



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.: General  
14 July 2009

Original: English



**Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to  
the Montreal Protocol on Substances that  
Deplete the Ozone Layer**

Twenty-ninth meeting  
Geneva, 15–18 July 2009  
Agenda item 5

**Presentation of and discussion on the summary report of the discussions  
that took place at the dialogue on high global-warming-potential  
alternatives for ozone-depleting substances (decision XX/8)**

**Summary report by the co-chairs of the workshop for a dialogue  
on high-global-warming-potential alternatives to ozone-depleting  
substances**

**Introduction**

1. As requested by decision XX/8 of the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, a workshop for a dialogue on high-global-warming-potential alternatives to ozone depleting substances was held in Geneva on 14 July 2009, immediately prior to the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.
2. As requested in paragraph 6 of that decision, the co-chairs have prepared, in cooperation with the Ozone Secretariat, the current document, a summary report of the discussions that took place during the dialogue. It summarizes the main views and opinions expressed in the dialogue for presentation to the Open-ended Working Group. A detailed report of the workshop will also be prepared for reference as discussions continue on the issue of high-global-warming-potential alternatives to ozone-depleting substances.
3. Experts and government representatives from the climate community attended the workshop and contributed to the deliberations. The representatives of the Climate Change Secretariat also participated and provided valuable contributions.

**I. General atmosphere and perspectives**

4. The dialogue, which was conducted in a constructive and positive atmosphere, addressed the complex issue of high global-warming-potential alternatives to ozone-depleting substances.

K0930420 150709

5. There was undoubted recognition of the achievements and success of the Montreal Protocol, which, through phasing out much of the production and consumption of ozone depleting substances, had already made significant contributions to protecting the climate. The Parties unanimously agreed that the Montreal Protocol should continue to take into consideration the possibility of contributing still further to climate protection by addressing the issue of high-global-warming-potential alternatives to ozone-depleting substances, including in particular HFCs.
6. The culture of trust and momentum for success were unanimously acclaimed as strengths that enabled the Montreal Protocol to tackle new challenges.
7. The Parties recognized the adverse impact of HFCs on climate associated with the increasing use and emissions of HFCs and there was a sense of urgency among them regarding the need to address the issue. At the same time, it was recognized that HFCs were dealt with under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol as part of the basket of greenhouse gases being controlled in terms of emissions.
8. It was also widely recognized that one of the best features of the Montreal Protocol, and one that had contributed to its success, was its informed decision-making process based on sound science and technological and economic assessments carried out by the assessment panels of the Montreal Protocol. Assessment and information provided by the Scientific Assessment Panel and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel formed an important basis for the dialogue.
9. The Scientific Assessment Panel delivered a presentation on the effects of HFCs and HCFCs on ozone and the climate, with a view to giving the Parties a sound scientific basis for their discussion of HCFC and HFC-related issues. The Panel's main points were that the Montreal Protocol had successfully led to decreases in ozone-depleting substances, primarily CFCs and methyl chloroform, while atmospheric concentrations of HCFCs were currently increasing and the use and emissions of HFCs were growing rapidly. There had been a major climate benefit in the phase-out of ozone depleting substances and further climate and ozone benefits could be gained from an accelerated phase-out of HCFCs. The climate effects of HFCs could be significant over the coming decades if their emissions continued to increase.
10. As requested by decision XX/8, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel presented its report on the status of alternatives to HCFCs and HFCs, including information on current market penetration for all relevant sectors and subsectors, namely, refrigeration and air-conditioning, foams, fire protection, solvents and inhaled therapy, and also updated data on ozone-depleting substance and HFC banks and emissions from foams and fire protection, refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment. For several sectors alternatives to HFCs were already available or were being developed but for some applications alternatives were currently not feasible. Aggregated carbon dioxide-equivalent emissions from CFCs, halons, HCFCs and HFCs had been decreasing over the current decade and were expected to continue decreasing as a result of CFC phase-out. After about 2015, however, total emissions were expected to show a slight increase, owing to the extensive use and consequent emission of HFCs.

## **II. Issues raised in the dialogue**

11. The workshop represented a good start for a discussion on the issue of high-global-warming-potential alternatives. The dialogue is expected to continue into the future, with a view, in particular, to addressing the issue of HFCs and related issues such as HCFC phase-out. The following list sets out some of the principal issues raised during the dialogue:
12. Lessons learned in the Montreal Protocol could be applied to the control of HFCs. The features that were repeatedly mentioned as being of key importance included a successful funding mechanism, technology transfer to developing countries and partnership between Article 5 and non-Article 5 Parties.
13. There was general support for the view that a process must be agreed upon to reduce the use and emissions of high global-warming-potential alternatives to ozone-depleting substances as a global effort.

14. It was recognized that low-global-warming-potential alternatives were available for most HCFC and HFC applications and that such low-global-warming-potential alternatives should be used as much as possible.
15. Where effective alternatives to HFCs were not technically and economically feasible, responsible use, careful maintenance and service and good housekeeping measures must be ensured to minimize emissions.
16. It was noted that all further steps to address new challenges required continued support for the national ozone units.
17. It was accepted that the phase-down of HFCs might be possible but that total phase-out would not be feasible at the current stage.
18. It was mentioned that although the Montreal Protocol's experience was extensive and successful, more innovative approaches might be needed for the phasing out of HFCs.
19. Concerns were expressed with regard to the affordability and availability of alternatives to HFCs, and also regarding additional costs associated with substitution.
20. Concerns were also expressed that the speedy implementation of HCFC phase-out must be secured before entering into new challenges to deal with HFCs.
21. It was mentioned that the legal implications of regulating HFCs under the Montreal Protocol vis-à-vis the Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol should be further explored.
22. There was agreement that all the options and possibilities for controlling HFCs should be kept open while further discussions were pursued under both the climate and the ozone regimes.
23. The proposal for an amendment of the Montreal Protocol submitted by the Federated States of Micronesia and Mauritius was welcomed as a good starting point for discussions of the HFC issue, enabling the Parties to explore further possibilities and opportunities.
24. It was noted that the results of the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change, to be held in Copenhagen in December 2009, should be taken into account before the ozone community decided on what should be done under the Montreal Protocol.
25. Parties agreed that there was mutual interest and pertinent opportunity for close collaboration and coordination between the ozone and climate regimes on HFCs, while recognizing that the Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol were the frameworks that currently controlled them and that any possible actions to control HFCs under the Montreal Protocol must be compatible with the climate regime.

### **III. Conclusion**

26. The workshop closed on a positive note, concluding that it had been a good initial dialogue, bringing to light a range of views of Parties and providing in-depth background information, including scientific, technological and economic considerations relating to high-global-warming-potential alternatives to ozone-depleting substances. There was a positive expectation that the dialogue should continue at the twenty-ninth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.
-