

## SUMMARY OF THE 21ST MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL ON SUBSTANCES THAT DEplete THE OZONE LAYER: 4-8 NOVEMBER 2009

The twenty-first Meeting of the Parties (MOP-21) to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer took place in Port Ghalib, Egypt, from 4-8 November 2009. The meeting was attended by over 400 participants representing governments, UN agencies, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, academia, industry and the agricultural sector.

MOP-21 opened with a preparatory segment from Wednesday to Friday, 4-6 November, which addressed the MOP's substantive agenda items and related draft decisions. This was followed by a high-level segment, which convened on Saturday and Sunday, 7-8 November, and adopted the decisions forwarded to it by the preparatory segment. Since the preparatory segment did not conclude its work on a number of contentious issues by Friday, it reconvened several times during the high-level segment to address outstanding issues.

MOP-21 adopted 30 decisions, including on: alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs); institutional strengthening; essential uses; environmentally sound management of banks of ozone depleting substance (ODS); methyl bromide; budget; and data and compliance issues. Despite an extensive agenda, the hard work of delegates in plenary, contact groups and informal bilateral discussions led to the resolution of most items, and enabled the meeting to conclude, as scheduled, on Sunday evening. Although the proposal to amend the Montreal Protocol to include hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) was unsuccessful, delegates expressed satisfaction that some progress had been made on the issue and predicted that it would continue to be considered at future meetings of the Protocol.

### 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 were first raised in the early 1970s. At that time, scientists warned that the release of 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 growing concern, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) convened a conference in March 1977 that adopted a World Plan of Action on the Ozone Layer and established a Coordinating Committee to guide future international action on ozone protection.

**VIENNA CONVENTION:** In May 1981, the UNEP Governing Council launched negotiations on an international agreement to protect the ozone layer and, in March 1985, the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer was adopted. The Convention called for cooperation on monitoring, research and data exchange, but did not impose obligations to reduce the use of ozone-depleting substances (ODS). The Convention now has 196 parties.

**MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** In September 1987 efforts to negotiate binding obligations to reduce the use of ODS led to the adoption of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. The Protocol 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 use of these ODS before taking on commitments. The Protocol currently has 196 parties.

### IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the Ozone Regime . . . . .	1
MOP-21 Report . . . . .	3
Preparatory Segment . . . . .	3
High-Level Segment. . . . .	3
MOP-21 Outcomes and Decisions . . . . .	4
Closing Plenary . . . . .	11
A Brief Analysis of MOP-21 . . . . .	12
Upcoming Meetings . . . . .	13
Glossary . . . . .	14

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Melanie Ashton, Robynne Boyd, Tallash Kantai, Anne Roemer-Mahler, and Kunbao Xia. The Editors are Pia M. Kohler, Ph.D. and Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the United Kingdom (through the Department for International Development – DFID), the Government of the United States of America (through the Department of State Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs), the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the European Commission (DG-ENV), and the Italian Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2009 is provided by the Government of Australia, the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES), the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (through the Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute - GISPRI), the Government of Iceland, and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French at this meeting has been provided by the International Organization of the Francophonie (IOF). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into Spanish at this meeting has been provided by the Spanish Ministry of the Environment and Rural and Marine Affairs. The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications with appropriate academic citation. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11A, New York, New York 10022, United States of America.

Since 1987, several amendments and adjustments to the Protocol have been adopted, adding new obligations and additional ODS, and adjusting existing control schedules. Amendments require ratification by a defined number of parties before they enter into force, while adjustments enter into force automatically.

#### **LONDON AMENDMENT AND ADJUSTMENTS:**

Delegates to the second Meeting of the Parties (MOP-2), which took place in London, UK, in 1990, tightened control schedules and agreed to add ten more CFCs to the list of ODS, as well as carbon tetrachloride (CTC) and methyl chloroform. To date, 193 parties have ratified the London Amendment. MOP-2 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, including technical assistance, information, training, and the costs of the MLF Secretariat. The Fund is replenished every three years, and has received pledges of over US\$2.8 billion since its inception.

#### **COPENHAGEN AMENDMENT AND ADJUSTMENTS:**

At MOP-4, held in Copenhagen, Denmark, in 1992, delegates tightened existing control schedules and added controls on methyl bromide, hydrobromofluorocarbons and hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs). MOP-4 also agreed to enact non-compliance procedures and to establish an Implementation Committee. The Implementation Committee examines cases of possible non-compliance by parties, and makes recommendations to the MOP aimed at securing full compliance. To date, 190 parties have ratified the Copenhagen Amendment.

**MONTREAL AMENDMENT AND ADJUSTMENTS:** At MOP-9, held in Montreal, Canada, in 1997, delegates agreed to a new licensing system for the import and export of ODS, in addition to tightening existing control schedules. They also agreed to ban trade in methyl bromide with non-parties to the Copenhagen Amendment. To date, 178 parties have ratified the Montreal Amendment.

**BEIJING AMENDMENT AND ADJUSTMENTS:** At MOP-11, held in Beijing, China, in 1999, delegates agreed to controls on bromochloromethane and additional controls on HCFCs, and to reporting on methyl bromide for quarantine and preshipment (QPS) applications. At present, 160 parties have ratified the Beijing Amendment.

**MOP-15 AND FIRST EXTRAORDINARY MOP:** MOP-15, held in Nairobi, Kenya, in 2003, resulted in decisions on issues including the implications of the entry into force of the Beijing Amendment. However, disagreements surfaced over exemptions allowing the use of methyl bromide beyond 2004 for critical uses where no technically or economically feasible alternatives were available. Delegates could not reach agreement and took the unprecedented step of calling for an "extraordinary" MOP. The first Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (ExMOP-1) took place in March 2004, in Montreal, Canada. Parties agreed to critical-use exemptions (CUEs) for methyl bromide for 2005 only. The introduction of a "double-cap" concept distinguishing between old and new production of methyl bromide was central to this compromise. Parties agreed to a cap on new production of 30% of parties' 1991 baseline levels, meaning that where the capped amount was insufficient for approved critical uses in 2005, parties were required to use existing stockpiles.

**MOP-16 AND EX-MOP2:** MOP-16 took place in Prague, the Czech Republic, in November 2004. Work on methyl bromide exemptions for 2006 was not completed and parties decided to hold a second Ex-MOP. ExMOP-2 was held in July 2005, in Montreal, Canada. Parties agreed to supplementary levels of CUEs for 2006. Under this decision, parties also agreed that: CUEs allocated domestically that exceed levels permitted by the MOP must be drawn from existing stocks; methyl bromide stocks must be reported; and parties must "endeavor" to allocate CUEs to the particular use categories specified in the decision.

**COP-7/MOP-17:** MOP-17 was held jointly with the seventh Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention (COP-7) in Dakar, Senegal, in December 2005. Parties approved essential-use exemptions 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 the replenishment of the MLF with US\$470.4 million 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.

**MOP-18:** MOP-18 took place in New Delhi, India, from 30 October - 3 November 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 and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP); difficulties faced by some Article 5 parties manufacturing CFC-based metered dose inhalers (MDIs); treatment of stockpiled ODS relative to compliance; and a feasibility study on developing a system for monitoring the transboundary movement of ODS.

**MOP-19:** MOP-19 took place in Montreal, Canada, in September 2007. Delegates adopted 29 decisions, including on: an accelerated phase-out of HCFCs; essential-use nominations and other issues arising out of the 2006 reports of the TEAP; critical-use nominations for methyl bromide; and monitoring transboundary movements and illegal trade in ODS.

**COP-8/MOP-20:** MOP-20 was held jointly with COP-8 of the Vienna Convention in Doha, Qatar in November 2008. Parties agreed to replenish the MLF with US\$490 million for 2009-2011 and adopted other decisions concerning, *inter alia*: the environmentally-sound disposal of ODS; approval of 2009 and 2010 CUEs for methyl bromide; and compliance and reporting issues. This meeting was also the Protocol's first paperless meeting.

**OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP:** The twenty-ninth meeting of the Montreal Protocol's Open-ended Working Group (OEWG-29) convened in Geneva, Switzerland from 15-18 July 2009. Delegates considered several issues arising from the 2009 Progress Report of the TEAP, as well as the treatment of stockpiled ODS relative to compliance, a proposed evaluation of the MLF, and institutional strengthening of national ozone units. OEWG-29 also considered a proposal by Mauritius and the Federated States of Micronesia to amend the Montreal Protocol to collect and destroy ODS banks and to regulate the phase-down of HFCs. OEWG-29 was preceded by the Workshop on the Environmentally Sound Management of Banks of ODS, held 13 July 2009, and the Dialogue on High Global Warming Potential (GWP) ODS Alternatives, held 14 July 2009.

**CURRENT ODS CONTROL SCHEDULES:** Under the amendments to the Montreal Protocol, non-Article 5 parties were required to phase out production and consumption of: halons by 1994; CFCs, CTC, hydrobromochlorofluorocarbons and methyl chloroform by 1996; bromochloromethane by 2002; and methyl bromide by 2005. Article 5 parties were required to phase out production and consumption of hydrobromochlorofluorocarbons by 1996 and bromochloromethane by 2002. Article 5 parties must still phase out: production and consumption of CFCs, halons and CTC by 2010; and methyl chloroform and methyl bromide by 2015. Under the accelerated phase-out of HCFCs adopted at MOP-19, HCFC production and consumption by non-Article 5 countries was to be frozen in 2004 and phased out by 2020, while in Article 5 parties, HCFC production and consumption is to be frozen by 2013 and phased out by 2030 (with interim targets prior to those dates, starting in 2015 for Article 5 parties). There are exemptions to these phase-outs to allow for certain uses lacking feasible alternatives.

## MOP-21 REPORT

### PREPARATORY SEGMENT

On Wednesday morning, 4 November 2009, the twenty-first Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (MOP-21) preparatory segment was opened by preparatory segment Co-Chair Maqsood Muhammad Akhtar (Pakistan).

Maged George, Minister for Environmental Affairs, Egypt, welcomed participants, emphasizing that the Montreal Protocol was one of the most successful international environmental agreements, and that the aim of this meeting was to further increase its effectiveness.

Marco González, Executive Secretary, Ozone Secretariat, highlighted achievements made by the ozone treaties marked by universal ratification and phase-out of ozone depleting substance (ODS). He noted the heavy agenda and outlined the major items requiring consideration at MOP-21, including: destruction of ODS banks; a proposal to amend the Protocol to include hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) in the refrigeration and air-conditioning sectors; quarantine and preshipment exemptions; and matters related to the financial mechanism.

Co-Chair Martin Sirois (Canada) introduced the agenda (UNEP/OzL.Pro 21/1) together with the organization of work. It was adopted with minor amendments.

Throughout MOP-21, delegates discussed agenda items and corresponding draft decisions in plenary, contact groups and bilateral consultations. Rather than addressing agenda items in numerical order, issues likely to lead to the establishment of contact groups were addressed first, in an effort to ensure as little overlap between contact groups as possible. Draft decisions were approved by the preparatory segment and forwarded to the high-level segment for adoption on Sunday afternoon. The description of the negotiations, the summary of the decisions and other outcomes can be found below.

### HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT

On Saturday morning delegates attended the opening of the high-level segment. MOP-20 President Róbert Tóth (Hungary) thanked the governments for their tireless efforts to implement the treaty and looked forward to progress on HFCs.

Marco González, Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat, delivered a message on behalf of UNEP Executive Director Achim Steiner, saying that the Montreal Protocol's collaboration with the International Plant Protection Convention and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) showed the Protocol's maturity and illuminated the variety of avenues available to tackle climate change.

Maged George, Minister for Environmental Affairs, Egypt, officially opened the high-level segment, outlined Egypt's efforts on ozone protection and emphasized the importance of international cooperation.

González congratulated parties on the universal ratification of the Vienna Convention and Montreal Protocol, noting they are the only treaties to achieve this.

MOP-21 elected by acclamation Michael Church (Grenada) as President, and Patrick McInerney (Australia), Kamran Lashari (Pakistan), and Ramadhan Kajembe (Kenya) as Vice Presidents, and Azra Rogović-Grubić (Bosnia and Herzegovina) as Rapporteur. President Church urged all delegations that had not submitted their credentials to do so as soon as possible.

**PRESENTATIONS BY THE ASSESSMENT PANELS ON THE STATUS OF THEIR WORK:** MOP-21 President Church invited reports from the assessment panels.

**Environmental Effects Assessment Panel:** On Saturday in the high-level segment, Environmental Effects Assessment Panel Co-Chair Janet Bornman (Denmark) presented on environmental effects of ozone depletion and its interactions with climate change from the Panel's Progress Report 2009, including status of ozone and ultraviolet radiation reaching the Earth, and effects on human health, terrestrial ecosystems, aquatic ecosystems, biogeochemical cycles, air quality and materials.

**Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP):** The TEAP Co-Chairs Lambert Kuijpers (Netherlands) and Stephen Anderson (US) updated delegates on the content of the TEAP report scheduled for completion at the end of 2010, and outlined the content of each technical options committee (TOC) report.

**PRESENTATION BY THE MULTILATERAL FUND:** On Saturday, Executive Committee (ExComm) Chair Husamuddin Ahmadzai (Sweden) discussed the key achievements of the ExComm and its implementation agencies. He noted that the ExComm had been considering the technical and policy matters of addressing the climate and energy aspects of reducing ODS, as called for in Decision XIX/6. He described a potential special facility for additional income that might cover costs to maximize climate and environmental benefits.

**STATEMENTS BY HEADS OF DELEGATIONS:** On Saturday and Sunday, delegates heard statements from senior officials and heads of delegations.

Iran stressed the need for pharmaceutical grade chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) for metered dose inhalers (MDIs), and that viable alternatives for methyl bromide quarantine and preshipment (QPS) must be identified. Cuba stressed that the Ozone and UNFCCC Secretariats should work together to enable developing countries to get the technical and financial assistance required. Iraq highlighted the need for further consideration of alternatives for high ambient temperature countries.

Fiji, also on behalf of the Cook Islands and Tonga, stressed the need for continued institutional strengthening. Explaining that there are several challenges in phasing out HCFCs, India urged the ExComm to resolve pending issues. Malaysia said the debate on HFC phase-out was premature as alternatives did not exist in many applications. The Dominican Republic explained that while it did not support the amendment proposal to include HFCs in the Montreal Protocol, a broad review of HFCs was necessary. Canada explained that HFC use is a consequence of HCFC phase-out, and urged parties to rise to the challenge of phasing down HFCs.

China highlighted the importance of the phase-out of HCFCs, called on the developed countries to provide adequate funds, and hoped this meeting would provide a signal to the Copenhagen climate conference in December 2009 to prioritize HFCs. The European Union (EU) urged parties to continue to make efforts not only to protect the ozone layer, but also the climate, and favored expeditious efforts to control HFCs and achieve synergies with the UNFCCC.

As the 196th and final party to the ozone treaties, Timor Leste committed to working together with all the parties in achieving a more sustainable world. Burkina Faso expressed his country's dedication to phase out ODS and fight global warming. Pakistan highlighted the importance of scientific research in finding alternatives, and the need for financial resources and technical assistance.

The US emphasized that the Multilateral Fund (MLF) had been at the core of the Protocol's success and said emerging challenges included how to use the MLF for seed-money to obtain climate investments from other sources. Saudi Arabia expressed concerns about restrictions imposed on HFCs, which not long ago, had been considered as alternatives for ODS. Kuwait said deliberations appeared to have become disoriented by focusing on activities outside the scope of the Montreal Protocol, while HCFC phase-out is yet to be completed.

Croatia highlighted that phasing out ODS has been progressing in line with the Montreal Protocol targets and noted the need to improve systems for the recovery, recycling and destruction of ODS in an economically viable way.

Angola provided an overview of national programmes aimed at eliminating ODS. Uganda highlighted the challenge of controlling the use of second-hand products and equipment whose functioning relies on ODS, and emphasized the need for technology transfer.

Bangladesh said his country is still facing the escalating problem of requiring CFCs for MDIs. Madagascar called on developed countries for financial support.

Serbia supported the proposed amendments to control HFCs under the Montreal Protocol proposed by the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) and Mauritius, and by North American countries. FSM stressed the importance and urgency for controlling HFCs and the need to amend the Montreal Protocol to deal with the issue. The Philippines outlined national efforts and achievements in phasing out ODS, and supported a phase-down of HFCs.

Reporting on his country's progress in phasing out ODS, Malawi pointed to a lack of alternatives for HCFCs and problems of access to destruction technologies. Mozambique highlighted implementation difficulties in phasing out ODS, and called for increased financial and technical support. Yemen

regretted slow progress on HCFC phase-out and called on the ExComm and the MLF to pay special attention to countries in high ambient air temperature regions. Zimbabwe said facilities for the environmentally sound destruction of ODS banks should be made available to all regions. Andorra outlined national activities to protect the ozone layer and supported the regulation of HFCs under the Montreal Protocol.

Indonesia highlighted the need for financial and technical assistance to Article 5 countries and the importance of participation of local people in implementation. Tajikistan outlined challenges faced by his country, including economic difficulties and illegal trade of ODS.

The Marshall Islands underscored national efforts to address climate change through building resilience and the importance of phasing down HFCs. Stressing that his country is already experiencing food shortages due to climate change, the Solomon Islands stressed the need for adequate financial support for HCFC Phase-out Management Plan (HPMP) preparation. Kiribati highlighted the establishment of the Regional Network of Ozone Officers for Pacific Island Countries and his country's efforts to enforce an ODS licensing system.

Japan underscored the need to address ODS banks and expressed willingness to provide support to those Article 5 countries eager to address banks. Kenya and Tonga stressed that Montreal Protocol parties had an obligation to continue working hard and not to become complacent. Sudan highlighted that the Montreal Protocol's paperless meeting concept contributes to a more sustainable meeting. Somalia discussed efforts to spear-head ODS activities in a challenging post-conflict peace building environment. Nicaragua described efforts to ban methyl bromide for farming uses. Noting the importance of expanding pilot destruction projects and addressing banks, Brazil said it was premature to consider an amendment to the Protocol on HFCs. Mongolia noted that the Montreal Protocol had demonstrated that the industrial sector could be a powerful partner. South Africa recalled the imminent phase-out of CFCs in Article 5 countries and highlighted efforts to address HCFCs. Grenada underscored its uncompromising commitment to protecting the ozone layer and the climate system. Mexico described its success in phasing out CFCs, noting phase-out had been achieved without having to request essential use nominations. Ghana highlighted its experience in intercepting mislabeled refrigerants, and urged parties to develop regional destruction centers. The International Institute of Refrigeration stressed that refrigeration is essential to life and that technological developments were necessary to reduce costs. The Basel Convention Secretariat highlighted its relationship with the Montreal Protocol, and invited all parties to participate in the Extraordinary Meetings of the Conferences of the Parties to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, scheduled to convene in Bali, Indonesia, in February 2010.

## **MOP-21 OUTCOMES AND DECISIONS**

### **MEMBERSHIP OF MONTREAL PROTOCOL BODIES**

**FOR 2010:** The issue was raised in the preparatory segment on Wednesday, and Saturday during the high-level segment. On Wednesday, Co-Chair Akhtar introduced the agenda item on new members for the Montreal Protocol's Implementation Committee (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21.3, XXI/[BB]), membership of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21.3, XXI/[CC]) and new Co-Chairs for the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21.3, XXI/[DD]). He reminded

participants of the need to nominate members to the Bureau, the Implementation Committee and the ExComm, noting that the President of the Bureau would be from the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC).

The high-level segment confirmed the positions of Armenia, Germany, Nicaragua, Niger and Sri Lanka as members of the Implementation Committee for one additional year, and agreed to select Egypt, Jordan, St. Lucia, the Russian Federation and US as members of the Committee for a two-year period beginning 1 January 2010. It also noted the selection of Javier Camargo (Colombia) to serve as Chair and Philippe Chemouny (Canada) to serve as Vice-Chair of the ExComm of the MLF for one year beginning 1 January 2010. Parties also endorsed the selection of Martin Sirois (Canada) and Fresnel Araujo (Venezuela) as Co-Chairs of the OEWG in 2010.

**FINANCIAL REPORTS AND BUDGETS:** On Wednesday, in the plenary of the preparatory segment, Co-Chair Akhtar established a budget committee to be co-chaired by Ives Gomez (Mexico) and Alessandro Giuliano Peru (Italy) to deliberate on and recommend, among other things, a revised budget for 2009, a budget for 2010 and an indicative budget for 2011.

On Friday, the budget committee had a first round discussion on a draft decision. In this draft, the proposed revised 2009 budget was in the amount of US\$5,329,104, and the proposed 2010 budget in the amount of US\$4,948,398 and the proposed 2011 budget was US\$4,935,639. The parties agreed on the revised budget for 2009, but did not reach consensus on the exact level of the budgets for 2010 and 2011.

The budget committee met again on Saturday. Parties agreed to add an amount of up to US\$400,000 to the budget for 2010 to accommodate the activities under discussion by MOP-21. A footnote was added to the budget to the effect that the additional funds are not available to be re-programmed to other activities. With this, the group agreed to the budget decision. The draft decision was forwarded to the high-level segment and was adopted on Sunday.

**Final Decision:** In the decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.14/Rev.1) the MOP:

- approves the revised 2009 budget in the amount of US\$5,329,104, and the 2010 budget in the amount of US\$5,400,398 and takes note of the proposed budget of US\$4,935,639 for 2011;
- authorizes the Secretariat to draw down US\$1,123,465 in 2010 and notes the proposed drawdown of US \$658,706 in 2011;
- approves total contributions to be paid by the parties of \$4,276,933 for 2010 and notes the contributions of \$4,276,933 for 2011; and
- authorizes the Secretariat to maintain the operating cash reserve at 15% of the 2010 budget to be used to meet the final expenditures under the Trust Fund.

**ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND MANAGEMENT OF ODS BANKS:** The issue was raised in the preparatory segment on Wednesday. A contact group met from Wednesday to Sunday, and a draft decision was then forwarded to the preparatory segment on Sunday and adopted by the high-level segment.

In plenary, on Wednesday, TEAP Co-Chairs Paul Ashford, Lambert Kuijpers and Paulo Vodianitskaia presented the final report of the TEAP task force on the management and destruction of ODS banks (UNEP/OzL. Pro.21/7). The main

conclusions of the report include, *inter alia*: the collection, recovery and destruction of refrigerants of all types represents the most immediate and cost-effective method of mitigating climate impacts from the release of ODS banks; decisions to include ODS substitutes within the scope of end-of-life activities could increase the demand for destruction capacity to as much as 400,000-450,000 tonnes annually by 2030; and the potential funding of ODS bank management activities continues to receive significant attention. Brazil clarified that the information on Brazil contained in the TEAP report was not official data. The US introduced a draft decision on destruction (UNEP/OzL. Pro.21/CRP.2). Japan and Canada said the US proposal presented a good basis for further discussion. The EU encouraged further analysis on, *inter alia*, ODS destruction and cost calculations. Brazil emphasized the importance of destruction and of the support by the MLF for Article 5 countries. China, Indonesia and Liberia suggested that the issue of ODS banks be addressed as a matter of priority. On Thursday, Colombia proposed a draft decision on the issue (UNEP/OzL. Pro.21/CRP.6).

In the contact group, co-chaired by Annie Gabriel (Australia) and Mazen Hussein (Lebanon), discussions on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday focused on the US proposal. Delegates discussed operative paragraphs concerning: a seminar on how to mobilize funds; a request to the ExComm regarding the conduct of further projects on the export and destruction of ODS in low volume consuming countries; and a request to the TEAP to review destruction technologies and report to the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on their commercial availability. Some delegates suggested that TEAP also focus on other issues, including the impact of these technologies on the environment, health and energy efficiency. Others warned against duplicating work already undertaken in the 2002 TEAP report. Delegates agreed to request the TEAP to report to the OEWG on both the commercial and technical availability of technologies. The group also discussed a paragraph proposing to include the issue of a special facility to promote climate benefits on the agenda of OEWG-30, saying it would help address policy issues. Several delegates underscored the need to continue deliberations in the ExComm to develop options that could then be discussed in the OEWG. Delegates agreed to discuss potential parallel track efforts at the bilateral level.

The group then turned to the proposal submitted by Colombia. Delegates discussed a request to the MLF to establish criteria to define the cost effectiveness of ODS destruction that takes into account impacts on ozone and climate. Some participants pointed at the lack of data and experience on this issue. Discussions also focused on whether to request the ExComm to generate more information through further pilot projects. Several developed countries said this was not necessary as decision XX/7 on environmentally sound destruction of ODS banks did not limit the number of pilot projects the ExComm may consider. One party expressed concern that the HCFC phase-out already implied costs, and emphasized that compliance activities have priority. Several developing countries said the ExComm should not be requested to consider destruction projects with special emphasis on low volume consuming countries, as proposed in the US draft decision, but in all Article 5 countries. Discussions then moved to whether the ExComm should be requested to elaborate a proposal on a general strategy of the Montreal Protocol for destruction and on the amounts of MLF resources

that should be provided. Several developed countries said the goal of such a strategy was unclear and preferred a learning-by-doing approach.

After bilateral discussions throughout Saturday, the Co-Chairs compiled a proposal that combined key ideas from the US and Colombian CRPs, and presented it to the group on Sunday morning. Delegates first discussed concerns by some developing countries that a request to the ExComm to consider further destruction projects would be limited to low volume consuming countries. They then debated the extent to which the ExComm was to report to OEWG-30 on possible options for a facility to mobilize resources to achieve maximum climate benefits. One developed country preferred deleting the request to report on possible options for the facility. Another developed country emphasized that there were policy issues involved that needed to be brought to parties' attention.

Delegates also debated whether the draft decision should request the TEAP and the parties to use information generated from pilot projects to inform the consideration of funding levels for destruction that could be provided in the next replenishment. Some developed countries preferred to delete this request saying that the terms of reference for replenishment were to be discussed in the relevant contact group. Some developing countries pointed out that this was the most important idea taken from the Colombian CRP and stressed that the MLF had to support some part of national destruction strategies because destruction was a responsibility of the Montreal Protocol. In the end, compromise language was found on all these issues and a draft decision was forwarded to the preparatory segment plenary.

In the preparatory segment plenary on Sunday afternoon, contact group Co-Chair Gabriel introduced the group's draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.17). She highlighted that representation of Article 5 and non-Article 5 parties in the contact group had been good and thanked participants for their flexibility. The draft decision was forwarded to the high-level plenary and adopted.

**Final Decision:** In the decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.17), the MOP, *inter alia*:

- requests the Ozone Secretariat to host a seminar on the margins of OEWG-30 on how to identify and mobilize funds for destruction, including funds additional to those being provided under the MLF, and further requests the Ozone Secretariat to invite the MLF and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to consider co-coordinating this effort;
- requests the ExComm to continue its consideration of further pilot projects in Article 5 parties, and in that context, to consider the costs of a one-time window within its current destruction activities to address the export and environmentally-sound disposal of ODS banks in low volume consuming countries;
- requests the TEAP to review those destruction technologies identified in its 2002 report as having a high potential, and any other technologies, and to report back to OEWG-30 on their commercial and technical availability;
- agrees that the ExComm should develop and implement, as expeditiously as possible, a methodology to verify the climate benefits and costs associated with MLF projects to destroy ODS banks;

- requests the ExComm to continue its deliberations on a special facility and to report on these deliberations, including possible options for such a facility, as appropriate, to OEWG-30 as an agenda item;
- calls upon parties, and institutions not traditionally contributing to the financial mechanism, to consider making additional support available to the MLF for ODS destruction;
- requests the ExComm to report annually on the results of destruction projects to the MOP, and requests the TEAP, based on this and other available information, to suggest to OEWG-31 components designed to help parties of diverse size and with diverse wastes to develop national and/or regional strategic approaches to address ODS destruction. In addition, this information should be available to the TEAP and the parties to inform the consideration of the financial implications for the MLF and other funding sources of addressing the destruction of ODS banks.

#### **HIGH-GLOBAL-WARMING-POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES TO OZONE-DEPLETING SUBSTANCES (DECISION XX/8): Proposed Amendment to the Montreal Protocol and Consideration of Work forwarded from**

**OEWG-29:** The issue was raised in the preparatory segment on Wednesday. A contact group met in open sessions each day, and in a closed session on Sunday afternoon. The draft decision was forwarded from the preparatory segment to the high-level segment on Sunday, where it was adopted.

In the preparatory segment on Wednesday, Co-Chair Sirois introduced the item (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/3, II.A, and Add.1) and invited the proponents of the two proposed amendments to introduce them. In a lengthy discussion in plenary, many parties noted questions about the North American amendment proposal, and voiced opposing views over the need to phase-down HFCs and about whether HFCs are within the ambit of the Montreal Protocol. Sirois convened a contact group that would consider the amendment proposal, as well the two draft decisions on HCFCs and HFCs (UNEP. OzL.Pro.21/3, XXI/[I], and XXI/[J]).

The contact group, co-chaired by Laura Berón (Argentina) and Mikkel Sørensen (Denmark), met in open sessions on Wednesday. After an initial discussion in Wednesday's contact group on how the group would proceed, on Thursday, parties began to discuss the technical, financial, and political and legal issues of the North American amendment proposal. The discussions were from a "conceptual viewpoint," so as to avoid delving into textual details. Delegates also discussed the bracketed text in the draft decision on HCFCs (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/3, XXI/[I]).

On Friday, the contact group continued discussions on the draft decision on HCFCs, where delegates discussed, most notably, its sixth operative paragraph on projects and programmes regarding the phase-out of HCFCs. Delegates grappled with: making a feasible request to the ExComm considering that it would be meeting the week following MOP-21; constructing the text so that it takes into consideration paragraph 11 of Decision XIX/6 on the priority for cost-effective projects and programmes; and simplifying the text.

A few developing countries then suggested new subparagraphs on the need for the ExComm to: provide adequate funding for preparing and implementing demonstration projects on HCFC alternatives, particularly for air conditioning applications in high ambient temperature areas, considering

different climate and environmental benefits; and consider and approve demonstration and pilot projects in air conditioning and refrigeration sectors that apply environmentally sound alternatives to HCFCs. A large developing country requested, and delegates agreed, to include a paragraph requesting parties to review and amend the policies and standards that prevent the use and application of products with low GWP alternatives to ODS. One country's proposed text on examining HFC consumption and the availability of low GWP alternatives as a central component of their HPMP was moved to the draft decision on HFCs.

Parties then turned their attention to other matters. During the introduction of the text, the US, noting that it may not be possible to pass the proposed amendment to the Montreal Protocol on an HFC phase-down, withdrew the North American amendment proposal and, instead, proposed language to be inserted into the draft decision on high-GWP alternatives. This decision was debated and re-written over the next two days.

The final wording of the draft decision on "HCFCs and environmentally sound alternatives," (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.20) was agreed in a closed contact group on Sunday. Maged George, Minister of Environment (Egypt) proposed compromise text that deleted any mention of HFCs from the text and replaced it with "environmentally sound alternatives."

**Final Decision:** In the decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.20), the MOP:

- notes that the transition from, and phase-out of, ODS has implications for climate system protection;
- recalls that Decision XIX/6 requests parties to accelerate HCFC phase-out of production and consumption;
- requests the TEAP, in its May 2010 Progress Report and subsequently in its 2010 full assessment, to provide the latest technical and economic assessment of available and emerging alternatives and substitutes to HCFCs;
- requests the TEAP in its 2010 progress report to: list all sub-sectors using HCFCs, with examples of technologies where low-GWP alternatives are used; identify and characterize the implemented measures for ensuring safe application of low-GWP alternative technologies and products as well as barriers to their phase-in, in the different sub-sectors; and provide a categorization and reorganization of the information previously provided in accordance with Decision XX/8 as appropriate, to inform the parties of the uses for which low- or no-GWP and/or other suitable technologies are or will soon be commercialized;
- requests the Ozone Secretariat to provide the UNFCCC Secretariat with the report of the workshop on high GWP alternatives for ODS;
- encourages parties to promote policies and measures aimed at avoiding the selection of high-GWP alternatives to HCFCs and other ODS in those applications where other market-available, proven and sustainable alternatives exist that minimize impacts on the environment, including on climate, as well as meeting other health, safety and economic considerations in accordance with decision XIX/6;
- encourages parties to promote the further development and availability of low GWP alternatives to HCFCs and other ODS;
- requests the ExComm to expedite the finalization of its guidelines on HCFCs in accordance with Decision XIX/6; and

- requests the ExComm, when developing and applying funding criteria for projects and programmes regarding in particular the HCFC phase-out: take into consideration paragraph 11 of Decision XIX/6; consider providing additional funding and/or incentives for additional climate benefits, where appropriate; and take into account, when considering the cost-effectiveness of projects and programmes, the need for climate benefits.

**ESSENTIAL-USE EXEMPTIONS:** The issue was raised in the preparatory segment on Wednesday, and a contact group was established, which met throughout the week. On Sunday, the draft decisions were forwarded from the preparatory segment to the high-level segment where they were adopted.

**Proposal on nominations for essential-use exemptions for 2010 and 2011:** On Wednesday in plenary, Co-Chair Akhtar introduced the report of the TEAP and the draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/3, XXI/[H]). The draft decision was related to the use of controlled substances, namely CFCs for MDIs, for 2010 and 2011. A contact group co-chaired by Robyn Washbourne (New Zealand) and W.L. Sumathipala (Sri Lanka) was established to consider the issue.

On Friday, the Russian Federation introduced a draft decision on essential-use exemptions for CFC-113 for aerospace applications (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.10), which was considered by the contact group on essential-use exemptions.

On Sunday, Co-Chair Washbourne reported that the contact group had concluded its work. The draft decision on essential uses and the one proposed by the Russian Federation were forwarded by the preparatory segment to the high-level segment, where they were adopted.

**Final Decisions:** In the decision on essential uses (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.19), the MOP:

- authorizes the levels of production and consumption for 2010 necessary to satisfy essential uses of CFCs for MDIs for asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease;
- requests nominating parties to supply to the Medical Technical Options Committee (MTOC) information to enable assessment of essential use nominations in accordance with the criteria set out in decision IV/25 and subsequent decisions as set out in the Handbook on Essential Use Nominations;
- encourages parties with essential-use exemptions in 2010 to consider sourcing required pharmaceutical grade CFCs initially from stockpiles;
- encourages parties with stockpiles of pharmaceutical grade CFCs potentially available for export to parties with essential-use exemptions in 2010 to notify the Ozone Secretariat, and requests the Secretariat to post on its website details of the potentially available stocks;
- requests the ExComm to consider, at its next meeting, reviewing the CFC production phase-out agreements with China and India with a view to allowing production of pharmaceutical grade CFCs to meet the authorized levels; and
- requests that the parties listed in the annex to the decision shall have full flexibility in sourcing the quantity of pharmaceutical grade CFCs to the extent required for MDI manufacturing, either from imports or from domestic producers or from existing stockpiles.

In the decision on essential use exemptions for CFC-113 (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.10), the MOP: authorizes the levels of production and consumption of CFC-113 in the Russian Federation for essential-use exemptions for CFCs in its

aerospace industry in the amount of 120 metric tonnes in 2010, and requests the Russian Federation to explore further the possibility of importing CFC-113 for its aerospace industry needs from available global stocks.

**Consideration of amendments to the handbook on essential-use nominations (Decision XX/3):** Co-Chair Sirois introduced the agenda item on Wednesday, and it was agreed this would be discussed in the contact group on essential uses. On Sunday, contact group Co-Chair Washbourne reported that discussion had concluded that there would be no changes to the handbook at this time.

**METHYL BROMIDE:** The issue was raised in the preparatory segment on Thursday and Co-Chair Sirois established a contact group on critical use exemptions (CUEs) and QPS uses for methyl bromide co-chaired by Federica Fricano (Italy) and Leslie Smith (Grenada). The group met on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, and three draft decisions were then forwarded to the preparatory segment on Sunday, and adopted by the high-level segment.

**Presentation by the TEAP:** On Thursday, in plenary, Mohamed Besri, Methyl Bromide TOC (MBTOC), reported on the final recommendations for critical use nominations (CUNs) for methyl bromide, saying that since 2005 the number of requests has decreased. He also said that while methyl bromide stocks for all parties have decreased, one party's stock is twice its CUE. He then presented the MBTOC 2010 workplan. Ian Porter, MBTOC, provided an overview of CUNs for soil uses, noting that in its final assessment seven of the CUNs were reassessed and 20 remain unchanged. He highlighted issues raised by the report on CUNs, including that more restrictive regulations on the use of fumigant alternatives, especially chloropicrin and dichloropropene, are affecting methyl bromide reductions for several remaining CUN uses. Michelle Marcotte, MBTOC, provided an overview of CUNs for food processing structures and commodities, and highlighted the higher cost of alternatives as reason for stalled progress in achieving zero CUNs for methyl bromide in this sector.

**Nominations for critical-use exemptions:** On Thursday, Canada introduced a draft decision on CUEs for methyl bromide for 2010 and 2011. Cuba, the EU and Mexico urged the few countries still requesting nominations to reduce their use of methyl bromide. The US said it had reduced its nominations for methyl bromide stressing that the remaining nominations are critical. The US suggested starting negotiations on CUEs at the bilateral level. Malaysia advocated the implementation of an integrated pest management approach. The Natural Resources Defense Council called on one party to use its existing stocks of methyl bromide for critical uses.

The contact group discussed the draft decision on CUEs for methyl bromide for 2010 and 2011. Agreement was reached on several paragraphs, but delegates differed on quantities of CUEs for the US. Agreement was later reached through bilateral consultations.

On Sunday, the plenary of the preparatory segment decided to forward the draft decision on CUEs for methyl bromide to the high-level segment, where it was adopted.

**Final Decision:** In the decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.5/Rev.1) the MOP, *inter alia*:

- permits the agreed critical-use categories for 2010 set forth in table A of the annex, the levels of production and consumption

for 2010 set forth in table B of the annex, the agreed critical-use categories for 2011 set forth in table C of the annex, and the levels of production and consumption for 2011 set forth in table D of the annex;

- requests the TEAP to ensure that the critical use recommendations reported in its annual progress report clearly set out the reasons for recommendations;
- requests all parties that have nominated a CUE to report data on stocks;
- requests parties to submit updates of the reports requested in the decisions on critical uses, including the relevant information; and
- requests MBTOC to summarize in the table on its recommendations for each nomination information on adherence with each criterion set out in Decision IX/6(1)(a)(ii) and (b)(i) and (b)(iii) and other relevant decisions of the parties.

**QPS of methyl bromide:** On Thursday in plenary, Co-Chair Sirois introduced the item. Leslie Smith (Grenada), Co-Chair of the QPS workshop held on 3 November 2009, discussed, *inter alia*, information on the economic feasibility of alternatives in Article 5 countries. China proposed that the MLF provide financial support and that developed countries provide technical assistance to developing countries. The EU introduced a draft decision on QPS uses of methyl bromide.

The contact group discussed the draft decision on QPS uses submitted by the EU on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. The EU outlined the draft decision, requesting MOP-22 to consider the establishment of a freeze and cap on methyl bromide production and consumption for QPS, and to further consider the phase-out of specific uses of methyl bromide for QPS in areas where alternatives are technically and economically feasible. One developed country and several developing country parties opposed freezing and setting a cap on methyl bromide for QPS because applicable alternative technologies are not available. Several parties said they need time to consider the issue and to consult among different government agencies and stakeholders in their countries on this draft decision before taking a position. Several developing country parties said they could not accept this text. A few developed country parties supported the draft in general, but said that amendments were necessary. After consultation among parties, the contact group decided to delete the paragraph relating to establishing a freeze on methyl bromide production and consumption for QPS.

The contact group also discussed a draft decision on reporting of methyl bromide for QPS use, introduced by the co-chairs and forwarded from OEWG-29 on Saturday.

On Sunday the plenary of the preparatory segment decided to forward the two draft decisions to the high-level segment, where they were adopted.

**Final Decisions:** In the decision on QPS uses of methyl bromide (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.7/Rev.1), the MOP, *inter alia*:

- reminds parties of their obligations to report annual data on the consumption of methyl bromide for QPS uses;
- requests the TEAP and its MBTOC to provide a report to be considered by the OEWG-30 covering four categories of information related to QPS uses of methyl bromide. The four categories include: technical and economic feasibility, and availability of alternatives; availability and market penetration rate of QPS alternatives; an update of Table 9.1 of the 2009 Task Force report; and a description of draft methodology;

- encourages parties to apply best-practice measures to reduce methyl bromide QPS uses and emissions;
- encourages parties to consider adopting incentives to promote the transition to alternatives such as deposit/rebate schemes or other financial measures; and
- encourages parties or regions to use the October 2009 TEAP QPS task force report to develop documents that summarize information on technical options, adopted technologies, the reductions achieved, the investments needed, the operating costs, and the funding strategies.

In the decision on reporting of QPS uses on methyl bromide (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/L.2), the MOP urges parties that have not reported data on QPS applications for previous years to do so expeditiously and to urge all parties to report such data annually, as required under paragraph 3 of Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol.

**REPORT OF THE TEAP: Alternatives to HCFCs in the refrigeration and air-conditioning sectors:** In the preparatory segment on Thursday, Co-Chair Akhtar introduced this item relating to parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 with special conditions (decision XIX/8). Kuwait, supported by Oman, Jordan and Iraq, raised concerns about the availability of HCFC alternatives in countries with high ambient air temperature and about the report's treatment of this issue. The EU noted that while alternatives exist, these are mostly HFCs. He outlined bilateral work on this issue and said further work on alternatives was necessary. The Gambia highlighted the necessity for accessibility and affordability. Co-Chair Akhtar suggested, and delegates agreed, that MOP-21 would take note of the report, request the TEAP to consider the above discussion, and revisit the issue at MOP-22.

**Projected regional imbalances in the availability of halons:** In the preparatory segment on Thursday, Co-Chair Akhtar introduced the item and a draft decision submitted by Australia, Canada and the US (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.4). The EU noted that it supports the proposal in principle, but said some details required clarification. Delegates agreed to consult bilaterally. On Sunday, the draft decision was forwarded from the preparatory segment to the high-level segment, where it was adopted.

**Final Decision:** In the decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.4/Rev.1), the MOP:

- expresses its continued support for the implementation of mandatory dates by when halon alternatives will be used in previously agreed upon applications of newly designed aircraft;
- requests TEAP and its Halons TOC (HTOC) to continue to engage the International Civil Aviation Organization on this issue and to report progress on this issue to the parties at MOP-22;
- encourages parties that have implemented import and/or export restrictions of recovered, recycled or reclaimed halons to consider reassessing their situation with a view towards removing barriers on the import and export of recovered, recycled or reclaimed halons to allow, wherever possible, their free movement between parties to enable them to meet current and future needs;
- encourages parties to refrain from destroying uncontaminated recovered, recycled, or reclaimed halons before they have considered their domestic as well as the global long-term future needs for halons, and to consider retaining them for anticipated future needs in a manner that employs best practices for storage and maintenance, in order to minimize emissions; and
- encourages parties to report their assessments of current and long-term future needs for halons to the Ozone Secretariat for use by the TEAP and its HTOC in their future assessments of management of halon banks, and, to inform their users of halons of the need to prepare for reduced access to halons in the future, and to take all actions necessary to reduce their reliance on halons.

**Laboratory and analytical-use exemptions:** In the preparatory segment on Thursday, the EU noted it was in the process of updating its draft decision on this matter, and delegates agreed to consult informally and return to this item later in the week. On Friday, the draft decision on global laboratory and analytical use exemption submitted by Australia, the EU and the US (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.9/Rev.1) was forwarded to the high-level segment where it was adopted. This document includes an explanatory note on: the Chemicals TOC report, the extension of the global and analytical use exemption to Article 5 countries, uses already banned, regional works, and other issues.

**Final Decision:** In the decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.9/Rev.1), the MOP:

- extends the applicability of the global laboratory and analytical use exemption to Article 5 countries from 1 January 2010 until 31 December 2010 for all ODS except those in Annex B Group III, Annex C Group I and Annex E;
- extends the global laboratory and analytical use exemption beyond 31 December 2010 until 31 December 2014 for Article 5 parties for all ODS except those in Annex B Group III, Annex C Group I and Annex E, and for non-Article 5 parties for all ODS except those in Annex C Group I;
- requests all parties to urge their national standards-setting organizations to identify and review those standards that mandate the use of ODS in laboratory and analytical procedures with a view to adopting, where possible, ODS-free laboratory and analytical products and processes;
- allows Article 5 parties until 31 December 2010 to deviate from the existing laboratory and analytical use bans in individual cases, where a party considers that this is justified, and to ask parties to revisit this issue at MOP-22; and,
- requests parties to continue investigating domestically the possibility of replacing ODS in those laboratory and analytical uses listed in the TEAP report, and to make this information available to the Ozone Secretariat by 30 April 2010.

**Process agents:** On Thursday, Co-Chair Akhtar introduced a draft decision submitted by the EU, Australia and Canada (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/3/Add.2, Annex 3), and the preparatory segment agreed to forward the decision to the high-level segment, where it was adopted.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on process agents (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/L.2), the MOP, *inter alia*:

- requests all parties with process agent uses of controlled substances to submit the information required by decision X/14 by 30 September each year to the Ozone Secretariat;
- clarifies that the annual reporting obligation shall not apply once a party informs the Ozone Secretariat they do not use ODS as process agents under Decision X/14 until they start

doing so and this one-time procedure pertains to all parties whether or not they are listed in Table B of Decision X/14.

- requests the TEAP and the ExComm to prepare a joint report for future meetings, reporting on progress with phasing out process agent issues, as sought by Decision XVII/6 (paragraph 6); and
- suggested revisiting this issue at the OEWG-30.

**Further work on CTC emissions:** In the preparatory segment on Thursday, the EU introduced a revised proposal on CTCs. Argentina noted its observations had not been fully reflected and, with China, agreed to consult directly with the EU to revise the proposal. On Friday, the EU said that agreement had been reached. Co-Chair Sirois said that the draft decision would be made available to delegates for review before forwarding it to the high-level segment. It was adopted in the high-level segment on Sunday.

**Final Decision:** In the decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.12), the MOP, *inter alia*:

- encourages parties having any CTC and other chloromethane production and/or consumption in pharmaceutical manufacturing processes to review their national data on production, consumption and, where possible, estimated emissions, to provide any new data to the TEAP, and to provide support for atmospheric research in the measurement of emissions of CTC with a particular focus on regions in which there is a need for improved data;
- requests the TEAP, in its 2011 assessment report, to investigate chemical alternatives to ODS in exempted feedstock uses, and investigate alternatives, including not-in-kind alternatives, to products made with such process agents and feedstocks and provide assessment of the technical and economic feasibility of reducing or eliminating such use and emissions; and
- requests TEAP and the Scientific Assessment Panel to review the ozone-depleting potential and atmospheric lifetime of CTC with a view to possibly reconciling the large discrepancy between emissions reported and those inferred from atmospheric measurements, and to coordinate their relevant findings.

**Issues arising out of TEAP reports:** On Thursday, Co-Chair Akhtar introduced the item and announced the proposed appointment of Roberto Peixoto (Brazil) to the Refrigeration, Air Conditioning and Heat Pumps TOC (RTOC). Delegates endorsed the proposal, and requested the Secretariat prepare a draft decision reflecting this.

**Final Decision:** In the decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/L.2), the MOP endorsed the selection of Roberto Peixoto (Brazil) as the new Co-Chair of the RTOC.

**FINANCIAL MECHANISM OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** Discussion of this matter was initiated in plenary on Wednesday and continued in a contact group, co-chaired by David Omotosho (Nigeria) and Gudi Alkemade (Netherlands). The contact group addressed both the terms of reference (TOR) of the evaluation of the MLF and a GRULAC proposal on institutional strengthening. The group completed its work on Saturday, and on Sunday two draft decisions were forwarded from the preparatory segment to the high-level segment and adopted.

**TOR of evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol:** Delegates' discussion centered around a draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/3, XXI/[E]) forwarded from OEWG-29. It was agreed that reference to holding a one-day workshop on the terms of the reference of the evaluation would be removed.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on the TOR of the evaluation of the Multilateral Fund (UNEP/OzL.Pro.CRP.15), the MOP agrees to: start discussing the TOR for an evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol during OEWG-30, and to finalize them during MOP-23.

**Proposal on institutional strengthening activities under the MLF:** In the plenary discussion on this matter, GRULAC, supported by Burkina Faso, Pakistan, the African Group, Kenya, Saudi Arabia, India, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mauritius, Lebanon and others, emphasized institutional strengthening beyond 2010 as being crucial for Article 5 parties' ability to fully implement present and future agreements under the Montreal Protocol. The US outlined the importance of institutional strengthening in contributing to the successful implementation of the Montreal Protocol and for HCFC phase out, and said that a "new concept" for institutional strengthening would be considered at the ExComm meeting scheduled to convene after MOP-21. Argentina stressed that the issue of institutional strengthening was political in nature and, therefore, warranted discussion by the MOP. The EU, with Switzerland, highlighted its continued commitment to support institutional strengthening, with Switzerland stressing the need to communicate this to the ExComm.

Discussions in the contact group centered around GRULAC's proposal (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/3, XXI/[F]). Delegates first agreed to consider elements of a potential political message to the ExComm. One developed country proposed language urging the ExComm to finalize its consideration of funding for institutional strengthening as expeditiously as possible. A developing country proposed reference to extending funding for institutional strengthening beyond 2010, and another country proposed a reference to increasing funding.

On Friday, GRULAC and the African Group introduced new text, and delegates agreed to discuss the issue on the basis of this text. The language proposed that the MOP "extend and increase" the level of financial support for institutional strengthening and recommended that the ExComm consider institutional strengthening requirements as a "stand alone project." The proposal attracted a robust discussion with several developed countries suggesting that, as opposed to moving the process forward, the proposal backtracked to the discussion at OEWG-29. Many developed countries stressed the need for a political statement to the ExComm and were reluctant to dictate or micro-manage activities of the body. Developing countries highlighted that since agreement was not achieved at the ExComm's last meeting, the MOP needs to instruct the ExComm on the issue. Regarding the MOP supporting the extension of institutional strengthening beyond 2010, developing countries advocated reference to "at current levels." In response, one developed country party suggested qualifying this with "for one year," or removing reference to funding levels.

After extensive discussion, delegates reached agreement on the draft decision and it was agreed by plenary and forwarded to the high-level segment, where it was adopted on Sunday.

**Final Decision:** In the final decision on institutional strengthening (UNEP/OzL.Pro.CRP.16), the MOP:

- urges the ExComm to extend financial support for institutional strengthening funding for Article 5 Parties beyond 2010, and to finalize its consideration of funding of institutional strengthening projects as expeditiously as possible, taking into account current and emerging challenges; and
- recommends that the ExComm does not require that institutional strengthening funding be incorporated within funding for HCFC phase-out management plans only, but allows flexibility for an Article 5 party to do so if it so chooses.

#### **COMPLIANCE AND DATA REPORTING ISSUES:**

Compliance and data reporting issues were discussed in plenary on Thursday and Friday.

On Thursday in the preparatory segment, the EU introduced a draft decision on stockpiling relative to compliance. Canada, Australia, and China supported the draft decision, with China asking for clarification of some issues. On Friday, the EU said little progress had been made but that they would continue their bilateral consultations on how to move the issue forward. There was no outcome on this issue.

Robyn Washbourne (New Zealand), Chair of the Implementation Committee, presented the Committee's draft decisions (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.1), which the plenary forwarded to the high-level segment of MOP-21.

Decisions related to compliance and data reporting issues were adopted on Sunday.

**Final Decisions:** The MOP adopted eleven decisions related to compliance and data reporting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/L.2), including on: the establishment and reporting of licensing systems; and encouraging parties to continue to report consumption and production data. The MOP also:

- urges Bangladesh and Bosnia and Herzegovina to work with the relevant implementing agencies to implement their plans of action to phase out consumption of CFCs;
- notes the FSM's return to compliance;
- notes Mexico's non-compliance in 2008 with the provisions of the Protocol governing consumption and production of CTC;
- requests Saudi Arabia to submit a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure the party's return to compliance for CFCs;
- notes the Solomon Islands' return to compliance;
- notes Somalia's introduction of a system for licensing the imports and exports of ODS;
- cautions Turkmenistan that in the event that it fails to return to compliance in a timely manner, the MOP will consider measures consistent with item C of the indicative list of measures; and
- requests Vanuatu to submit to the Secretariat a plan of action with time-specific benchmarks to ensure the party's return to compliance for CFC production and consumption.

**STATUS OF RATIFICATIONS:** On Saturday, President Church noted that on 16 September 2009, the ozone treaties became the first environmental treaties with universal ratification, and he urged all the parties that have not ratified the amendments to the Montreal Protocol to do so as soon as possible.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on ratification of the Montreal Protocol and Vienna Convention (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.18), the MOP:

- notes with satisfaction that 196 parties have ratified the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol, representing universal ratification, and also a higher number of parties than any other treaties in history;
- notes that, as of 31 October 2009, 193 parties had ratified the London Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, 190 parties had ratified the Copenhagen Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, 178 parties had ratified the Montreal Amendment to the Montreal Protocol and 160 parties had ratified the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol; and
- urges all states that have not yet done so to ratify, approve or accede to the amendments to the Montreal Protocol, taking into account that universal participation is necessary to ensure the protection of the ozone layer.

**OTHER MATTERS:** On Wednesday, Indonesia introduced a draft decision on difficulties faced by Timor-Leste in compliance (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.3). After a brief discussion, parties agreed to consult bilaterally on the precise language of the decision. On Sunday, a revised version of the decision was forwarded to the high-level segment for consideration, where it was adopted.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on the difficulties faced by Timor Leste (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/CRP.3/Rev.1), the MOP:

- urges all parties to assist Timor-Leste, as a new party, in controlling the export of ODS and ODS based technologies into Timor Leste through the control of trade, and to encourage Timor-Leste to participate in an informal prior informed consent process;
- requests the ExComm, when considering project proposals for Timor-Leste, to phase out ODS to take into account the special situation of this new party, and the implementing agencies to provide appropriate assistance to Timor-Leste in institutional strengthening, capacity building, data collection, development of its country programme and national phase-out plans; and
- requests the Implementation Committee to consider difficulties faced by Timor Leste when addressing any possible non-compliance situations faced by Timor Leste after the date on which the Protocol and its amendments enter into force.

**DATES AND VENUE FOR MOP-22:** In Sunday's preparatory segment, Co-Chair Sirois introduced a draft decision on MOP-22, proposed to be held in Nairobi, Kenya, in October 2010. Uganda offered to host MOP-22 in Kampala and agreed to discuss this matter with the Secretariat. The decision was forwarded to the high-level segment, where it was adopted.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on the date and venue of MOP-22 (UNEP/OzL.Pro.22/CRP.21) the MOP agrees to convene MOP-22 in Nairobi, Kenya, in October 2010, unless other appropriate arrangements are made.

#### **CLOSING PLENARY**

The closing plenary was held on Sunday evening. At the beginning of the session, the preparatory segment reconvened and agreed to forward several outstanding decisions to the high-level segment. Co-Chair Sirois thanked delegates for their dedicated work in the preparatory segment and closed the segment.

President Church reported the meeting credentials and said the Bureau had approved the credentials of 89 of the 149 participating parties. He urged parties to submit credentials at the next meeting.

Rapporteur Azra Rogović-Grubić (Bosnia and Herzegovina) introduced the reports of the meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.21/L.1 and Add.1), and delegates adopted them after a number of minor amendments and statements of clarification.

Prior to the close of plenary, FSM introduced a declaration on high-GWP alternatives to ODS, which he said had the support of 37 parties, and invited other parties to sign on. Mauritius read the text of the declaration, and the EU and Australia noted that while they supported continued work on HFCs, they had had very little time to consider the declaration. Japan and New Zealand expressed their support and joined the declaration.

In their closing remarks, many parties expressed their gratitude to the Government of Egypt for hosting the meeting and to the Secretariat for their tireless work. Several delegations expressed appreciation and gratitude to Executive Secretary Marco González directly, with India describing him as “simple and humble, with a smiling face.”

In his closing remarks, President Church stated it was clear that parties wished to achieve the noble goal of cleaning and maintaining our planet for future generations. He said some of us may want to take different roads, but that the destination was the same. Church expressed hope that in 2010 there would be fewer roads, and gaveled the meeting to a close at 9:05 pm.

## A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF MOP-21

The Egyptian Red Sea resort of Port Ghalib hosted the 21st Meeting of the Parties (MOP-21) to the Montreal Protocol. Like MOP-20 in Doha, Qatar, the desert environs reminded delegates of the challenge of providing cooling in high ambient air temperature environments, while also avoiding harm to the ozone layer and climate system. Throughout the meeting, delegates emphasized the achievements of the Montreal Protocol, notably the successful phasing-out of 97% of ozone depleting substances (ODS), the complete phase-out of CFCs, halons and carbon tetrachloride (CTC) by 2010, as well as universal ratification of the Protocol, with Timor Leste adding the 196th and final signature.

Despite this successful track-record, delegates faced new and emerging challenges through a heavy agenda. Two key emerging issues dominated MOP-21: the proposed phase-down of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and the environmentally sound management of ODS banks, with climate as the thread between them. This analysis will examine how MOP-21 made progress on these challenges, and how this will affect the Protocol's way forward.

### OZONE'S HOT TOPIC – HFCs

One issue dominated discussions at MOP-21: HFCs. The contention was whether they should be governed under the Montreal Protocol. The debate arose from proposals by the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) and Mauritius, and the US, Canada and Mexico to amend the Protocol to allow for the control of HFCs under the ozone regime.

The history behind the proposed amendments is that in 2007, MOP-19 agreed to an accelerated phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs). This prompted an increase

in the consumption and production of HFCs, once touted as the most environmentally-friendly substitute for HCFCs. While HFCs do not deplete the ozone layer, some of these substances have proven to have a global warming potential (GWP) thousands of times greater than that of carbon dioxide.

At MOP-21, the amendment proposals faced resolute opposition led by India and China who argued that non-ODS substances are outside the ambit of the treaty. They preferred that HFCs be addressed under the climate regime where they are already included in the basket of GHGs addressed by the Kyoto Protocol. Also, China and India may gain from HFCs included within the ambit of the climate regime because they are important producers of HCFC-22, a by-product of which is HFC-23. China and India can therefore gain credits under the climate regime's Clean Development Mechanism for destroying HFC-23.

The hesitation of other developing countries was linked to problems currently faced with the accelerated HCFC phase-out. An important issue for developing countries to agree to this in 2007 had been the reference made in Decision XIX/6 for stable and sufficient funding in order to cover incremental costs. At MOP-21, several developing countries expressed disappointment about the level of funding through the Multilateral Fund (MLF). Additional commitments, they said, would divert funds to HFC phase-out when they still require large amounts to deal with HCFCs. Other parties, including Kuwait, Oman, Jordan and Yemen, raised concerns about the availability of alternatives to HCFCs in countries with high ambient air temperatures.

Parties proposing amendments argued that the Protocol had an obligation to address these substances because of its role in promoting them as the main alternative to HCFCs, and argued there is language in the Vienna Convention about preventing negative impacts to the environment due to phase-out decisions. Furthermore, since the Montreal Protocol is concerned with production and consumption, and while the UNFCCC addresses emissions, they contend the Montreal Protocol has an important role to play given its successful track record of reducing production and consumption of dangerous substances. Given also the highly anticipated, yet very rocky path to Copenhagen, proponents expressed greater confidence in the Protocol's ability to handle the issue than the climate regime, especially given that the Montreal Protocol now can claim universal ratification.

Opponents to governing HFCs under the Montreal Protocol recently lost an important ally. At the Barcelona Climate Talks occurring concurrently with MOP-21, the EU proposed that the Protocol could be used to develop and implement a global arrangement for HFC phase-down. While the EU emphasized that these discussions should take place only after the climate conference in Copenhagen in December, this was an evolution from their position at OEWG-29 in July, where they preferred HFCs be addressed under the climate regime. Wedded strongly to a successful outcome in Copenhagen, the EU is concerned that HFCs may be important for cobbling together a climate deal. They therefore don't want countries excusing themselves from HFC discussions in Copenhagen by pointing to discussions already occurring under the Montreal Protocol. This may already be happening since there were reports that India had stated at the Barcelona Climate Talks that HFCs should not be discussed in the climate context as they were being discussed at MOP-21. In the end, substantial progress on the issue proved to be impossible.

**DESTRUCTION IN THE NAME OF PROTECTION**

The question of how to destroy ODS banks in an environmentally-sound manner has preoccupied the Montreal Protocol in recent years. The first problem is that the phase-out of most ODS has contributed to growing ODS banks requiring safe disposal. The second problem is that the Montreal Protocol is concerned with regulating production and consumption – not destruction – of ODS. As destruction activities are not compliance activities, they do not have priority for assistance under the MLF. Nevertheless, accumulating ODS banks are a direct result of the Protocol's phase-out programmes. For this reason, developing countries demand assistance for destruction.

To facilitate destruction while limiting additional costs, donor countries promote a learning-by-doing approach that provides MLF assistance to pilot projects on destruction rather than funding the overall process. Deliberations at MOP-21 once again demonstrated the split between Article 5 and non-Article 5 countries on this issue, with some developing countries requesting a general strategy of the Montreal Protocol to fund destruction. Recognizing that the MLF has a role to play in assisting destruction, the US and other donor countries want the MLF's role limited to the provision of "seed-funding" to attract additional resources from other institutions.

To do so would require the creation of an institutional framework, referred to as the special facility, which is currently being deliberated in the ExComm. Originally conceived as a facility to fund conversion from HCFCs to low-GWP alternatives, at MOP-21, the US promoted it in the context of destruction. Realizing that the destruction of ODS banks has climate benefits, in addition to ozone benefits, they hope to capitalize on the emission reductions via the carbon markets. A number of developing countries responded with concern that a strong emphasis on co-financing destruction will make access to funding more difficult for them.

The precise nature of the facility remains unclear and the ExComm will report on its deliberations at OEWG-30.

**OZONE AND CLIMATE – A COMMON FUTURE**

As delegates concluded their work at MOP-21, FSM and Mauritius presented a declaration on HFCs, supported by 37 parties. While MOP-21 failed to send a signal to Copenhagen in the form of a decision on HFCs, many felt the declaration would succeed in carrying the message forward. Others were glad that MOP-21 had seen a full exploration of positions on the matter and were satisfied that it was on the Protocol's future agenda.

On the issue of destruction several developed country delegates were pleased that momentum was maintained. Others mourned the slow progress. Looking toward the ExComm to be held immediately after MOP-21, delegates predicted extensive discussion on the special facility, and hoped for a robust debate at OEWG-30, in order to establish the potential both for funding low GWP alternatives to HCFCs and destruction. What is certain is that all MOP-21 delegates will be focused on future climate and ozone meetings to see how the hot topic of HFCs continues to evolve.

**UPCOMING MEETINGS**

**SEVENTH WORLD FORUM OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: PARIS 2009:** This conference will take place from 19-20 November 2009 in Paris, France. The theme

is "The new world order: after Kyoto and before Copenhagen." For more information, contact: Passages-ADAPes; tel: +33-01-43-25-2357; fax: +33-01-43-25-6365/6259; e-mail: Passages4@wanadoo.fr; internet: [http://www.fmdd.fr/english\\_version.html](http://www.fmdd.fr/english_version.html)

**SECOND WORKSHOP ON ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN HOUSING:** This workshop will take place from 23-25 November 2009 in Vienna, Austria. Results of the workshop and the related measures presented will feed into and contribute to the development of the Action Plan for Energy Efficient Housing, to be developed under the UN Economic Commission for Europe. For more information, contact: Paola Deda, Secretary to the Committee on Housing and Land Management, UNECE; tel: +41-22-917-2553, fax: +41-22-917-0107, e-mail: [paola.deda@unece.org](mailto:paola.deda@unece.org); internet: <http://www.energy-housing.net>

**UNFCCC COP 15 AND KYOTO PROTOCOL COP/MOP 5:** The fifteenth Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC and fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol will take place from 7-18 December 2009 in Copenhagen, Denmark. These meetings will coincide with the 31st meetings of the UNFCCC's Subsidiary Bodies. Under the "roadmap" agreed at the UN Climate Change Conference in Bali in December 2007, COP 15 and COP/MOP 5 are expected to finalize an agreement on a framework for combating climate change post-2012 (when the Kyoto Protocol's first commitment period ends). For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); internet: <http://unfccc.int/>

**TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE BODY FOR THE CONVENTION ON LONG-RANGE TRANSBOUNDARY AIR POLLUTION:** This meeting will take place from 14-18 December 2009 in Geneva, Switzerland. For more information, contact the Secretariat: tel: +41-22-917-2370; fax: +41-22-917-0107; e-mail: [air.env@unece.org](mailto:air.env@unece.org); internet: <http://www.unece.org/env/lrtap/listofmeetings.htm>

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING FOR THE HIGHLEVEL TASKFORCE ON THE GLOBAL FRAMEWORK FOR CLIMATE SERVICES:** The meeting will take place from 21-22 December 2009 in Geneva, Switzerland. The meeting is being organized by the WMO pursuant to the decision of the World Climate Conference-3, held in Geneva from 31 August to 4 September 2009, for the establishment of the High Level Taskforce on the Global Framework for Climate Services. For more information, contact: WMO Secretariat; tel: +41-22-730 81-11; fax: +41-22-730 81-81; e-mail: [hlt@wmo.int](mailto:hlt@wmo.int); internet: [http://www.wmo.int/hlt-gfcs/index\\_en.html](http://www.wmo.int/hlt-gfcs/index_en.html)

**EXTRAORDINARY MEETINGS OF THE CONFERENCES OF THE PARTIES TO THE BASEL, ROTTERDAM AND STOCKHOLM CONVENTIONS:** The meeting will take place from 22-26 February 2010, in Bali, Indonesia. It will take place in coordination with the eleventh special session of the UNEP Governing Council and Global Ministerial Environment Forum. For more information, contact: a) Rotterdam Convention Secretariat: tel: +41-22-9178296; fax: +41-22-917-8082; e-mail: [pic@pic.int](mailto:pic@pic.int); b) Stockholm Convention Secretariat: tel: +41-22-917-8729; fax: +41-22-917-8098; e-mail: [ssc@pops.int](mailto:ssc@pops.int); c) Basel Convention Secretariat: tel: +41-22-917-8218; fax: +41-22-797-3454; e-mail: [sbc@unep.ch](mailto:sbc@unep.ch); internet: <http://excops.unep.ch/>

**ELEVENTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UNEP GOVERNING COUNCIL AND GLOBAL MINISTERIAL ENVIRONMENT FORUM:** The meeting will take place from 24-26 February 2010, in Bali, Indonesia. In pursuance of General Assembly resolution 53/242 (Report of the Secretary-General on environment and human settlements) of 28 July 1999, the Governing Council constitutes the annual ministerial-level global environmental forum in which participants gather to review important and emerging policy issues in the field of the environment. For more information, contact: UNEP; tel: +254-20-762-3431; fax: +254-20-762-3929; e-mail: [sgc.sgb@unep.org](mailto:sgc.sgb@unep.org); internet: <http://www.unep.org>

**SEVENTH SESSION OF THE BASEL CONVENTION OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP:** The session will convene from 10-14 May 2010, in Geneva, Switzerland. For more information, contact: the Basel Convention Secretariat; tel: +41-22-917-8218; fax: +41-22-797-3454; e-mail: [sbc@unep.ch](mailto:sbc@unep.ch); internet: <http://www.basel.int/meetings/meetings.html>

**UNFCCC SUBSIDIARY BODIES:** This meeting is tentatively scheduled to take place from 31 May - 11 June 2010, in Bonn, Germany. For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); internet: [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2010](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2010)

**THE FIRST SESSION OF THE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE TO PREPARE A GLOBAL LEGALLY BINDING INSTRUMENT ON MERCURY:** This session will convene from 7-11 June 2010, in Stockholm, Sweden. This meeting is expected to be the first of five Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee meetings to negotiate a legally binding instrument on mercury. For more information, contact: UNEP Chemicals; tel: +41-22-917 8183; fax: +41-22-797-3460; e-mail: [mercury@chemicals.unep.ch](mailto:mercury@chemicals.unep.ch); internet: <http://www.respoint.se/itp/event/inc1/9475> or <http://www.chem.unep.ch/mercury/>

**MONTREAL PROTOCOL OEWG-30:** The meeting is tentatively scheduled to take place from 21-25 June 2010, in Bangkok, Thailand. For more information, contact: the Ozone Secretariat; tel: +254-20-762-3850/1; fax: +254-20-762-4691; e-mail: [ozoneinfo@unep.org](mailto:ozoneinfo@unep.org); internet: <http://ozone.unep.org/Events/meetings2010.shtml>

**44TH MEETING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE UNDER THE NON-COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE FOR THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** The meeting is tentatively scheduled to meet from 1-2 July 2010, in Bangkok, Thailand. For more information, contact: Ozone Secretariat; tel: +254-20-762-3850/1; fax: +254-20-762-4691; e-mail: [ozoneinfo@unep.org](mailto:ozoneinfo@unep.org); internet: <http://ozone.unep.org>

**45TH IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE UNDER THE NON-COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE FOR THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** The meeting is tentatively scheduled to meet from 21-23 October 2010, in Nairobi, Kenya. For more information, contact: Ozone Secretariat; tel: +254-20-762-3850/1; fax: +254-20-762-4691; e-mail: [ozoneinfo@unep.org](mailto:ozoneinfo@unep.org); internet: <http://ozone.unep.org>

**BUREAU OF THE 21ST MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** The meeting is tentatively scheduled for 23 October 2010, in Nairobi, Kenya.

For more information, contact: Ozone Secretariat; tel: +254-20-762-3850/1; fax: +254-20-762-4691; e-mail: [ozoneinfo@unep.org](mailto:ozoneinfo@unep.org); internet: <http://ozone.unep.org>

**22ND MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** The meeting is tentatively scheduled to take place from 25-29 October 2010, in Nairobi, Kenya. For more information, contact: Ozone Secretariat; tel: +254-20-762-3850/1; fax: +254-20-762-4691; e-mail: [ozoneinfo@unep.org](mailto:ozoneinfo@unep.org); internet: <http://ozone.unep.org>

## GLOSSARY

CFC	Chlorofluorocarbon
CTC	Carbon tetrachloride
CUE	Critical-Use Exemption
CUN	Critical-Use Nomination
ExComm	Executive Committee
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HCFC	Hydrochlorofluorocarbon
HFC	Hydrofluorocarbon
HPMP	HCFC Phase-out Management Plan
MBTOC	Methyl bromide Technical Options Committee
MDI	Metered dose inhaler
MLF	Multilateral Fund
ODS	Ozone depleting substance
OEWG	Open-Ended Working Group
QPS	Quarantine and preshipment
TEAP	Technology and Economic Assessment Panel
TOC	Technical Options Committee