. He explained that in September 2010, the General Assembly had passed a resolution which included determining the reserves of halons available to support current and future civil aviation needs. He indicated that ICAO had issued a State letter to each of its member States requesting a response to the following two questions, given the Montreal Protocol phase-out of halon production: “Do you anticipate that there will be enough halon to meet the civil aviation needs of your State?”, and “Do you know the quantity of halon reserves accessible to the civil aviation industry in your State in order to support its future operations? If ‘Yes’, please provide quantities in metric tonnes.” To date, 55 out of 191 ICAO member States had responded. Mr. Verdonik explained that the results of the survey identified substantial uncertainty on the part of the civil aviation community regarding their needs for halons and current and future halon supplies available to them.

35. Mr. Verdonik provided an assessment of the survey results. He indicated that on the question relating to whether there would be enough halon to meet the civil aviation needs of the State, a large majority answered either “No”, “Unsure” or “Not applicable”. He noted that a similar response was given on the question of whether or not States knew the quantity of halon reserves accessible to the civil aviation industry in their State; the majority responded “No” or “Not applicable”. Mr. Verdonik further indicated that ICAO and HTOC had observed, first, that there was little evidence that States’ civil aviation and ozone offices worked together. However, he also noted that some replies were from ozone focal points. Secondly, he explained that there had been a notable lack of response from those States where much of the halon bottles that supported the global aviation fleet were filled. Thirdly, he pointed out that some States had determined their available supplies. Lastly, he indicated that for those States that had responded “Yes” to knowing their supplies, some did not provide a quantity of halon or indicated “Zero”. Mr. Verdonik summarized the survey results, noting that some States had indicated that their airlines, which serviced both domestic and international markets, said that foreign suppliers provided the halon to fill the fire extinguishers in their fleets and that some States were unaware of any company that recycled halon for aviation fire extinguishers within their country, and therefore, on the basis of those initial replies, it was likely that many States depended on the availability of halon in the few countries that supplied the aviation industry as a whole, and not on stocks within their own States.

36. Mr. Verdonik indicated that ICAO was holding a stakeholders meeting during the same week as the Meeting of the Parties and that those same results and conclusions would be presented on Friday, 16 November 2012 at that meeting. It was understood that ICAO would indicate that it was considering establishing time frames for a mandate for the implementation of halon alternatives in cargo bays, which is currently the last use in civil aviation without a specific date for implementing alternatives. Mr. Verdonik explained that this was important because cargo bays were the largest use of halon in civil aviation, and until time frames had been established, it would not be possible to estimate total halon needs over the lifetime of the aircraft relying on halon for safety/airworthiness. Mr. Verdonik indicated that the civil aviation community still needed to determine the long-term needs for halons, where its halons would come from and how they would report results to parties to the Montreal Protocol. Lastly, he indicated that a new State letter would be sent in an attempt to collect information on supplies of halons available to support civil aviation needs but that this time, each letter would be sent jointly to the ozone focal points and the civil aviation offices in each State to foster collaborative responses.
