



SUMMARY OF THE TENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE VIENNA CONVENTION AND THE TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL: 17-21 NOVEMBER 2014

The Tenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer (VC COP10) and the twenty-sixth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (MP MOP26) met from 17-21 November 2014, in Paris, France. Over 450 participants from governments, UN agencies, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, academia and industry attended the joint meeting.

The Preparatory Segment met from Monday until Wednesday. On Thursday and Friday, the High-Level Segment (HLS) convened. As the Preparatory Segment was unable to complete its work by Wednesday, it reconvened a number of times during the HLS.

MOP26 adopted eight substantive and seventeen procedural decisions. Substantive decisions adopted include: essential-use exemptions (EUEs) and critical-use exemptions (CUEs); availability of recovered, recycled or reclaimed halons; and a Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) report on alternatives to ozone depleting substances. Procedural decisions adopted include: budget; organizational issues related to the TEAP; the Multilateral Fund (MLF) replenishment; and membership of Montreal Protocol bodies for 2015.

While most of the issues were not contentious, parties spent a number of hours deliberating on the MLF replenishment, the TEAP report on ODS Alternatives, and CUEs and EUEs. Proposed amendments on hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and ways to the move the issue forward proved particularly difficult, with parties unable to agree on a mandate for a discussion group going into 2015.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE OZONE REGIME

Concerns that the Earth's stratospheric ozone layer could be at risk from chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and other anthropogenic substances first arose in the early 1970s. At that time, scientists warned that releasing these substances into the atmosphere could

deplete the ozone layer, hindering its ability to prevent harmful ultraviolet rays from reaching the Earth. This would adversely affect ocean ecosystems, agricultural productivity and animal populations, and harm humans through higher rates of skin cancers, cataracts and weakened immune systems. In response to this, a UN Environment Programme (UNEP) conference held in March 1977 adopted a World Plan of Action on the Ozone Layer and established a Coordinating Committee to guide future international action.

VIENNA CONVENTION: Negotiations on an international agreement to protect the ozone layer were launched in 1981 under the auspices of UNEP. In March 1985 the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer was adopted. It called for cooperation on monitoring, research and data exchange, but did not impose obligations to reduce ozone depleting substances (ODS) usage. The Convention now has 197 parties, which represents universal ratification.

MONTREAL PROTOCOL: In September 1987, efforts to negotiate binding obligations to reduce ODS usage led to the adoption of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (MP). The MP introduced control measures for some CFCs and halons for developed countries (non-Article 5 parties). Developing countries (Article 5 parties) were granted a grace period allowing them to increase their ODS use before taking on commitments. The Protocol has 197 parties.

Since 1987, several amendments and adjustments have been adopted, adding new obligations and additional ODS,

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|---|----|
| A Brief History of the Ozone Regime | 1 |
| COP10/MOP26 report | 3 |
| Preparatory Segment | 3 |
| High-Level Segment | 3 |
| COP10/ MOP26 Outcomes | 5 |
| A Brief Analysis of COP10/MOP26 | 12 |
| Upcoming Meetings | 14 |
| Glossary | 14 |



and adjusting existing control schedules. Amendments require ratification by a particular number of parties before they enter into force; adjustments enter into force automatically.

LONDON AMENDMENT AND ADJUSTMENTS:

Delegates to the second Meeting of the Parties to the MP (MOP2), held in London, UK, in 1990, tightened control schedules and added ten more CFCs to the list of ODS, as well as carbon tetrachloride (CTC) and methyl chloroform. The London Amendment has been ratified by 197 parties. MOP2 also established the Multilateral Fund (MLF), which meets the incremental costs incurred by Article 5 parties in implementing the Protocol's control measures and finances clearinghouse functions. The Fund is replenished every three years.

COPENHAGEN AMENDMENT AND ADJUSTMENTS:

At MOP4, held in Copenhagen, Denmark, in 1992, delegates tightened existing control schedules and added controls on methyl bromide, hydrobromofluorocarbons and hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs). MOP4 also agreed to enact non-compliance procedures. It established an Implementation Committee to examine possible non-compliance and make recommendations to the MOP aimed at securing full compliance. The Copenhagen Amendment has been ratified by 197 parties.

MONTREAL AMENDMENT AND ADJUSTMENTS:

At MOP9, held in Montreal, Canada, in 1997, delegates agreed to: a new licensing system for importing and exporting ODS, in addition to tightening existing control schedules; and banning trade in methyl bromide with non-parties to the Copenhagen Amendment. The Montreal Amendment has been ratified by 197 parties.

BEIJING AMENDMENT AND ADJUSTMENTS:

At MOP11, held in Beijing, China, in 1999, delegates agreed to controls on bromochloromethane, additional controls on HCFCs, and to reporting on methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment applications. The Beijing Amendment has been ratified by 196 parties.

MOP15 AND FIRST EXTRAORDINARY MOP:

MOP15 was held in Nairobi, Kenya, in 2003. It resulted in decisions on issues including the implications of the entry into force of the Beijing Amendment. Delegates could not reach agreement on exemptions allowing methyl bromide usage beyond 2004 for critical uses, where no technically or economically feasible alternatives were available, and called for an "extraordinary" MOP. The first Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (ExMOP1) took place in 2004 in Montreal, Canada. Parties agreed to critical-use exemptions (CUEs) for methyl bromide for 2005 and introduced the "double-cap" concept distinguishing between old and new production of methyl bromide as a compromise.

MOP16 AND EXMOP2:

MOP16 took place in Prague, Czech Republic, in 2004. Work on methyl bromide exemptions for 2006 was not completed and parties decided to hold a second ExMOP. ExMOP2 was held in 2005 in Montreal, Canada. Parties agreed to supplementary levels of CUEs for 2006. Parties also agreed, *inter alia*: CUEs allocated domestically that exceed permitted levels must be drawn from existing stocks; and methyl bromide stocks must be reported.

COP7/MOP17: MOP17 was held jointly with VC COP7 in Dakar, Senegal, in 2005. Parties approved essential-use exemptions (EUEs) for 2006 and 2007, supplemental CUEs

for 2006 and CUEs for 2007, and production and consumption of methyl bromide in non-Article 5 parties for laboratory and analytical critical uses. Other decisions included a US\$470.4 million replenishment of the MLF for 2006-2008, and agreement on terms of reference for a feasibility study on developing a monitoring system for the transboundary movement of controlled ODS.

MOP18: MOP18 took place in New Delhi, India, in 2006. Parties adopted decisions on, *inter alia*: future work following the Ozone Secretariat's workshop on the Special Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP); difficulties faced by some Article 5 parties manufacturing CFC-based metered dose inhalers; treatment of stockpiled ODS relative to compliance; and a feasibility study on developing a system for monitoring the transboundary movement of ODS.

MOP19: MOP19 took place in Montreal, Canada, in 2007. Delegates adopted decisions on: an accelerated phase-out of HCFCs; critical-use nominations for methyl bromide; and monitoring transboundary movements of, and illegal trade in, ODS. Parties also adopted an adjustment accelerating HCFC phase-out.

COP8/MOP20: MOP20 was held jointly with VC COP8 in Doha, Qatar in 2008. Parties agreed to replenish the MLF with US\$490 million for 2009-2011 and adopted other decisions including: the environmentally sound disposal of ODS; approval of 2009 and 2010 CUEs for methyl bromide; and compliance and reporting issues.

MOP21: MOP21 took place in Port Ghalib, Egypt, in 2009 and adopted decisions on: alternatives to HCFCs; institutional strengthening; environmentally sound management of ODS banks; methyl bromide; and data and compliance issues. This was the first meeting at which delegates considered, but did not agree on, a proposal to amend the Protocol to include hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) submitted by the Federated States of Micronesia and Mauritius.

MOP22: MOP22 took place in Bangkok, Thailand, in 2010 and adopted decisions on, *inter alia*: the terms of reference for the TEAP study on the MLF replenishment and the evaluation of the financial mechanism; and assessment of technologies for ODS destruction. Delegates considered, but did not agree to, two amendments proposed to address HFCs under the Protocol, one submitted by the US, Mexico and Canada and another submitted by the Federated States of Micronesia.

COP9/MOP23: COP9/MOP23 took place in Bali, Indonesia, in 2011 and adopted decisions on, *inter alia*: a US\$450 million replenishment of the MLF for the 2012-2014 period; updating the nomination process and recusal guidelines for the TEAP; the treatment of ODS in relation to service ships; and additional information on alternatives. Delegates also discussed the two proposed amendments to the Protocol to address HFCs, but no agreement was reached.

MOP24: MOP24 took place in Geneva, Switzerland, in 2012 and adopted decisions on, *inter alia*, the review by the Scientific Assessment Panel of RC-316c; procedural issues related to the TEAP and its subsidiary bodies; and data and compliance issues. MOP24 did not reach agreement on two draft decisions: clean production of HCFC-22 through by-product emission control; and amendment of the MP to include HFCs.

MOP25: MOP25 was held in Bangkok, Thailand, in 2013. The MOP adopted 21 decisions, including on: terms of reference for the study of the 2015-2017 MLF replenishment; implementation of the Montreal Protocol with regard to small island developing states; and a TEAP report on ODS alternatives. MOP 25 did not reach agreement on: amendment proposals; additional funding for the MLF for implementing the Protocol to maximize the climate benefit of the accelerated phase-out of HCFCs; and the harmonization and validation of the climate impact fund.

COP10/MOP26 REPORT

PREPARATORY SEGMENT

The Preparatory Segment was opened by Co-Chair Patrick McInerney (Australia) on Monday morning. Ségolène Royal, Minister of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy, France, stressed the importance of the MLF to the Protocol's success, and pledged France's support for its replenishment. She urged forming a contact group to discuss the modalities of addressing HFCs under the Protocol, suggesting that an agreement on HFCs at MOP27 could contribute to the success of twenty-first Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC COP21), which is to be held in Paris in 2015.

Highlighting the MP as a "shining example of multilateralism," Achim Steiner, UNEP Executive Director, emphasized the need for: a strong global partnership; patience to see "the positive results of our actions," as it takes time for planetary systems to recover; and taking into account decisions that bring results later in international negotiations.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: On Monday, Co-Chair McInerney introduced the agenda (UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/1/Rev.1-UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/1/Rev.1). Noting their disagreement with the amendment proposals, Saudi Arabia expressed willingness to cooperate with previous rulings since the rules of procedure had been applied. The Federated States of Micronesia thanked Saudi Arabia for acceding not to remove the agenda item.

Kuwait, Iraq, Egypt, Jordan, Bahrain and Tunisia preferred removing the item on proposed amendments, while the US, the European Union (EU) and its 27 Member States, and Nigeria favored keeping it on the agenda. Co-Chair McInerney suggested that the proposed amendments be discussed and parties' views be reflected in the report of the meeting. Delegates agreed.

Co-Chair McInerney suggested, and delegates agreed to, addressing the topics in the order they appear on the agenda.

HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT

The HLS opened on Thursday morning with a short video about Mario Molina, who was recently awarded the UNEP Champion of the Earth Lifetime Award.

COP9 President Nino Tkilava (Georgia) highlighted the importance of adequate funding and capacity building for further ozone research and monitoring, and called on delegates to look favorably at the decision on financial needs submitted by the Bureau. MOP25 President Oleksandr Sushko (Ukraine) described Ukraine's commitment to protecting the ozone layer.

Ozone Secretariat Executive Secretary Tina Birmpili noted the international community's progress in phasing out ODS, highlighting the significant climate benefits achieved. She

reiterated the international community's commitment to continue moving along this path of success despite funding difficulties and recent challenges in the HFCs negotiations.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: These items were addressed on Thursday morning.

Election of Officers of the Tenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention: COP10 elected by acclamation: César Vinicio Montero Suarez (Guatemala) as President; Annie Gabriel (Australia), Sianga Abilio (Angola) and Abdullah Islam Jakob (Bangladesh) as Vice-Presidents; and Gulmira Sergazina (Kazakhstan) as Rapporteur.

Election of Officers of the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol: MOP26 elected by acclamation: Rodrigo Siles Lora (Bolivia) as President; Mikkel Sorensen (Denmark), Anna Paulo Samo Gudo Chiochava (Mozambique) and Abdullah Islam Jakob (Bangladesh) as Vice-Presidents; and Liana Ghahramanyan (Armenia) as Rapporteur.

Adoption of the Agenda and Organization of Work: MOP26 President Siles Lora invited parties to adopt the HLS agenda (UNEP.OzL.Conv.10/1/Rev.1-UNEP.OzL.Pro.26/1/Rev.1), which they did without amendment. COP10 President Montero Suarez proposed that the items be addressed in the order that they appear on the agenda. He informed delegates that the HLS may need to be suspended to allow the Preparatory Segment to finish its work. Delegates agreed.

PRESENTATIONS BY THE ASSESSMENT PANELS ON THE STATUS OF THEIR 2014 QUADRENNIAL ASSESSMENT AND EMERGING ISSUES:

This item was taken up on Thursday morning. The Scientific Assessment Panel (SAP) Co-Chairs Paul Newman and A.R. Ravishankara presented on the SAP's assessment, which focuses on ODS and changes in the ozone layer, and on how increases in HFC levels may offset climate benefits achieved by the MP.

Environmental Effects Assessment Panel (EEAP) Co-Chair Nigel Paul presented on the EEAP's Assessment, saying that the MP's success in preventing large increases in ultraviolet radiation has now been quantified, and the scale of health damage avoided is beginning to be quantified.

TEAP Co-Chair Bella Maranion reviewed issues raised by the Technical Options Committees (TOCs) in the TEAP's assessment, including that: civil aviation's slow progress in replacing halons will likely result in future exclusive-use nominations; the Halons TOC suggests parties revisit the global approach to halons bank management in order to avoid a severe supply disruption; CFC phase-out for metered-dose inhalers (MDIs) is almost complete; quarantine and pre-shipment consumption of methyl bromide is increasing in Article 5 parties; and hydrofluorochlorocarbon-22 (HCFC-22) is still widely used in new and existing air conditioning (AC) equipment in Article 5 countries.

PRESENTATION BY THE CHAIR OF THE MLF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

This item was taken up on Thursday. Premhans Jhugroo (Mauritius), Chair of the MLF Executive Committee (ExCom), presented on the 72nd and 73rd ExCom meetings, reporting, *inter alia*, that: 140 HCFC Management Phase-out Plans have been approved for Article 5 countries, along with the first HCFCs production phase-out

plan; and the ExCom will consider proposals for demonstration projects for low-global warming potential (GWP) alternatives to HCFCs at its 75th and 76th meetings.

STATEMENTS BY HEADS OF DELEGATION: On Thursday and Friday, delegations had the opportunity to address the HLS. Citing the MP example, Sri Lanka pointed out that there is a way, if the world has the will to tackle major environmental issues. Ecuador expressed concern over requests for agricultural uses of ODS. Nicaragua reminded delegates that Mother Earth belongs to all, and urged parties to fight together to achieve sustainable development and a sustainable future for our planet. Chile stressed the need to continue efforts towards sustainable development strategies, and cooperation based on shared responsibility. Algeria encouraged research exchange between countries. The United Arab Emirates offered to host MOP27 in Dubai.

On HFCs, Malaysia, Indonesia, Malawi and others stressed the need for economically and commercially viable alternatives to HCFCs. Zimbabwe called upon MP parties to avoid high-GWP alternatives in HCFCs phase-out and to promote ozone- and climate-friendly chemicals in the refrigeration and air conditioning (RAC) sector. China emphasized that the HCFCs phase-out depends on the availability of alternative solutions.

Cook Islands urged parties to explore hydrocarbon alternatives to refrigerant R134a, which, although compliant with the MP, has a high GWP. Rwanda said that if HFCs are not controlled effectively, their use in developing countries will continue to grow. The Philippines highlighted the challenge of finding ODS substitutes that will not offset or undermine climate benefits achieved by the MP. Mauritius highlighted the importance of leapfrogging to ozone- and climate-friendly alternatives.

Kenya stated the need to approach HFCs holistically to avoid other environmental problems. Macedonia recognized that the MP approach and experience could be applied for managing HFCs in all applications. The EU expressed conviction that the MP has the institutions and capacities to overcome challenges to phase-down HFCs.

On the TEAP, India called for a TEAP report on consumption and demonstration projects on viable, energy-efficient alternatives, with Egypt requesting a TEAP report on HFC substitutes in the air conditioning sector, particularly for countries with high ambient temperatures. Singapore encouraged the TEAP to do further work to find technically feasible, environmentally sound and economically viable ODS alternatives suited to varying national circumstances. Brunei Darussalam highlighted the TEAP's role in addressing low-GWP alternatives to HFCs that are energy efficient and commercially viable.

On implementation, India, Malaysia, Myanmar, Djibouti and others called for transfer of environmentally sound and affordable technologies, and adequate financial assistance. Iraq emphasized the need for continued implementation assistance with regard to HCFC alternatives in the air conditioning sector. Myanmar called for measures to improve cost effectiveness, with Djibouti noting the role of capacity building of importing agencies, and qualified customs agents and refrigerant technicians, in meeting MP objectives. The Dominican Republic called on non-Article 5 countries to increase funding to help developing countries respond to the challenges of reducing and eliminating HFCs.

On the relationship with other conventions, Saudi Arabia said it was unacceptable to ask Article 5 countries to implement actions that "belong under other conventions." Cuba called for the UNFCCC and MP to work in concert on HFCs. Bosnia and Herzegovina called for synergies between the MP and Kyoto Protocol in phasing out HFCs. Tanzania said creating a viable platform to address HFCs could provide a way to strengthen synergies between the climate and ozone regimes. Venezuela contrasted the success of the MP with the lack of progress in the climate regime.

On the MLF, a number of Article 5 countries stressed the need for its substantial replenishment. The Republic of Congo called for the MLF to continue financial support to developing countries until 2030 to help them phase out ODS. Mozambique highlighted the support of the MLF as crucial to ensuring technology transfer for HCFCs' phase-down. Timor Leste requested the MLF to support an institutional strengthening project to enable Article 5 countries' compliance with the MP.

On the proposed amendments to the MP, Zambia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Mongolia, Kyrgyzstan, Timor Leste and others expressed support for the proposed amendments on HFCs. Armenia supported establishing a contact group to develop an MP amendment on technical aspects of HFCs phase-out. Trinidad and Tobago supported discussing inclusion of HFCs under the MP.

On ODS production and consumption, Argentina said ODS production and consumption processes should be sustainable and reduce risks to human health and the environment. Japan stated that reducing ODS production and consumption has contributed to sustainable development.

The International Pharmaceutical Aerosol Consortium expressed commitment to ozone layer and climate protection that balances patient health and environmental interests. The International Institute for Refrigeration stressed the need to develop and adopt low-GWP, high-efficiency technologies in the RAC sector in all countries.

MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE: The ministerial roundtable took place on Friday morning and was moderated by Fernando Lugris, Uruguayan Permanent Representative to UNEP. He listed the MP's achievements, including universal ratification, high rates of compliance, financial and technical assistance to developing countries, and strong institutions. He called on panelists to reflect on, "with a visionary spirit," where the MP will be in ten years.

Miguel Arias Cañete, European Commissioner for Climate and Energy, said the main challenge facing the MP over the next decade is to eliminate remaining ODS without harming the climate, particularly by countering the growing use of HFCs resulting from measures taken under the Protocol. He also stated that the EU is considering tabling a proposal for an amendment in 2015.

Beatriz Domingorena, Undersecretary for Control and Enforcement, Secretariat for Environment and Sustainable Development, Argentina, stressed that any programme to address ODS should account for providing small and medium enterprises (SMEs) with the tools they need to convert, while remaining competitive. She called for more funding to strengthen institutions involved in ozone protection, and for the MP to work

harder to tackle ODS smuggling and contraband by providing customs officials with the tools they need to address this.

Daniel Reifsnnyder, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Environment and Sustainable Development, US, said the MP was in “a very interesting and to some extent a dangerous place,” with many perceiving the ozone layer problem as solved, while more years of dedicated, consistent attention is required before the ozone layer can be healed. He urged recruiting the next generation of ozone officers to take up the cause and called for remaining mindful of the challenges still facing developing countries in stage II of HCFC phase-out.

Prakash Javadekar, Minister of State for Environment, Forests and Climate Change, India, said that multilateral success is possible only when the politics of consensus is practiced. He disagreed with those who say that the MP has done more than the Kyoto Protocol regarding greenhouse gas emissions because the Kyoto Protocol is about “real emissions,” whereas the MP deals with emissions from leaks. He opined that “whatever we have made wrong” by resorting to HFCs, the international community will have to deal with it, but only through the politics of consensus. He called for a joint collaborative effort to develop alternative technologies, to address a challenge for humanity.

Thoriq Ibrahim, Minister for Environment and Energy, Maldives, described the challenge faced by his country in finding HCFC alternatives for the fisheries sector, and the need for multilateral funding.

Hanne Inger Bjurström, Special Envoy for Climate Change, Norway, attributed the success of the MP to committed political and financial support, and incentives for the industry to innovate in the right direction. She said Norway is prepared to scale up financial and technical support if the MP amendment to phase down HFCs is agreed.

Mohamed Mubarak Bin Daina, Supreme Council for the Environment, Bahrain, stated the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC) countries’ concern over the lack of viable alternatives to HFCs.

In the discussion, Iran questioned going beyond the mandate of the VC and MP. Bangladesh asked if the MLF could fund demonstration projects on technically proven, commercially available and cost effective technologies to replace HFCs. India raised legal, policy, technical and financial concerns. Iraq said developing countries are willing to make the change from HFCs if alternative technologies are available. The Earth Institute asked what new issues would have to be addressed once all issues related to HCFCs are resolved. The delegate from Nigeria sang a song on global cooperation to heal the ozone layer.

In their responses, the roundtable participants emphasized the need to maintain flexibility to address problems that arise while phasing out ODS, and organize a dedicated session to deal with existing challenges; and deliver clear solutions.

Chair Lugris concluded the roundtable, summarizing the potential challenges, including how to: sustain the technical and financial assistance to Article 5 parties; phase out remaining ODS; control HFCs; address illegal trade in ODS; and prevent new ODS from being produced.

ADOPTION OF THE DECISIONS AND REPORT OF COP10/MOP26: On Friday evening, the HLS considered the draft report of COP10 and MOP26 (UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/L.1, UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/L.1 and UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/L.1/Add.1-

UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/L.1/Add.1). They also considered the compilation of draft decisions (UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/L.2- UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/L.2).

After going through the report paragraph by paragraph, it was adopted with minor amendments. The decisions were adopted by the HLS in two rounds, as they became available following contact group discussions.

CLOSING PLENARY: Tina Birmpili, Ozone Secretariat Executive Secretary, thanked delegates for their hard work during COP10/MOP26. MOP President Siles Lora closed the meeting at 12:00 am.

COP10/MOP26 OUTCOMES

Unless otherwise stated, all draft decisions submitted for COP10/MOP26’s consideration are contained in documents UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/3-UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/3 and UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/3/Add.1-UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/3/Add.1.

Unless otherwise indicated, draft decisions were adopted during the HLS on Friday and can be found in documents UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/L.2-UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/L.2, UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/L.2/Add.1- UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/L.2/Add.1 and UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/L.2/Add.2-UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/L.2/Add.2.

COMBINED VIENNA CONVENTION AND MONTREAL PROTOCOL ISSUES: These items were taken up throughout the week.

Financial Reports and Budgets of the Trust Funds for the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol: On Monday, Co-Chair Richard Mwendandu (Kenya) called for a contact group to discuss financial reports and budgets of the trust funds for the VC and the MP (UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/4 and Add.1, and UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/4 and Add.1). An open-ended Budget Committee was established, co-chaired by Fiona Walters (UK) and Kazeem Bayero (Nigeria). It met four times during the week and submitted its draft decision on Friday evening. The draft decision was then forwarded to the HLS for adoption.

Final Outcome: In its decisions, the COP/MOP, *inter alia*:

- approves a budget for the VC Trust Fund of US\$1,280,309 for 2014, US\$800,937 for 2015, US\$773,578 for 2016 and US\$1,363,368 for 2017; and
- approves a budget for the MP Trust Fund of US\$5,065,460 for 2014 and US\$5,922,857 for 2015, and to note the budget for 2016 in the amount of US\$5,033,230.

Extension of the Trust Funds for the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol: Addressing this issue on Monday, Co-Chair Mwendandu noted that parties need to submit requests for the trust funds to be extended beyond 2017 and advised the Budget Committee to forward this aspect of the decision to the HLS for adoption.

Final Outcome: For both the VC and MP, the final decisions request the UNEP Executive Director to extend the trust funds until 31 December 2025.

Status of Ratification of the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol: On Monday, Co-Chair Mwendandu noted that only one party has yet to ratify the Beijing amendment, following which all instruments under the MP will have universal membership.

Final Outcome: In its decision, the COP/MOP:

- notes with satisfaction the universal ratification of the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol, and the London,

- Copenhagen, and Montreal Amendments to the MP;
- notes that, as at 1 November 2014, 196 parties had ratified the Beijing Amendment to the MP; and
- urges Mauritania, which has not yet done so, to ratify, approve or accede to the Beijing Amendment, taking into account that universal participation is necessary to ensure the protection of the ozone layer.

REPLENISHMENT OF THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL: Supplemental Report of the TEAP

Replenishment Task Force: This item was introduced on Monday.

Shiqiu Zhang (China), TEAP, explained the origin and development of TEAP's Supplemental Report. Lambert Kuijpers, TEAP Co-Chair, outlined the supplemental report findings, concluding that, *inter alia*: the most significant impact in the replenishment will be the way in which Case 1 (commitment-based phase-out estimates) and Case 2 (unfunded phase-out estimates) will be considered for the next two triennia; any major change in the proportion of foams versus RAC will impact relative funding levels for the next two triennia; and all other issues investigated by the Task Force would only have minor effects on replenishment levels. Responding to India, Kuijpers explained that the TEAP did not suggest an increase to account for SMEs because it did not have a cost effectiveness factor to use.

Kuwait cautioned that equal distribution of funding is not a correct reflection of funding needs. Mexico called for including the need for pilot projects in Article 5 countries and funding for swing plants production of HCFCs in future triennia, and, with Venezuela and Argentina, noted a 10-30% inflation of equipment and technologies costs, depending on the sector.

Lebanon, with Argentina, China, Colombia and Jordan, stressed the need for increased funding for SMEs in the MLF replenishment in light of higher incremental costs. Lebanon, Argentina and Jordan highlighted the importance of institutional strengthening. Colombia expressed concern over the cost effectiveness factors used in the TEAP report.

The EU expressed readiness to assist Article 5 countries in complying with their phase-out schedules. Comoros said continued support of implementation agencies is essential. Norway pledged a "strong" contribution to ensure stable and sufficient funding for HCFC phase-out. Canada, with Australia, supported establishing a contact group on the matter. The US urged finding a way to continue cost-effective and efficient funding for the MLF.

Co-Chair McInerney announced the creation of a contact group, co-facilitated by Agustín Sánchez (Mexico) and Jozef Buys (Belgium). The contact group met throughout the week, first in open meetings and then in closed meetings with 12 representatives from Article 5 and 12 representatives from non-Article 5 countries, and finished its work late Friday evening.

Final Outcome: In its decision, the COP/MOP, *inter alia*:

- adopts a budget of US\$507.5 million for the MLF for 2015-2017 on the understanding that US\$64 million of that budget will be provided from anticipated contributions due to the MLF and other sources for 2012-2014, and that US\$6 million will be provided from interest accruing to the Fund during 2015-2017;

- notes that outstanding contributions from some parties with economies in transition for the period 2012-2014 stands at US\$8,237,606;
- adopts the scale of contributions for the MLF based on a replenishment of US\$145,833,333 for each year (2015, 2016 and 2017); and
- requests the MLF ExCom to take action to ensure, as far as possible, that the whole of the budget for 2015-2017 is committed by the end of 2017, and that parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 make timely payments.

Extension of the Fixed-Exchange-Rate Mechanism for 2015-2017: This item was taken up on Monday, when Co-Chair Mwendandu referred this issue to the MLF Replenishment contact group for discussion.

Final Outcome: In its decision, the COP/MOP, *inter alia*, directs the Treasurer to extend the fixed-exchange-rate mechanism to the period 2015-2017.

ISSUES RELATED TO EXEMPTIONS FROM ARTICLE 2 OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL: Nominations for

Essential-Use Exemptions for 2015 and 2016: This issue was first considered in Monday's plenary. Keiichi Ohnishi (Japan), Chemicals Technical Options Committee (CTOC) Co-Chair, reviewed CTOC's recommendations for EUEs of 75 metric tonnes (MT) of CFC-113 for the Russian Federation for aerospace purposes in 2015, 182.61 MT for China for MDIs, and 80 MT of carbon tetrachloride (CTC) for China for testing of oil, grease and total petroleum hydrocarbons in water for 2015 only. China indicated its acceptance of the CTOC's recommendations and desire for further talks with the CTOC and other interested parties during the MOP so that China could phase out EUEs for laboratory and analytical uses. The Russian Federation announced its current EUE nomination for aerospace uses would be its last.

Draft decisions XXVI/[A] on aerospace uses and XXVI/[C] on MDI uses by China were forwarded to the HLS on Monday, and draft decision XXVI/[B] on the use of carbon tetrachloride for testing of oil, grease and total petroleum hydrocarbons in water, following the EU's requests for more time to consider it, was forwarded to the HLS on Thursday.

Final Outcomes: In its decision on **EUE for CFC-113** (XXVI/[A]) for aerospace applications in the Russian Federation, the COP/MOP: authorizes production and consumption of CFC-113 in the Russian Federation for essential-uses in its aerospace industry in the amount of 75 MT in 2015; requests the Russian Federation to explore further the possibility of importing CFC-113 for its aerospace industry needs from available global stocks; and encourages the Russian Federation to continue its efforts to introduce alternative solvents, adopt newly designed equipment and complete the phase-out of CFC-113 by 2016.

In its decision on **essential use nominations (EUNs) for controlled substances for 2015** (XXVI/[C]), the MOP, *inter alia*:

- authorizes the levels of production and consumption for 2015 necessary to satisfy essential uses of CFCs for MDIs for asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, as specified in the annex to the decision;
- requests nominating parties to provide the Medical Technical Options Committee with information to enable the assessment

of EUNs, in accordance with relevant criteria, as set out in the handbook on EUNs;

- encourages parties with EUEs in 2015 to consider initially sourcing required pharmaceutical-grade CFCs from stockpiles where they are available and accessible, provided that such stockpiles are used subject to the conditions established by the MOP; and
- encourages parties with stockpiles of pharmaceutical-grade CFCs potentially available for export to parties with EUEs in 2015 to notify the Ozone Secretariat of those quantities and to provide it with the details of a contact point by 31 December 2014.

It further decides: that the party listed in the annex to the decision (China) shall have full flexibility in sourcing the quantity of pharmaceutical-grade CFCs to the extent required for manufacturing MDIs from imports, domestic producers or existing stockpiles; to request that parties consider domestic regulations to ban the launch or sale of new CFC-based MDIs, even if such products have been approved; and to encourage parties to fast-track their administrative processes for the registration of MDI products in order to speed up the transition to CFC-free alternatives.

The annex to the decision sets out essential-use exemptions for 2015 of CFCs for MDIs in China.

In its decision on the **EUE for laboratory and analytical uses** for 2015 (XXVI/[B]), the MOP decides to: encourage China to complete the revision of its relevant national standard and to ensure that a revised national standard is brought into force as soon as possible with a view to ensuring a smooth transition to a method that does not use ODS; and authorize the level of consumption for 2015 necessary to satisfy essential uses of CTC for the testing of oil, grease and total petroleum hydrocarbons in water, as specified in the annex to the decision.

The annex to the decision contains essential-use authorizations for 2015 for CTC for testing of oil, grease and total petroleum hydrocarbons in water in China.

Nominations for Critical-Use Exemptions for 2015 and 2016: The issue was first considered in Monday's plenary. Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (MBTOC) Co-Chair Ian Porter (Australia) explained the Committee's reasoning behind accepting CUNs from Australia, Canada and the US, and adjusting those from China and Mexico. MBTOC Co-Chair Mohamed Besri (Morocco) explained that the MBTOC had not recommended accepting Argentina's CUN regarding tomatoes, green peppers and strawberries because Argentina had not provided suitable data to show that the alternatives registered and available in Argentina are ineffective. Argentina expressed surprise that the MBTOC rejected its CUN, and listed many reasons why it felt the CUN should be urgently reassessed. A contact group, co-chaired by Donnalyn Charles (Saint Lucia) and Mikkel Sorensen (Denmark), was formed to draft a decision on issues involving CUNs.

The contact group met on Tuesday and Wednesday. On Wednesday, Co-Chair Sorensen reported that the contact group on CUNs had agreed on a draft decision that includes CUNs for Argentina, and the decision was forwarded to the HLS for adoption.

Final Outcome: In its decision, the COP/MOP permits, for the agreed critical-use categories for 2015 and 2016 set forth in

Table A contained in the annex to the decision for each party, subject to the relevant conditions, the levels of production and consumption for 2015 and 2016 set forth in Table B of the annex, which are necessary to satisfy critical uses. It further decides that:

- parties shall endeavor to license, permit, authorize or allocate quantities of methyl bromide for critical uses as listed in Table A of the annex;
- each party that has an agreed CUE shall renew its commitment to ensuring that relevant criteria are applied in licensing, permitting or authorizing critical uses of methyl bromide; and
- each party reports on the implementation of the present provision to the Ozone Secretariat by 1 February for 2015 and 2016.

The annex to the decision contains two tables. Table A lists agreed critical-use categories for Australia (strawberry runners), Canada (strawberry runners) and the US (strawberry fields and cured pork) for 2016, and Argentina (strawberry fruit, green peppers and tomatoes), China (ginger) and Mexico (strawberry and raspberry nurseries) for 2015. Table B sets out corresponding permitted levels of production and consumption.

Global Exemption of Controlled Substances for Laboratory and Analytical Uses: The issue was introduced in Monday's plenary. Following an amendment by the EU to the draft decision, it was forwarded to the HLS for adoption.

Final Outcome: In its decision, the COP/MOP:

- extends the global laboratory and analytical-use exemption until 31 December 2021, under the relevant conditions, for the controlled substances under the MP in all annexes and groups except Annex C, group 1 (HCFCs);
- requests the TEAP to report no later than 2018 on the development and availability of laboratory and analytical procedures that can be performed without using controlled substances under the MP; and
- encourages parties to continue to investigate domestically the possibility of replacing ODS in laboratory and analytical uses and to share resulting information.

AVAILABILITY OF RECOVERED, RECYCLED OR RECLAIMED HALONS: The issue was introduced in Monday's plenary. Following minor amendments by Argentina to draft decision XXVI/[E], it was forwarded to the HLS for adoption.

Final Outcome: In its decision (XXVI/[E]), the COP/MOP:

- encourages parties, on a voluntary basis, to liaise, through their national ozone officers, with their national civil aviation authorities to gain an understanding: of how halons are being recovered, recycled or reclaimed to meet purity standards for aviation use, and supplied to air carriers to meet ongoing civil aviation needs; and on any national actions being taken to expedite the replacement of halons in civil aviation uses;
- encourages parties, on a voluntary basis, to submit information provided in accordance with the previous paragraph to the Ozone Secretariat by 1 September 2015;
- invites parties, on a voluntary basis, to reassess any national import and export restrictions other than licensing requirements with a view to facilitating the import and export of recovered, recycled or reclaimed halons and the management of stocks of such halons with the aim of

enabling all parties to meet remaining needs in accordance with domestic regulations even as they transition to halon alternatives;

- requests the TEAP, through its Halons Technical Options Committee, to: continue to liaise with the International Civil Aviation Organization to facilitate the transition to halon alternatives, to approach the International Maritime Organization to estimate the amount and purity of halon-1211 and -1301 available from the breaking of ships and to report information on global stocks of recovered halons to parties in its 2015 progress report; and report on existing and emerging alternatives for halons, including information on their characteristics and their rate of adoption, in particular for aviation uses; and
- requests the Ozone Secretariat to report to parties, prior to the 36th meeting of the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG36), any information provided by parties in accordance with the present decision.

MEASURES TO FACILITATE THE MONITORING OF TRADE IN HCFCs AND SUBSTITUTING SUBSTANCES:

This item was taken up on Monday. The EU provided an overview of draft decision XXVI/[G] forwarded by the OEWG, saying that the decision looks to amend the relevant custom codes to allow for better monitoring and data of the trade in HCFCs and the use of substituting substances, underscoring that it is a voluntary measure. He said that, due to bracketed text, further discussion was required. Saint Lucia, with Canada and Venezuela, supported the decision, with Saint Lucia saying that illegal trade in ODS and HCFCs compromises efforts to protect the environment. Kuwait and Saudi Arabia expressed concerns over the draft decision. A contact group, co-chaired by Leslie Smith (Grenada) and Nancy Seymour (Canada), was established. In the Preparatory Segment on Friday, the contact group reported that it had finalized a draft decision to be adopted by the HLS.

Final Outcome: In its decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/CRP.4), the COP/MOP:

- requests the Ozone Secretariat to liaise with the World Customs Organization to examine the possibility of designating individual Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System (HS) codes for the most commonly traded fluorinated substitutes for HCFCs and CFCs classified under HS code 2903.39, for the purpose of preventing illegal trade in HCFCs and CFCs, and to communicate to parties the results of those consultations no later than OEWG35;
- encourages parties that are contracting parties to the International Convention on the HS to undertake the necessary steps to recommend the consideration of the aforementioned custom classifications; and
- encourages parties in a position to do so to consider voluntarily establishing domestic customs code for the aforementioned substitutes for HCFCs and CFCs.

RELEASES, BREAKDOWN PRODUCTS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR REDUCTION OF RELEASES OF ODS:

This item was introduced on Monday, when Chair Mwendandu noted that the original Decision XXVI/[F] had been turned into two decisions: XXVI/[H] (Releases of halogenated substances from production, including co- or by-production, and opportunities for the reduction of releases) and XXVI/[I] (Breakdown products and their effects).

Providing an overview of the decisions, the EU said that the SAP assessment for decision makers on ozone depletion had informed the decision to split the original draft decision. Canada, opposed by India, supported the draft decisions. The US, with Australia, cautioned that the full assessment has not yet been released.

India, with China, opposed considering draft decision XXVI/[H] in a contact group, stating that it addressed issues that do not fall within the ambit of the MP. The EU supported a contact group. The US said those issues already fell under the SAP and the EEAP mandates. Canada proposed addressing the discrepancy between emissions reported and those inferred from atmospheric measurements in a group without considering a draft decision.

No agreement could be reached, and discussions resumed on Tuesday morning, when Co-Chair Mwendandu proposed establishing a contact group on draft decision XXVI/[H], and invited the EU and India to consult with the Co-Chairs on draft decision XXVI/[I]. The EU welcomed this way forward, noting that emissions had been addressed under the MP before, and feedstocks, while in exempted uses, fall under the MP. India reiterated his opposition to forming a contact group on issues that do not fall under the MP, such as co- and by-production.

Co-Chair Mwendandu proposed the EU resubmit draft decision XXVI/[I] when more information is available. On decision XXVI/[H], Co-Chair Mwendandu said a majority of parties had expressed an interest in discussing it in a contact group, proposing that India's objection be recorded. India sought clarification on whether a contact group could be formed in the absence of consensus. The Secretariat supported the Co-Chair's ruling, explaining that the decision was a procedural one, noting that "consensus does not mean unanimity." India cautioned against establishing precedent and, supported by Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq and Egypt, emphasized a lack of consensus on contact group formation. Jordan also opposed establishing a contact group.

Canada, with Switzerland and Cameroon, noted that failure to form a contact group due to lack of consensus on an issue is a "recent development" under the MP. Supporting this, China observed that consensus "does not simply mean agreement of all." He urged that discussions continue "to preserve the spirit of the ozone family." The US noted that a contact group is a way to build consensus.

Co-Chair Mwendandu announced that the Co-Chairs, India, the EU and other interested parties would consult informally on the way forward. The EU requested that the initial ruling by the Co-Chair to establish a contact group that was subsequently "undone" be recorded in the report of the meeting.

On Thursday, the EU reported that, following discussions with India, they had decided to await the outcome of forthcoming assessments and take their findings into account the following year. Along with the US, they noted their dissatisfaction with the withdrawal of the contact group.

Final Outcome: The parties will resubmit the decision pending the outcome of the forthcoming TEAP assessments.

ISSUES RELATED TO ODS ALTERNATIVES: This item was addressed Tuesday through Friday.

Final Report by the TEAP on ODS Alternatives: Co-Chair McInerney introduced this item, informing delegates that the

report (UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/2/Add.1-UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/2/Add.1) is an updated and finalized version of the one presented to OEWG34. Various TEAP members outlined how the scenarios had been developed, in particular considerations and findings for the RAC, foam, MDIs and civil aviation sectors. TEAP Halons TOC Co-Chair Dan Verdonik summarized the key findings: information on available alternatives continues to evolve; RAC is the dominant sector in terms of consumption under a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario; and it has been possible to identify plausible measures that support two mitigation scenarios beyond the BAU assumptions.

In response to questions from parties, the panel explained that: it is difficult to predict transition in the extruded polystyrene sector because many of the larger “players” have not yet decided on technology changes; assessing appropriate technologies for RAC in high ambient temperature environments remains a significant challenge; the TEAP used a 52°C ceiling for its high ambient temperature assumptions; CO₂ is not yet feasible as a coolant for high ambient temperature regions because of energy efficiency concerns; and the costs of alternatives in RAC over a life cycle are difficult to predict because they are dependent on how industry and consumers adopt alternative technologies.

The US, supported by Australia, Canada, the EU and New Zealand, said that it had submitted a draft decision requesting the TEAP, *inter alia*, to assess the technical and economic considerations of implementing a global phase-down of HFCs, and to investigate deploying climate-friendly alternatives in areas with high ambient temperatures. Saudi Arabia, with Bahrain, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait and Oman, opposed the draft decision, with Saudi Arabia adding that assessments regarding HFCs do not fall within the ambit of the MP.

Noting that many parties acknowledged that there are gaps in information, Co-Chair McInerney proposed establishing a contact group chaired by Alice Gaustad (Norway) to formulate a draft decision instructing the TEAP to fill the information gaps identified, while not necessarily considering the US proposal. The group reached consensus late Friday evening and forwarded the draft to the HLS for adoption.

Final Outcome: The COP/MOP decides to request the TEAP to prepare a report identifying the full range of alternatives, including not-in-kind technologies and applications where alternatives fulfilling the relevant criteria are not available. This report will be considered at OEWG35 and an updated report will be submitted to MOP27, to, *inter alia*:

- update information on alternatives to ODS in various sectors and sub-sectors and differentiating between Article 5 and non-Article 5 parties, considering energy efficiency, regional differences and high ambient temperature conditions in particular, and assessing whether they are commercially available, technically proven, environmentally sound, economically viable and cost effective, and describe potential limitations of their use and their implications on the different sectors;
- provide information on energy efficiency levels in the RAC sector referring to high ambient temperature zones in international standards; and
- take into account the uptake of various existing technologies, revise the scenarios for current and future demand, and

improve information related to costs and benefits with regard to the relevant criteria.

It also requests the TEAP to:

- convene a two-day workshop, back to back with an additional three-day OEWG meeting in 2015, to continue discussions on all issues in relation to HFC management;
- encourage parties to continue to provide to the Secretariat, on a voluntary basis, information on their implementation of paragraph 9 of decision XIX/6, including information on available data, policies and initiatives pertaining to the promotion of a transition from ODS that minimize environmental impact wherever the required technologies are available, and to request the Secretariat to compile any submissions received; and
- request the MLF ExCom to consider providing additional funding to conduct inventories or surveys on alternatives to ODS in interested Article 5 parties.

Information Submitted by Parties on their Implementation of Paragraph 9 of Decision XIX/6 to Promote a Transition from ODS that Minimizes Environmental Impact: Co-Chair McInerney introduced this agenda item (UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/9 and UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.1/34/INF/4, Add.1 and Add.2), noting that the documents detail submissions by parties on promoting the transition to ODS that minimize environmental impact.

The EU said the information submitted helps parties to see what action is being taken on high-GWP alternatives. He said this information is relevant to a number of other agenda items that have been discussed and should not be considered in isolation.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL: On Tuesday, Co-Chair McInerney invited the amendments’ proponents to present their proposals. Canada introduced the North American proposal (UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/5), stressing that a patchwork of domestic measures will not be enough to prompt the development of alternatives to HFCs and urging parties to agree to establish a contact group. The Federated States of Micronesia introduced its proposal (UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/6), co-sponsored by the Maldives, arguing that there is a growing consensus on the need to phase-down HFC production and consumption because of their negative climate impacts and urged establishing a contact group. The Maldives underscored that the MP is a suitable and competent body to address HFCs.

In response to the proposals, Kuwait, with Tunisia and Saudi Arabia, reported that the GCC opposed creating a contact group on the HFC phase-down proposals since the issue falls under the ambit of the UNFCCC. Lebanon, Tunisia, Pakistan, Bahrain, Oman, Iran, Jordan, Venezuela, Iraq, Malaysia, Indonesia, Egypt and Sudan also opposed forming a contact group. Mexico, Georgia, Cook Islands, Japan, Switzerland, Nigeria, Fiji, New Zealand, Australia, Grenada, Senegal, Colombia, Cameroon, Burkina Faso, Macedonia, Turkey, Dominican Republic, Saint Lucia, South Africa, Belarus, Trinidad and Tobago, the EU and the Environmental Investigation Agency favored setting up a contact group. Switzerland urged parties to strengthen synergies with the UNFCCC. The Republic of Korea, “in principle,” favored phasing down HFCs under the MP. Brazil suggested that

the recent EU discussion paper on HFCs was a good basis for discussion. China said it was open-minded on how to address HFCs.

The US, supported by many, suggested that an informal group be formed to discuss a possible mandate for a contact group. On Wednesday, the plenary agreed to an amended version of text suggested by the EU for convening informal discussions on: mechanisms for ensuring a sustainable phase-out of HCFCs in Article 5 parties, as well as all issues in relation to HFCs management for all parties; and how to address HFCs management in 2015. The informal discussion was convened on Friday with Co-Chair McInerney and Obed Baloyi (South Africa) as co-facilitators.

Co-Facilitator Baloyi reported to the Friday evening plenary on the informal discussions. He said that the first segment of the discussion was wide ranging, focusing on: whether safe, economical, energy-efficient and commercially available HFC alternatives exist; ways to act on HFCs before viable alternatives are available for all sectors; possible exemptions for certain sectors or sub-sectors; technology transfer; TEAP's analysis and advice on the issue; whether HFCs belong under the UNFCCC or the MP; and how the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities would be accommodated for HFCs under the MP.

Regarding the way forward in 2015, Baloyi summarized suggestions on moving forward, including:

- the TEAP should be mandated to provide a detailed report that addresses all pending issues and focuses on finding solutions and assessing the feasibility of reducing HFCs over time;
- the TEAP should include members from high ambient temperature regions to promote better understanding of their issues;
- an additional session of the OEWG should be held with a broad mandate to look at HFC management, together with a workshop on targeted technical issues in HFC management, as addressing the challenges posed by HCFC phase-out and prioritizing the sectors that need to be addressed;
- intersessional work by the Ozone Secretariat to seek written submissions and suggestions regarding challenges posed by HFCs;
- discussion of HFC management during the regional ozone managers network meetings; and
- ensuring that the OEWG and MOP discussions on HFCs address the mandate of the MP and legal aspects of HFC management as they relate to the UNFCCC.

Following Baloyi's report on Friday evening, the US introduced a draft decision proposing a contact group on HFC management (UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/CRP.9), which, he said, took into account the concerns raised by many parties during the week. He explained that the proposed contact group would take up the full range of issues and concerns related to HFC management, including availability, cost, safety of substitutes, environmental benefits, financial and technical support to Article 5 parties, and an MP amendment. He said the contact group would be open-ended, convening at this and subsequent MOP sessions until the group's work was concluded, and would discuss:

- potential exemptions to an HFC phase-down to address the challenges of high ambient temperature countries;

- baselines and appropriate schedules for the phase-down, taking into account national circumstances for Article 5 and non-Article 5 countries;
- how possible schedule reductions for HFCs relate to the existing HCFC phase-out schedule; and
- legal aspects and the complementarity between HFC management efforts under the MP and the accounting and reporting of HFC emissions taking place under the UNFCCC's Kyoto Protocol.

The draft decision also called for an additional three-day OEWG in April 2015 to discuss HFC management, back-to-back with a two-day workshop on HFC alternatives with a primary focus on alternatives suitable for use in high ambient temperatures.

While many countries supported the draft decision, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Bahrain and Iraq expressed reservations, while Iran and India questioned whether a CRP could be introduced on the MOP's last day. The Secretariat said nothing in the rules of procedure precludes introducing a CRP under the appropriate agenda item while the MOP is in session. The EU suggested that further consultations might produce a compromise. As a result of two rounds of consultations, further revisions to the US's CRP were introduced (UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/CRP.9/Rev.1) that changed references to a "contact group" to just a "group," limited its mandate to OEWG and MOP sessions in 2015, and added reference to trade issues. Despite the changes, Pakistan, Iran and India said they could not accept the CRP, with Pakistan adding that his proposed amendment replacing "contact group" with "discussion group" had not been reflected. Co-Chair McInerney ruled that there was no consensus on the draft decision and, therefore, it could not be adopted.

Final Outcome: No consensus was reached on the way forward on this issue.

RENOMINATION AND REAPPOINTMENT OF CO-CHAIRS AND MEMBERS OF THE TEAP AND ITS TECHNICAL OPTIONS COMMITTEES: On Wednesday morning, Co-Chair Mwendandu urged parties to consider the expiry of the current appointments of the two TEAP Co-Chairs at the end of 2014, consult during the day and return to this item in the afternoon. During the evening plenary, Co-Chair Mwendandu invited parties to consider the draft decision on TEAP membership changes (UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/CRP.7), introducing the nominations of: Lambert Kuijpers (the Netherlands) as Senior Expert of the TEAP; Ashley Woodcock (UK) and Marta Pizano (Colombia) as TEAP Co-Chairs for a four-year term; and Fabio Polonara (Italy) to the TEAP and as a new Refrigeration, Air-Conditioning and Heat Pumps Technical Options Committee (RTOC) Co-Chair for a four-year term.

India, with Egypt, Kuwait, Argentina, Iraq, China, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Uruguay, Nigeria, Pakistan and Bahrain, requested that Kuijpers' term as a TEAP Co-Chair be extended for a transitional period of one or two years. The US said his role as a Senior Expert is a transitional arrangement. Co-Chair Mwendandu invited parties to consult informally with the EU. Consultations continued until Friday evening, when Italy, on behalf of Colombia, the Netherlands and the UK, presented a revised draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/CRP.7/Rev.1), noting that Kuijpers would be reappointed as RTOC Co-Chair for one year and then as TEAP Senior Expert for another.

Final Outcome: The revised decision was adopted without amendment.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF MONTREAL PROTOCOL BODIES FOR 2015: On Tuesday, Co-Chair Mwendandu called on parties to consult internally and submit their nominations to the Secretariat. The HLS considered the nominations on Friday.

Members of the Implementation Committee: In its decision, the COP/MOP decides that Canada, the Dominican Republic, Ghana, Lebanon and Poland would remain on the Implementation Committee for one more year and selects Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cuba, Mali, Italy and Pakistan as members for a two-year period beginning on 1 January 2015. Elisabetta Scialanca (Italy) will serve as President, and Mazen Hussein (Lebanon) will serve as Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Committee for one year beginning on 1 January 2015.

Members of the Executive Committee of the MLF: In its decision, COP/MOP decides to endorse the selection of Bahrain, Brazil, the Comoros, Egypt, Grenada, India and Tanzania as members of the ExCom representing Article 5 countries, and Australia, Belgium, Italy, Japan, Sweden, the US and the Russian Federation representing non-Article 5 parties, for one year beginning 1 January 2015. John Thompson (US) will serve as Chair, and Leslie Smith (Grenada) will serve as Vice-Chair of the ExCom for one year beginning 1 January 2015.

Co-Chairs of the OEWG: In its decision, the COP/MOP decides to endorse the selection of Paul Krajnik (Austria) and Emma Rachmawaty (Indonesia) as Co-Chairs of the OEWG for 2015.

COMPLIANCE AND REPORTING ISSUES CONSIDERED BY THE IMPLEMENTATION

COMMITTEE: On Wednesday, the Implementation Committee (ImpCom) Chair Azra Rogović-Grubić (Bosnia and Herzegovina) reported on the 52nd and 53rd meetings of the Committee. She noted that: only one party has yet to report required data for 2013; 72 parties had reported by 30 June 2014; and the ImpCom encourages more parties to report early. She reported three cases of non-compliance involving Kazakhstan, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Guatemala reflected in three of the five draft decisions submitted to the HLS for adoption (UNEP/OzL.Pro.26/CRP.1). She said the other two draft decisions urge the Central African Republic to report its 2013 data as soon as possible, and granted requests from Libya and Mozambique to revise their baseline HCFC consumption data. The plenary then decided to forward the five ImpCom draft decisions as a block to the HLS for adoption.

Final Outcome: On Friday, the COP/MOP adopted the five decisions recommended by the ImpCom without amendment.

VIENNA CONVENTION: These issues were addressed on Wednesday.

Report of the ninth meeting of the Ozone Research Managers of the Parties to the Vienna Convention: Co-Chair Mwendandu introduced the item (UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/6). Michael Kurylo (US), Co-Chair of the ninth meeting of Ozone Research Managers (ORMs), reported on its outcomes and recommendations. He said that the ORM's recommendations were formulated within the framework of four overarching goals: encompassing climate change in ozone layer protection efforts; maintaining and enhancing observational and analysis

capabilities for climate and ozone layer variables; enhancing the VC Trust Fund for Research and Systematic Observation to support those goals; and capacity building. He recommended that a strategic plan for more effective Trust Fund utilization be developed, and a steering committee be established to ensure effective and timely implementation, noting also specific projects for priority support in 2014-2016, as identified by the ORM's.

Georgia introduced a draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Conv10/CRP.1) on the recommendations of the ninth meeting of the ORM's. The EU and Australia emphasized the link between ozone layer and climate research. Proposing minor amendments, the US said the decision could help harmonize countries' efforts in ozone layer monitoring.

The amended draft decision was then forwarded to the HLS for adoption.

Final Outcome: In its decision (UNEP/OzL.Conv10/CRP.1/Rev.1), the COP/MOP:

- takes note of the report of the ninth meeting of the ORM's;
- encourages parties to adopt and implement, as appropriate, the recommendations of the ORM's under the topics of research, systematic observations, data archiving, and capacity building;
- accords priority to capacity-building activities, in particular the specific projects identified for priority funding under the General Trust Fund for Financing Activities on Research and Systematic Observations Relevant to the VC, related to the inter-calibration of instruments, the training of instrument operators and increasing the number of ozone observations, especially through the relocation of available Dobson instruments;
- encourages the ORM's to review, at their tenth meeting, the capacity-building activities that have been conducted, with a view to assessing their effectiveness, and to include further specific recommendations in their report to the COP; and
- encourages the national ozone focal points, or other appropriate officials, to distribute information on, and coordinate where relevant, monitoring, research and scientific activities in their countries.

Status of the General Trust Fund for Financing Activities on Research and Systematic Observations Relevant to the Vienna Convention: Co-Chair McInerney introduced the report on the status of the General Trust Fund (UNEP/OzL.Conv10/5).

Highlighting the remaining balance of US\$101,626 out of US\$277,454 that the Trust Fund has received since its inception, the Secretariat invited parties to consider whether and how to extend it.

Among plans for the Trust Fund for 2014-2016, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) listed: relocation of old Dobson spectrophotometers; conducting more Dobson inter-comparison campaigns; organizing a Brewer Users' Group meeting and a training course for Asia; and donating additional Dobson instruments. For 2017 onwards, he identified the need for work on lower-cost instruments that are easier to operate.

Georgia, on behalf of the COP9 and MOP25 Bureaus, introduced the draft decision on general trust fund for financing activities on research and systematic observation relevant to the VC (UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/CRP.2). Australia, Italy and the US queried the budgetary implications of the proposed steering committee. The Secretariat assured parties that its meetings would be covered by additional funding.

Italy recommended, and parties agreed, to extend the Trust Fund until 2020. He also requested including a reference to gender balance, which was accepted.

The US introduced a number of amendments, among others: replacing “steering” with “advisory” committee; including the World Meteorological Organization as an observer and ORMs as members; and specifying that the committee would convene electronically or on the margins of other meetings. Norway supported a connection between the committee and ORMs.

Following informal consultations, parties agreed that the advisory committee’s mandate will include developing both a long-term strategy and a short-term action plan.

The amended draft decision was then forwarded to the HLS for adoption.

Final Outcome: In the decision (UNEP/OzL.Conv.10/CRP.2/Rev.1), the COP/MOP requests the UNEP Executive Director to extend the life of the General Trust Fund up to 31 December 2020 and requests the Ozone Secretariat to coordinate with the WMO to establish a small advisory committee for the Trust Fund with a mandate to:

- develop a long-term strategy and implementation objectives and priorities in the light of the four overarching goals identified by the ORM;
- develop a short-term action plan that takes into account the most urgent needs of the global ozone observing system and that will make the best possible use of the resources available in the Trust Fund; and
- ensure quality control of the individual project proposals developed under the Trust Fund, striving for regional balance in the projects supported by the Fund and identifying possibilities for complementary funding to maximize its resources.

It also requests the Ozone Secretariat to: continue inviting parties, and relevant international organizations, as appropriate, to make financial and/or in-kind contributions towards well defined and well-budgeted project proposals developed under the Trust Fund; and report to VC COP11 on the operation of, contributions to and expenditures from the Trust Fund and on the activities funded by the Trust Fund since its inception, as well as on the activities of an advisory committee.

DATES AND VENUES FOR MOP27 OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL: The United Arab Emirates and Rwanda offered to host MOP27 in 2015, with Rwanda also noting an interest in hosting MOP28 in 2016. Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon supported United Arab Emirates’ bid. Lesotho and Kenya expressed support for Rwanda to host MOP28 in 2016. Delegates agreed that MOP27 will take place in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and that Rwanda would host MOP28.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF COP10/MOP26

A QUI IL A ÉTÉ BEAUCOUP DONNÉ, IL SERA BEAUCOUP DEMANDÉ

“Everybody to whom much is given, much is expected”

The Montreal Protocol is often lauded as “the most successful multilateral environmental agreement.” Yet, as parties convened during a rainy week in Paris, it was clear that despite its successes, this is not the time for the Protocol to rest on its laurels. On the one hand, delegate after delegate mentioned

the brilliant record of the Vienna Convention and Montreal Protocol in controlling 96 ODS, achieving universal ratification, ensuring a high rate of compliance, providing robust financial and technical support to developing countries to implement the Montreal Protocol on the ground, and creating strong global and national institutions. All of this has resulted in measurable improvements in the health of the ozone layer, and delivered a massive reduction in greenhouse gases—as much as 11 billion tonnes of CO₂ equivalent—as a side benefit. On the other hand, delegates were still unable to reach agreement on whether or not the Protocol should use its highly successful mechanisms to address damage it may have wittingly or unwittingly caused in the past while phasing out HCFCs.

MOP26 and COP10 successfully addressed a number of issues during the week, including essential-use exemptions, critical-use exemptions, and the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund. Procedural issues, such as consideration of the membership of the Montreal Protocol bodies for 2015, and compliance and reporting, were also addressed. However, the one issue that hung over the meeting like a thick cloud was whether or not the Protocol should be amended to deal with HFCs—introduced by the Protocol as an ODS alternative despite its global warming potential.

While some parties feel they have a moral duty to deal with HFCs even if they are a threat to climate, and the Montreal Protocol has a better chance of dealing with them successfully, others feel they have just committed to transition from HCFCs to HFCs, and appropriate, viable alternatives are not yet available to replace HFCs. The former have put forward a proposal for an amendment to phase-down HFCs. The latter have opposed such an amendment ever since it was first proposed five years ago. The debate is getting increasingly acrimonious, and any hint of progress was quickly vaporized in the past, as it also appeared to be at this meeting.

This brief analysis will consider some of the bumps that may be appearing on the smooth road of the Montreal Protocol, and the fallouts of the overlaps with the climate process.

“EN TOUT PAYS, IL Y A UNE LIEUE DE MAUVAIS CHEMIN”

“There will be bumps in the smoothest roads”

In the minds of many long-time participants in the process, the Montreal Protocol owes its success to consensus, sound science to inform decisions, cooperation, and a congenial atmosphere. All these elements were put to the test at COP10/MOP26.

The definition and role of consensus was much discussed at the meeting, and not just in the context of the HFC amendments. Discussion on releases, breakdown products and opportunities for reduction of releases of ODS, for example, also dealt with reviewing quantities of, and providing information on co- or by-production of ODS, including HFCs. The EU proposed a draft decision on this, but this was opposed by India and China, among others. As Canada suggested discussing this in a group without addressing the draft decision, a situation similar to that of the HFC amendments emerged. Parties debated the interpretation of consensus in this context. India, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, among others, maintained that consensus means unanimous agreement on any topic or decision. Others, including Canada, Switzerland and Cameroon, argued that this approach to

consensus was a “recent development” in the Montreal Protocol process and that unanimity was not required for a procedural decision, such as forming a contact group. The former group of countries believed, however, that establishing a contact group with majority rather than universal support may set a dangerous precedent—with an eye, no doubt, on the implications of this decision for the contact group on the HFC amendments. Ultimately, no contact group was established, and the issue of ODS co- and by-production appeared to be hijacked by the HFCs discussion.

In the context of the HFC amendment proposals, the opposition not only to a contact group, but also to “informal discussions on how to discuss,” led to concerns, expressed by many parties, that the MOP might be losing its “dedicated, cooperative and collegial spirit.” One delegate suggested that in order for the debate to move forward, the definition of consensus may have to be “revisited,” or else parties might have to start using the voting procedures that are in place. (While the Montreal Protocol includes provisions for changing the Protocol, in the absence of consensus, by a two-thirds majority vote of both developed and developing countries, the voting procedures have never had to be used.) The need for 100% agreement on every decision the MOP takes is becoming “a recipe for getting nothing done,” as the Nigerian delegate lamented in Friday’s plenary.

Science and technical expertise, another long-time strength of the Protocol, continued to be politicized in Paris. In Bangkok, the EU had proposed a temporary subsidiary body to assess the economic costs and benefits of various scenarios for the global phase-down of the production and consumption of HFCs. India said it would not be acceptable for the TEAP to provide an assessment of a substance that they consider to fall outside the Montreal Protocol’s mandate. Delegates did agree to establish the subsidiary body, however, and asked it to prepare a report that would, *inter alia*, assess the economic costs and implications and environmental benefits of various scenarios of avoiding high-GWP ODS alternatives. In its report to MOP26, the TEAP found that whereas alternatives do exist in some applications, there are still concerns, such as cost-effectiveness, and use in high ambient temperatures. The US proposed a draft decision requesting the TEAP to assess the technical and economic implications of implementing a global phase-down of HFCs and to investigate deploying climate-friendly alternatives in areas with high ambient temperatures. This was opposed by several countries, including Saudi Arabia and India, with Saudi Arabia saying that assessments regarding HFCs do not fall under the Montreal Protocol.

Cooperation and a congenial atmosphere also appeared to fade, as India, Pakistan and the GCC countries opposed discussing the amendments in a contact group format, with India repeatedly stating that HFCs “belonged” with the UNFCCC. The mood of the negotiations seemed to have become increasingly more acrimonious since the concern about HFCs’ global warming potential entered the debate six years ago. Observers in Paris looked out hopefully for potential changes following the high-level discussions that took place recently between the US and India, and the US and China. However, there were only small signals of change from India and China—such as China’s willingness to show flexibility on the interpretation of consensus,

and the Indian environment minister’s assertion that a solution could be found through “mutual confidence and trust.” Yet, the mood did not appear to lighten much.

Protracted debates eventually resulted in informal consultations on how to take the discussion on the HFC amendments forward. This small success was ephemeral, however. The US tabled a draft decision late on the final day of the meeting, proposing a contact group or a “group” to consider HFC management. This was met with resistance from several countries, with India questioning whether a draft decision could even be introduced at this late stage. Following a clarification from the Secretariat that the rules of procedure allowed for it, a couple of hurried informal consultations on the US proposal took place outside plenary. When plenary reconvened, an atmosphere of distrust was palpable. China said they were not part of the consultations that took place outside of plenary because they were unable to locate where the consultations were held. Pakistan, meanwhile, said that the revised draft read out by the US did not include the changes agreed in the consultations. Having gone through three iterations, the document was finally rejected as parties were unable to agree on the way forward.

“IL N’Y A QUE LES MONTAGNES QUI NE SE RENCONTRENT JAMAIS”

“There are none so distant that fate cannot bring together”

With each passing year, linkages between the Montreal Protocol and the UNFCCC have increased with the overlapping work to reduce greenhouse gases and ODS. This has led some delegates to speculate that the Protocol may be “catching a cold” from the UNFCCC. The lack of trust and procedural quarrels seem to have migrated from one process to the other because of this overlap. Progress under the Montreal Protocol is also now being linked to progress, or lack thereof, under the UNFCCC: Canada observed that when a Montreal Protocol amendment proposal on HFCs was first introduced, parties were told to wait until after the UNFCCC COP 15 in Copenhagen in 2009, then until after Durban in 2011. Now, they are being asked to wait until after the 2015 Climate Conference in Paris.

Another aspect of the influence of the UNFCCC process on the Montreal Protocol is that some of the developed countries pushing for addressing the global warming potential of HFCs under the Montreal Protocol are not perceived as being constructively engaged in the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. This adds to the levels of distrust felt by some developing countries, who suspect the HFC alternatives are being pushed for commercial, rather than environmental, interests.

The remedy, however, may not lie in keeping the two processes apart, as suggested by some parties who preferred to address HFCs solely under the Kyoto Protocol. Instead, as Hanne Inger Bjurstrøm, Norwegian Special Envoy for Climate Change, suggested, ozone management and climate change are two sides of same story, and cannot be solved in isolation. Only time will tell if the two processes can complement, rather than hinder, each other.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Lima Climate Change Conference: The 20th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 20) to the UNFCCC and 10th session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties (CMP) to the Kyoto Protocol will take place in Lima, Peru. Also meeting will be SBSTA 41, SBI 41 and ADP 2.7. **dates:** 1-12 December 2014 **location:** Lima, Peru **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/lima_dec_2014/meeting/8141.php

Second Meeting of the SAICM OEWG: The second meeting of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) is expected to: review and prioritize proposals for emerging policy issues in preparation for the fourth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM4); consider proposals for the inclusion of new activities in the Global Plan of Action; consider the outcomes of regional meetings; and identify priority issues for consideration at ICCM4. **dates:** 15-17 December 2014 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** SAICM Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-917-8532 **fax:** +41-22-797-3460 **email:** saicm@unep.org **www:** <http://www.saicm.org/>

ATMOsphere Asia 2015: ATMOsphere Asia 2015 – Solutions for Asia aims to exhibit the latest natural refrigerant technologies and projects applicable to the Asian market. **dates:** 3-5 February 2015 **location:** Tokyo, Japan **contact:** ATMOsphere Secretariat **phone:** +81-33-28-77-330 **email:** asia@ATMO.org **www:** <http://www.atmo.org/events.details.php?eventid=27>

ATMOsphere Europe 2015: ATMOsphere Europe 2015 brings together decision-makers from industry and government to discuss the latest natural refrigerant technologies, market trends and regulatory issues in Europe. **dates:** 16-17 March 2015 **location:** Brussels, Belgium **contact:** ATMOsphere Secretariat **phone:** +32-22-30-37-00 **email:** info@atmo.org **www:** <http://www.atmo.org/events.details.php?eventid=26>

Basel COP 12, Rotterdam COP 7 and Stockholm COP 7: The 12th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Basel Convention, seventh meeting of the COP to the Rotterdam Convention and seventh meeting of the COP to the Stockholm Convention will convene back to back in May 2015. **dates:** 3-14 May 2015 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-917- 8729 **fax:** +41-22-917-8098 **email:** brs@brsmeas.org **www:** <http://synergies.pops.int/>

12th International Conference on Mercury as a Global Pollutant: The 12th International Conference on Mercury as a Global Pollutant (ICMGP) will take place in Jeju, Republic of Korea, in June 2015. **dates:** 14-19 June 2015 **location:** Jeju City, Republic of Korea **contact:** Conference Secretariat **phone:** +82-64-735-1036 **fax:** +82-64-735-1098 **email:** icmcp2015@icmcp2015.com **www:** <http://mercury2015.com/>

ATMOsphere America 2015: ATMOsphere America 2015 will serve as the forum for discussions about the business case for natural refrigerants in North America, South America and Canada. **dates:** 25-26 June 2015 **location:** Atlanta, US

contact: ATMOsphere Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-657-6164 **email:** info@atmo.org **www:** <http://www.atmo.org/events.details.php?eventid=30>

35th Meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group of the Montreal Protocol: OEWG35 will meet in July 2015. **dates:** 13-17 July 2015 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** Ozone Secretariat **phone:** +254-20-762-3851 **fax:** +254-20-762-0335 **email:** ozoneinfo@unep.org **www:** <http://conf.montreal-protocol.org/>

ICCM4: The fourth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management has been tentatively scheduled to be held in Geneva, nine months after the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. **dates:** 28 September - 2 October 2015 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** SAICM Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-917-8532 **fax:** +41-22-797-3460 **email:** saicm.chemicals@unep.org **www:** <http://www.saicm.org>

27th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol: MOP27 is scheduled to consider a number of issues, including nominations for critical- and essential-use exemptions. **dates:** November 2015 **location:** Dubai, United Arab Emirates **contact:** Ozone Secretariat **phone:** +254-20-762-3851 **fax:** +254-20-762-0335 **email:** ozoneinfo@unep.org **www:** <http://conf.montreal-protocol.org/>

GLOSSARY

| | |
|--------|---|
| CFCs | Chlorofluorocarbons |
| COP | Conference of the Parties |
| CRP | Conference room paper |
| CTC | Carbon tetrachloride |
| CUEs | Critical-use exemptions |
| EEAP | Environmental Effects Assessment Panel |
| EUEs | Essential use exemptions |
| ExCom | Executive Committee |
| GCC | Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf |
| GWP | Global warming potential |
| HCFCs | Hydrochlorofluorocarbons |
| HFCs | Hydrofluorocarbons |
| HLS | High-level Segment |
| MDIs | Metered dose inhalers |
| MLF | Multilateral Fund |
| MOP | Meeting of the Parties |
| MP | Montreal Protocol |
| ODS | Ozone depleting substances |
| OEWG | Open Ended Working Group |
| RAC | Refrigeration and air conditioning |
| SAP | Scientific Assessment Panel |
| SMEs | Small and medium sized enterprises |
| TEAP | Technology and Economic Assessment Panel |
| TOC | Technical Options Committee |
| UNEP | United Nations Environment Programme |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |
| VC | Vienna Convention |