

**EIGHTEENTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES  
TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL ON  
SUBSTANCES THAT DEplete  
THE OZONE LAYER:  
30 OCTOBER - 3 NOVEMBER 2006**

The eighteenth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (MOP-18) took place in New Delhi, India, from 30 October - 3 November 2006. Over 550 people participated, representing governments, UN agencies, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, academia, industry, and the agricultural sector.

MOP-18 opened with a preparatory segment from Monday, 30 October, to Wednesday, 1 November, that addressed the MOP's substantive agenda items and related draft decisions. The preparatory segment was followed by a high-level segment, which convened from 2-3 November to adopt the decisions forwarded to it by the preparatory segment. Since the preparatory segment did not conclude its work by Wednesday, it convened several times on Thursday and Friday.

MOP-18 adopted 37 decisions, including on: essential-use nominations and other issues arising out of the 2006 reports of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP); future work following the Secretariat's workshop on the Special Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the TEAP; critical-use nominations; difficulties faced by some Article 5 parties manufacturing CFC-based MDIs; treatment of stockpiled ozone-depleting substances (ODS) relative to compliance; a feasibility study on developing a system for monitoring the transboundary movement of ODS; and key challenges to be faced by parties in protecting the ozone layer over the next decade.

When the meeting concluded late on Friday evening, parties had managed to adopt decisions on almost all agenda items, with the majority of negotiations conducted in contact and informal groups. Parties did not agree to a draft or final decision on Canada's proposal to adjust the Montreal Protocol to meet the basic domestic needs of Article 5 parties. Items deferred for consideration until OEWG-27 included multi-year exemptions for CUEs and options that parties may consider for preventing harmful trade in methyl bromide stocks.

**A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE OZONE REGIME**

Concerns that the Earth's stratospheric ozone layer could be at risk from 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 ODS. The Convention now has 190 parties.

**IN THIS ISSUE**

A Brief History of the Ozone Regime . . . . .	1
MOP-18 Report . . . . .	3
Preparatory Segment . . . . .	3
High-level Segment . . . . .	3
MOP-18 Outcomes and Decisions . . . . .	5
Closing Plenary . . . . .	14
A Brief Analysis of MOP-18 . . . . .	14
Upcoming Meetings . . . . .	15
Glossary . . . . .	16

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Ingrid Barnsley, Asmita Bhardwaj, Robynne Boyd, Amber Moreen and Andrey Vavilov, Ph.D. The Digital Editor is Leila Mead. The Editor is Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org> and the Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are 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 United Kingdom (through the Department for International Development - DFID), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Germany (through the German Federal Ministry of Environment - BMU, and the German Federal Ministry of Development Cooperation - BMZ), the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the European Commission (DG-ENV) and the Italian Ministry for the Environment and Territory General Directorate for Nature Protection. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2006 is provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Swiss Agency for Environment, Forests and Landscape (SAEFL), the Government of Australia, the Austrian Federal Ministry for the Environment, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES) and the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (through the Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute - GISPRI). Funding for translation of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* into French has been provided by the International Organization of the Francophonie (IOF) and the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Funding for the translation of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* into Spanish has been provided by the Ministry of Environment of Spain. The opinions expressed in the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Earth Negotiations 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 212 East 47th St. #21F, New York, NY 10017, USA.

**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 190 parties.

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 their entry 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, 183 parties have ratified the London Amendment. MOP-2 also established the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol (Multilateral Fund). The Multilateral Fund 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 Multilateral Fund Secretariat. The Fund is replenished every three years, and received pledges of US\$2.1 billion between 1991 and 2005.

**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 (HBFCs) and hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs). MOP-4 also agreed to enact non-compliance procedures and to establish an Implementation Committee (ImpCom). The ImpCom examines cases of possible non-compliance by parties, and makes recommendations to the MOP aimed at securing full compliance. To date, 174 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 a ban on trade in methyl bromide with non-parties to the Copenhagen Amendment. To date, 147 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 pre-shipment (QPS) applications. MOP-11 also agreed to replenish the Multilateral Fund with US\$440 million for 2000-2002. At present, 116 parties have ratified the Beijing Amendment.

**MOPs 12-14:** MOP-12, held in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, in 2000, adopted the Ouagadougou Declaration, which encouraged parties to take steps to prevent illegal production,

consumption and trade in ODS, and to harmonize customs codes. The following year in Colombo, Sri Lanka, delegates to MOP-13 adopted the Colombo Declaration, which encouraged parties to apply due care in using substances that may have ozone depletion potential (ODP), and to determine and use available, accessible and affordable alternatives and technologies that minimize environmental harm while protecting the ozone layer. At MOP-14, held in Rome, Italy, in 2002, the MOP's decisions covered such matters as compliance, interaction with the World Trade Organization, and replenishment of the Multilateral Fund with US\$474 million for 2003-2005.

**MOP-15:** Like its predecessors, MOP-15, held in Nairobi, Kenya, in November 2003, resulted in decisions on a range of 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 are available. As delegates could not reach agreement, they took the unprecedented step of calling for an "extraordinary" MOP.

**FIRST EXTRAORDINARY MOP:** The first Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (ExMOP-1) took place from 24-26 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 for new production of 30% of parties' 1991 baseline levels, meaning that where the capped amount was insufficient for critical uses allocated in 2005, parties were required to use existing stockpiles. Parties also achieved compromises on conditions for approving and reporting on CUEs, and the working procedures of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (MBTOC).

**MOP-16:** MOP-16 took place in Prague, Czech Republic, from 22-26 November 2004. The parties adopted decisions on the Multilateral Fund, ratification, compliance, trade in ODS and other matters, but work on methyl bromide exemptions for 2006 was not completed. For the second time, parties decided to hold an extraordinary MOP.

**SECOND EXTRAORDINARY MOP:** ExMOP-2 was held on 1 July 2005, in Montreal, Canada. Parties agreed to supplementary levels of CUEs for 2006 left unresolved at MOP-16. Under this decision, parties also agreed that: CUEs allocated domestically that exceed levels permitted by the MOP must be drawn from stocks rather than from new production; methyl bromide stocks must be reported; and parties must "endeavor" to allocate CUEs to the particular 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 in Dakar, Senegal, from 12-16 December 2005. Parties approved essential-use exemptions for 2006 and 2007, supplemental CUEs for 2006 and CUEs for 2007. They authorized production and consumption of methyl bromide in non-Article 5 parties for laboratory and analytical critical uses, and requested the

Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) to report on such uses. Other decisions concerned, *inter alia*: submission of information on methyl bromide in space fumigation; replenishment of the Multilateral Fund with US\$470.4 million for 2006-2008; and the terms of reference for a feasibility study on developing a monitoring system for the transboundary movement of controlled ODS. Parties deferred consideration of: the US's proposal on multi-year CUEs; Canada's proposal on disclosure of interest guidelines for bodies such as the TEAP and its Technical Options Committees (TOCs); and the European Community's proposal for an adjustment to the methyl bromide phase-out schedule for Article 5 parties.

**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 of methyl chloroform by 1996; bromochloromethane by 2002; and methyl bromide by 2005. Consumption of HCFCs is to be phased out by 2030 (with interim targets prior to those dates), with production to have been stabilized by 2004. Article 5 parties were required to phase out production and consumption of bromochloromethane by 2002. These parties must still phase out: production and consumption of CFCs, halons and CTC by 2010, and methyl chloroform and methyl bromide by 2015; and consumption of HCFCs by 2040 (with interim reduction targets prior to phase-out). Production of HCFCs in Article 5 countries must be stabilized by 2016. As for non-Article 5 parties, there are exemptions to these phase-outs to allow for certain uses lacking feasible alternatives or in particular circumstances.

## MOP-18 REPORT

### PREPARATORY SEGMENT

Marco Gonzalez, Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat, opened MOP-18's preparatory segment, commending India's strong commitment to the Montreal Protocol. He highlighted progress achieved in reducing ODS, and current challenges in and opportunities for advancing the goals of the Protocol.

Stressing the importance of the Montreal Protocol, Thiru A. Raja, India's Minister of Environment and Forests, called on delegates to consider favorably the use of CFCs in MDIs in developing countries, given the lack of viable alternatives. He also noted other issues to be discussed at the meeting, including the safe disposal of unused ODS and illegal trade.

Delegates adopted the agenda (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/1), with additional items proposed by the European Community (EC), the US, China and Argentina, and agreed to the organization of work, as suggested by the Co-Chairs of the preparatory segment, Tom Land (US) and Nadzri Yahaya (Malaysia). The EC's proposed inclusion of n-propyl bromide, the US's proposed inclusion of cooperation with the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), and China's proposed inclusion of the 2008 Beijing Olympics were addressed under the agenda item on "Other matters." Argentina's proposed inclusion concerning the Special Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the TEAP (IPCC/TEAP Special Report) was

addressed in the contact group set up to consider work to follow from the experts' meeting on the IPCC/TEAP Special Report.

Throughout MOP-18, delegates discussed agenda items and corresponding draft decisions in plenary, contact groups and informal consultations. Rather than addressing agenda items in numerical order, issues likely to lead to the establishment of contact groups were introduced to plenary on Monday and Tuesday, in an effort to ensure adequate time for resolution of these issues. Draft decisions were approved by the preparatory segment, and forwarded to the high-level segment for adoption on Friday evening. The description of the negotiations, the summary of the decisions and other outcomes can be found below.

### HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT

Thiru A.Raja, India's Minister of Environment and Forests, welcomed participants to the high-level segment on Thursday, 2 November. UNEP Deputy Executive Director Shafqat Kakakhel reaffirmed UNEP's readiness to continue assisting parties with implementation of the Protocol, and stressed that political support is vital for overcoming remaining challenges. President of the MOP-18 Bureau, Elias Mulungula (Democratic Republic of Congo), noted that the Protocol is progressing towards universal membership.

Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh stressed the link between poverty, economic growth and environmental protection, and highlighted India's progress in implementing the Protocol. He noted lessons from the Protocol, including that trade restrictions are not advisable, and that compliance should be more creative and less adversarial. He also called for channeling additional financial and technological resources to Article 5 parties to achieve the objectives of the Montreal Protocol.

Namonarain Meena, Minister of State for Environment and Forests, India, reiterated the significance of the interface between the environment and development.

Parties then elected Bureau members for MOP-18. Elias Malungula (Democratic Republic of Congo) was elected President, Evgeny Gorshkov (Russian Federation), Juan Filpo (Dominican Republic) and Muhammad Masgood Akhtar (Pakistan) were elected Vice-Presidents, and Paul Krajnik (Austria) was elected Rapporteur. Parties then agreed to the organization of work presented by MOP-18 President Mulungula.

**PRESENTATIONS BY ASSESSMENT PANELS:** Parties heard presentations by the assessment panels on their work on the 2002-2006 assessment reports.

**Scientific Assessment Panel:** A.R. Ravishankara, Scientific Steering Committee of the Scientific Assessment Panel (SAP), presented the major findings and conclusions of the 2006 Science Assessment, including the expected delay in the recovery of the ozone layer, the upward revision of methyl bromide's ODP and the impact of climate change. David Fahey, Lead Author, explained the 2006 update of the "Twenty Questions and Answers about the Ozone Layer," designed for a general audience.

**Environmental Effects Assessment Panel:** Janet Bornman, Environmental Effects Assessment Panel Co-Chair, updated delegates on, *inter alia*, terrestrial and ecosystem effects, the relationship between climate change and ozone depletion, and the effects the expected increase in ultraviolet B radiation.

**Task Force on Emissions Discrepancies:** Lambert Kuijpers, Co-Chair of the Task Force on Emissions Discrepancies (Netherlands), reported on the sources of discrepancies between emissions determined from bottom-up methods and atmospheric measurements for certain chemicals, as requested by COP-17 (Decision XVII/19). He noted conclusions, including that consistency between bottom-up and top-down assessments is better than was portrayed in the IPCC/TEAP Special Report.

**PRESENTATION BY THE CHAIR OF THE MULTILATERAL FUNDS' EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:** Khaled Klaly (Syria), Chair of the Multilateral Fund's Executive Committee (ExCom), presented a report of ExCom's activities since MOP-17 (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/8\*), including its forty-eighth and forty-ninth meetings (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/48/45, UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/48/45/Corr.1 and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/49/43). He cautioned against complacency in eliminating ODS.

**COUNTRY STATEMENTS:** On Thursday and Friday, delegates heard statements from senior officials and heads of delegation. Many countries thanked India for hosting, and the Secretariat for organizing, MOP-18. Delegates provided details of national and regional activities concerning the elimination of ODS, including information on legislative developments, training of customs officials and technicians, and public awareness campaigns. The Democratic Republic of Congo, for example, highlighted its commitment to sharing experiences in customs codification with Central African countries.

Delegates also highlighted the latest scientific findings on the ozone layer's recovery, as contained in the 2006 Scientific Assessment, and noted the upcoming twentieth anniversary of the Protocol's signing. Canada offered to host MOP-19 in Montreal in celebration of this anniversary. China and Tanzania linked the Protocol's success to its incorporation of the idea of common but differentiated responsibilities, while several countries, including Guinea and Libya, cautioned against complacency at this advanced stage in the Protocol's phase-out. The European Union (EU), Fiji, and Trinidad and Tobago welcomed the initiation of a dialogue on the future of the Protocol.

Article 5 parties, including Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Georgia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey and Uruguay, thanked international partners and relevant non-Article 5 parties for assistance with ODS phase-out projects. Some Article 5 parties, including China, Haiti, India, Malaysia and Syria, also called for continued and increased assistance from the Multilateral Fund, implementing agencies and non-Article 5 parties. India, Malaysia and Brazil noted the seriousness of the difficulties faced by some Article 5 parties in phasing out CFCs in the manufacture of MDIs, due to the non-availability of feasible alternatives, while Togo expressed hope that parties would seriously consider the proposed adjustment of the Montreal Protocol to address the basic domestic needs of Article 5 parties. Japan called for closer

cooperation to enable Article 5 parties to comply with their obligations, and reaffirmed its intention to continue assisting with technology, expertise and funding.

On methyl bromide, the EU expressed concern over its use for QPS treatments, while Uganda noted that it was seeking assistance for heat treatment, as an alternative to methyl bromide, for wood packaging materials used in export. China noted support for single-year exemptions for CUEs. Mauritius expressed concern that while developed countries supported the inclusion of methyl bromide control schedules for Article 5 parties, some are now themselves falling short of full phase-out. More generally, several parties, including Tanzania and Uganda, noted the importance of using incentives to encourage the commercial sector to develop and adopt ODS alternatives.

Burundi, China, Dominican Republic, EU, Ghana, Indonesia, Mauritius, Malaysia, the Philippines, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda noted the importance of addressing illegal trade in ODS, while Pakistan noted that both exporting and importing countries should institute controls for traded products. Many delegates expressed support for the development of an international system to track trade in ODS.

The EU, Mauritius and Dominican Republic noted concern about the use of CFC alternatives, including HCFCs, which have high global warming potentials. China said that the phase-out of HCFCs is different than the phase-out of other CFCs because HCFCs are used in larger-scale industries and in products with a wider application where there is greater difficulty in finding alternatives. The EU, Malaysia, Mauritius, the Philippines, and Trinidad and Tobago urged synergies with multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) on chemicals, waste and climate change.

**PRESENTATIONS BY IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES:** Noting that the Protocol is a good example for other MEAs and is a cornerstone of the chemicals agenda, Suely Carvalho, UN Development Programme (UNDP), said that chemicals hazards pose a particularly large risk to developing countries. Rajendra Shende, UNEP, gave an overview of UNEP's achievements with regard to the Protocol, emphasized the economic and development advantages of phasing out ODS, and noted the importance of achieving the Protocol's remaining tasks. Sidi Menad Si Ahmed, UN Industrial Development Programme (UNIDO), discussed its efforts to assist non-Article 5 parties to achieve their phase-out objectives. Steve Gorman, World Bank, reported that tackling HCFCs and other ODS calls for a multi-sectoral approach at the national level.

**NGO STATEMENTS:** Greenpeace noted its concern that the Protocol is subject to inordinate influence from multinational chemical corporations and suggested that this creates an un-level playing field for non-HCFC alternatives. He emphasized that the TOCs must consist of independent experts who are not financially connected to the chemical industry to ensure that ODS alternatives are given a fair hearing. The Environment Investigation Agency (EIA) said he hoped a decision on the future of the Protocol would revitalize the instrument and that he was concerned with the perverse incentives created by the Kyoto Protocol's Clean Development Mechanism with regard to HCFC

production. The International Institute of Refrigeration urged greater international coordination to address issues of ozone depletion and global warming.

### **MOP-18 OUTCOMES AND DECISIONS**

MOP-18 considered agenda items and related decisions on a variety of topics, including on: ratification; membership of Protocol bodies in 2007; budgetary matters; issues arising out of the TEAP's 2006 reports, including essential uses of CFCs; methyl bromide-related matters; Canada's proposal to adjust the Montreal Protocol; future challenges to be faced in protecting the ozone layer over the next decade; and compliance and data reporting. In total, 37 decisions were adopted. This section summarizes the negotiations and resulting decisions and outcomes.

#### **MEMBERSHIP OF PROTOCOL BODIES FOR 2007:**

In the preparatory segment on Monday, Co-Chair Yahaya introduced draft decisions on membership of the ImpCom, the ExCom and the OEWG for 2007 (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3, draft decisions XVIII/CC, XVIII/DD and XVIII/BB). He noted existing nominations and urged regional groupings to provide the Secretariat with nominations for outstanding positions. On Friday, Co-Chair Land updated delegates on nominations for the remaining positions and the preparatory segment agreed to forward the three draft decisions to the high-level segment, where they were adopted.

**Final Decisions:** In the decision on ImpCom membership (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/1), the MOP confirms the positions of Argentina, Lebanon, New Zealand, Nigeria and Poland for one further year, and selects Bolivia, Georgia, India, Tunisia and the Netherlands for a two-year period beginning 1 January 2007. It also notes the selection of a President, Vice-President and Rapporteur for one year, effective 1 January 2007, with the names to be inserted at a later date.

In the decision on ExCom membership, (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/2), the MOP endorses the selection of Canada, Sweden, Czech Republic, Japan, the US, Belgium and Italy as non-Article 5 members, and the selection of Sudan, Guinea, Mexico, Saint Lucia, Uruguay, Jordan and China as Article 5 members, for one year, effective 1 January 2007. It also notes the selection of Philippe Chemouny (Canada) as Chair and Nimaga Mamadou (Guinea) as Vice-Chair of the ExCom for one year, effective 1 January 2007.

In the decision on OEWG membership (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/3), the MOP names Marcia Levaggi (Argentina) and Mikkel Sorensen (Denmark) as Co-Chairs of OEWG for 2007.

**Chemicals Technical Options Committee (CTOC):** Co-Chair Land introduced a draft decision to confirm Biao Jiang (China) as Co-Chair of CTOC (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/35) to the preparatory segment on Friday, when it was forwarded to the high-level segment and adopted.

**Final Decision:** In the decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/35), the MOP names Biao Jiang (China) as a Co-Chair of CTOC.

**FINANCIAL MATTERS:** In Monday's preparatory segment, parties established a contact group to work on the draft decisions on the financial reports and proposed 2007-2008 budgets of the Convention and Protocol Trust Funds (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/4 and UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/4/Add.1). The contact group, chaired by Jozef Buys (Belgium), met from Monday through Wednesday.

In the contact group, the Secretariat presented a note discussing: budgetary principles; overview of budgets; performance of the 2005 Protocol and Convention budgets; proposed changes to the 2007 Protocol budget; overview of the proposed 2007-2009 Protocol budgets; and review status of the Protocol Trust Fund. Participants discussed issues, including budget surplus and possible areas of added costs, arrangements for convening a meeting on the Canadian proposal regarding the future of the Protocol, and cash reserve scenarios.

Based on these discussions, the Secretariat prepared scenarios that contained a revised contribution table, budgets with different cash reserve scenarios for 2007-2008, and a draft decision on financial reports and budgets. After discussion, participants agreed on a budget scenario, which maintains an 8.3% operating cash reserve for 2007 and 11.3% for 2008, and on the budget sources for the expenditures of the Protocol's twentieth anniversary celebrations. In presenting a report on the draft decisions on financial reports and budgets on Thursday, Chair Buys noted that there is a slight increase in party contributions in 2007-2008.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on financial reports and budgets, (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1 Dec XVIII/4), the MOP *inter alia*:

- recognizes voluntary contributions as essential for Protocol implementation;
- approves the 2007 budget of the Protocol Trust Fund in the amount of US\$4,671,933 and takes note of a budget of US\$4,542,563 for 2008;
- authorizes the Secretariat to draw down US\$395,000 in 2007;
- approves total contributions to be paid by parties at US\$4,276,933 for 2007 and US\$4,542,563 in 2008;
- approves the Protocol Trust Fund budget for the operating cash reserve of 8.3% in 2007, agrees to contribute 3% of the budget for the cash operating reserve in 2008 and strives to maintain an operating cash reserve of 15% thereafter;
- allows the Secretariat the flexibility to make transfers between budget lines as necessary for funding activities to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the Protocol;
- expresses concern over payment delays in agreed contributions; and
- requests the Secretariat to inform OEWG-27 on all sources of income received, and actual and projected expenditures and commitments.

**STATUS OF RATIFICATIONS:** In the preparatory segment on Monday, Co-Chair Yahaya introduced the draft decision on the status of ratifications of the ozone instruments (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3, draft decision XVIII/AA), and congratulated Equatorial Guinea for becoming a party to the Montreal Protocol. Various delegates reported on their efforts to ratify the ozone instruments. The Secretariat noted that it hoped to see universal ratification of

the Protocol in the near future and parties agreed to forward the draft decision to the high-level segment.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on the status of ratifications of the ozone instruments (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/5), the MOP notes with satisfaction the large number of parties that have ratified the instruments and urges all parties to ratify all instruments.

#### ISSUES ARISING OUT OF THE 2006 TEAP REPORTS:

**Review of essential-use nominations:** Co-Chair Yahaya introduced draft decisions proposed by the US, the EC and the Russian Federation (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3, draft decisions XVIII/A, XVIII/B and XVIII/C) in the preparatory segment on Monday. Informal discussions between the three parties were held throughout the week. On Wednesday, the US released a draft decision, which sought to combine the three drafts (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.10). After further consultations, the three parties agreed to present two draft decisions to the high-level segment on Friday night, one merging the draft decisions of the US and the EC (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.19) and one revising the original decision of the Russian Federation (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.21). These were adopted.

In introducing the three original draft decisions, Co-Chair Yahaya explained that the EC and the US's decisions concerned their nominations for essential-use exemptions for CFCs for MDIs for 2007 and 2008 respectively, which the TEAP had recommended parties approve in its May 2006 progress report. Co-Chair Yahaya also outlined that the Russian Federation's draft decision concerned its nomination for the use of CFC-113 in aerospace applications for 2007-2010. He explained that, given the date of submission of this nomination, the TEAP had not been able to fully consider the request, but that it had suggested the parties might wish to grant a one-year exemption, on the understanding that the request for 2008-2010 be subjected to a thorough review in 2007.

On the final draft decision on nominations by the US and the EC, the US explained that the first two paragraphs represented consensus text from previous meetings, with the first paragraph authorizing essential uses for amounts as recommended by the TEAP, taking into account stocks so that no more than a one-year operational supply is maintained. He also explained that the third paragraph addressed research into alternatives.

**Final Decisions:** In the decision on essential-use nominations for non-Article 5 parties for 2007 and 2008 (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.19), the MOP:

- authorizes the levels of production and consumption for 2007 and 2008 necessary to satisfy essential uses of CFCs for the production of MDIs, as specified in the annex as 535 tonnes for 2007 for the EC and 385 tonnes for 2008 for the US;
- requests non-Article 5 parties, when licensing, authorizing or allocating essential-use exemptions for CFCs for MDIs to take into account pre- and post-1996 CFC stocks, such that no more than a one-year operational supply is maintained by the manufacturer; and
- asks non-Article 5 parties to request companies applying for MDI essential-use exemptions to demonstrate they are making efforts with all due diligence on research and development

of CFC-free alternatives to their products, and are diligently seeking approval of their CFC-free alternatives in domestic and export markets aimed at transitioning those markets away from CFC products.

In the decision on nomination for an essential-use exemption for CFC-113 for aerospace applications in the Russian Federation (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.21), the MOP:

- permits the Russian Federation a level of production and consumption of 150 metric tonnes of CFC-113 for use in its aerospace industry in 2007;
- requests the TEAP and its CTOC to complete a comprehensive assessment of the information made available in the nomination and, on the basis of any additional relevant information, taking into account that the information underlying such analysis should comprehensively address why existing CFC-113 alternatives would not be applied for the use concerned;
- calls upon the Russian Federation to continue to cooperate closely with the TEAP and its CTOC in relation to the present decision and to submit, in accordance with the requirements of the TEAP and its CTOC, additional technical information on the use of CFC-113 that may be required;
- requests the TEAP and CTOC to review all information provided and to present the results to OEWG-27;
- calls upon the Russian Federation to further consider the use of foreign sources of CFC-113 stockpiles, the possibility of and a timetable for introducing any new alternatives that become available, and to continue research and development activities with a view to finding alternatives;
- calls upon the Russian Federation to provide to the TEAP, for the purpose of any future nomination of CFC-113 for aerospace applications, comprehensive information; and
- calls upon the TEAP to take into consideration the outcome of the continued consultations mentioned above, in reviewing any additional nomination by the Russian Federation for aerospace applications for 2008.

**Review of draft terms of reference for case studies on the environmentally sound destruction of ODS:** Co-Chair Land introduced a draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3, draft decision XVIII/D) in the preparatory segment on Monday. A contact group was established, chaired by Patrick McInerney (Australia), which met on Monday and Tuesday. Chair McInerney introduced revised draft terms of reference, proposed by Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, the EU, Japan, Mexico and the US, to the preparatory segment on Wednesday (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.8). Parties agreed to forward the draft decision to the high-level segment, where it was adopted on Friday.

During discussions in plenary, a number of parties, including the EU, Colombia, India, Brazil, Mexico and Japan, with support from Canada, suggested that the ExCom develop consolidated terms of reference, based on the terms of reference currently being considered by the Multilateral Fund and those being considered by MOP-18. Contact group discussions developed from this basis. Participants focused on the need to produce a final report and the need for the study to commence as soon as possible.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on draft terms of reference for case studies on environmentally sound destruction of ODS (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/7) the MOP:

- requests the ExCom to develop consolidated terms of reference taking into account the elements referred to in both the draft terms of reference submitted to MOP-18 and the terms of reference developed by the Multilateral Fund Secretariat on the disposal of unwanted ODS; and
- requests the ExCom to conduct, as soon as possible, a study based on the resulting terms of reference and to provide a progress report to MOP-19, with a final report for consideration at OEWG-28.

**Report on activities related to the source of discrepancies between emissions determined from bottom-up methods and atmospheric measurement:** Delegates took up this issue on Tuesday in the preparatory segment, when TEAP Co-Chair Lambert Kuijpers (Netherlands) discussed the TEAP's assessments of CFCs and HCFCs (requested in Decision XVII/10). He discussed the methodology used for assessing emissions, and noted that top-down emissions were susceptible to uncertainty regarding the accuracy of observations and the ability to assess global changes and removal rates. TEAP Co-Chair Paul Ashford (UK) discussed the TEAP's analysis of top-down information and atmospheric uncertainties, and comparisons between estimates derived from top-down versus bottom-up information. No formal decision was adopted on this issue.

**Sources of CTC emissions and opportunities for reductions:** During Tuesday's preparatory segment, the EC introduced a draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3, draft decision XVIII/E), with a request to the TEAP to provide more data on the issue and report to the OEWG. The US said it would suggest some changes to the EC's text informally. On Wednesday, the US reported that agreement was reached on a draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.14), and parties agreed to forward it to the high-level segment, where it was adopted on Friday.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on sources of CTC emissions and opportunities for reductions (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/8), preambular language expresses concern regarding the large discrepancy in reported emissions and observed atmospheric concentrations, which indicate emissions from industrial activity are significantly underestimated. In the operative paragraphs of the decision, the MOP requests the TEAP to:

- continue its assessment of global CTC emissions, and to pay particular attention to better data for industrial emissions, further investigation of issues related to CTC production, and estimation of emissions from other sources such as landfills; and
- prepare a final report on the assessment in time for OEWG-27.

**Other issues arising out of the TEAP's 2006 reports:** This item was introduced in plenary on Monday. On outstanding process agent requests, Co-Chair Land explained the TEAP found that Brazil's request did constitute a process agent use but that it was phased out in 2000, and that Turkey's request

also constituted a process agent use, to the value of 13 tonnes of emissions with ODP. Brazil noted it would try to provide additional information on its phase-out, as there may be some corrections concerning consumption, given inadequate technical information. Co-Chair Land said the issue, together with the TEAP's findings, would be noted in the meeting report.

On the TEAP's membership and budget, Co-Chair Land recalled the TEAP's request, contained in its May 2006 progress report, for funding for some travel by non-Article 5 experts in 2007. With Australia, the US suggested that non-Article 5 parties might expand efforts to provide support for their experts. Argentina, with Mauritius and Bolivia, said that the issue is broader than budgetary concerns and stressed the need for Article 5 expert participation. The TEAP also clarified that the requested funding would finance travel in extraordinary circumstances where no other sources of funding are available. No final decision was taken on this issue.

**REPORT OF THE EXPERTS' MEETING ON THE IPCC/TEAP SPECIAL REPORT:** The report of the Secretariat's expert workshop on the IPCC/TEAP Special Report was taken up in the preparatory segment on Monday and Wednesday. The issue was also addressed in a contact group, chaired by Sophia Mylona (Norway), which met Tuesday through Thursday. During contact group discussions, the EU presented a draft decision on future work following from the experts' workshop (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.5) and Argentina submitted a draft decision on implications of the establishment of new HCFC-22 facilities seeking to obtain certified emissions reductions for the destruction of HFC-23 under the Clean Development Mechanism (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.4). A revised draft decision combining components of the EU's and Argentina's draft decisions was presented to the preparatory segment on Thursday, and was adopted in the high-level segment on Friday.

During discussions, the EU, noting the need to consider the relative urgency of the measures in the Special Report, said it was developing a draft decision. The US, supported by India, stated that prioritization of the measures was likely to be party-specific. Argentina emphasized the importance of HCFCs and the incentives created by the Kyoto Protocol's Clean Development Mechanism, and said it was drafting a related decision. The EIA emphasized that the global warming potential of HCFCs and HFCs could rival the total greenhouse gas emissions of the EU by 2015 and, with Greenpeace, urged a fully-funded accelerated phase-out.

The discussion in the contact group revealed extensive differences between the two approaches, as reflected in the draft decisions of the EU and Argentina. While the EU text requested the TEAP to assess and prioritize practical measures listed in Annex 1 of the report of the experts' workshop on the IPCC/TEAP Special Report, Argentina's draft addressed the prospect of higher global production of HCFC-22, which would significantly impact on the objectives of the Montreal Protocol. The authors of the latter proposal argued that there is a potential for an accelerated shift in HCFC-22 production from non-Article 5 to Article 5 parties. They pointed to downward pressure on HCFC-

22 prices, and lack of incentives to develop new technologies to replace HCFC-22.

Several participants supported Argentina's proposal, noting that it highlighted an urgent problem. China objected to the proposal, saying that it duplicates the expected discussion of HCFC-22 at the upcoming UNFCCC COP-12 and Kyoto Protocol COP/MOP-2, and there is no ground for involving the CDM. The discussion in the contact group mainly revolved around these issues, but parties managed to reach compromise by incorporating the main elements of Argentina's proposal in a revised EU text.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on future work following the Secretariat's workshop on the IPCC/TEAP Special Report (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.2, Decision XVIII/10), preambular language expresses concern that better scientific understanding now suggests a 10-15 year delay in the return of atmospheric chlorine levels to pre-1980 levels, and notes parties' awareness of the potential implications of Clean Development Mechanism projects in HCFC-22 production facilities. In the operative paragraphs of the decision, the MOP requests:

- the TEAP to further assess measures listed in the workshop report, in light of trends in ODS production and consumption with a focus on HCFCs, taking into account timing, feasibility and environmental benefits;
- the TEAP to provide information on current and future demand and supply of HCFCs, giving full consideration to the influence of the CDM on HCFC-22 production, and on the availability of alternatives;
- the Secretariat to facilitate consultations between the TEAP, the UNFCCC Secretariat, the Clean Development Mechanism Executive Board and the Multilateral Fund Secretariat; and
- the TEAP to report its findings to OEWG-27, with a view to providing a final report at MOP-19.

**METHYL BROMIDE-RELATED ISSUES: Review of CUNs:** The issue was taken up in Tuesday's preparatory segment, when the MBTOC Co-Chairs Mohammed Besri (Morocco), Ian Porter (Australia), Michelle Marcotte (Canada) and Marta Pizano (Colombia) presented an overview of MBTOC's review of CUNs, as well as MBTOC's work plan and timetable. CUNs were then discussed in a contact group, chaired by Pierre Pinault (Canada), from Tuesday through Friday. On Friday, Chair Pinault presented a draft decision in the high-level segment (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.20), where it was adopted with minor editorial amendments.

The main topics of discussion were treatment of stockpiles in relation to CUEs, and issues with MBTOC's recommendations.

During discussions on stocks, the US discussed the information it recently released on its stocks, emphasized its consideration of stocks in its domestic allocation processes, and said that stocks were needed: to ensure a smooth and timely distribution of material; to meet export needs, and as a safety net in the event of a catastrophic event or a plant failure. The EC, Switzerland and the US emphasized the importance of reaching a decision at MOP-18 on the treatment of stockpiles. The EC, Switzerland, the EIA and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) noted unease over US stockpiles. The EC said it is

the responsibility of the parties to take account of these stocks when considering CUNs in order to be in full accordance with Decision IX/6 which, *inter alia*, calls for parties to consider stocks in allocating CUEs. NRDC further said that the sale of methyl bromide stocks to users that do not hold CUEs contravenes Article 2H of the Protocol (methyl bromide). Non-Article 5 parties also discussed the size of stockpiles needed, with one non-Article 5 party specifying that available stock information reflects stocks existing prior to 2005, and others expressing concern about stocks constituting CUE loopholes.

In deciding how to treat stocks, some non-Article 5 parties sought clarity regarding: the differentiation between operational stockpiles for feedstock and QPS uses, and pre-2005 stocks; the meaning of stocks; and categories of use of the quantities drawn from stocks in the past. In order to better understand these matters, some non-Article 5 parties suggested a study on stocks to clarify this. However, no such study was included in the final decision.

Various ideas regarding how to treat stocks were put forward (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.7 and UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.9). The US pointed to prior precedent in how the parties dealt with CFC stocks and essential-use exemptions. In contrast, Switzerland said this precedent was not relevant to methyl bromide. He said that in the case of essential uses, the required CFCs are unique in that they need to be of a pharmaceutical grade, but for methyl bromide, adequate quantities are available given that feedstock use of methyl bromide will continue and that all uses, including feedstocks, can be drawn from the same stocks. An EU proposal called for stocks to be less than 25% of the quantity allowed for CUEs and for new production for CUEs to be contingent on a lack of availability of stocks. In contrast, text proposed by the US limited stocks to a one-year operational supply and called for CUEs to be contingent on party-specific, as opposed to regional, National Management Strategies (NMSs). In the accepted compromise, the parties did not impose caps on stocks, but called for the TEAP to report on stocks held by each nominating party and renewed parties' commitment to allocate methyl bromide for critical uses only if sufficient stocks are unavailable.

Parties' general views on CUEs and the role of MBTOC varied. A few non-Article 5 parties said that MBTOC was only advisory in nature, and thus that parties could question their recommendations. Others disagreed, saying the parties were in no position to question the technical bodies' recommendations. The EC, with Chile, said that accepting MBTOC's recommended CUE quantities sends an important signal to Article 5 parties, and Switzerland said doing so is a matter of principle.

Parties' views on MBTOC's recommendations regarding the quantity of CUEs to grant for specific categories of use in specific countries for 2008 and the supplemental amounts to approve for 2007 also varied. The EC said that MBTOC's recommendations for its member states were acceptable despite some significant reductions in the nominated quantities recommended by MBTOC. Chile said MBTOC's recommendations should be adopted without amendment and Switzerland questioned why some countries were transitioning to alternatives at a much higher rate than others. In contrast,

Australia, the US, New Zealand and Israel challenged specific MBTOC recommendations. Australia noted the need for better information-sharing between MBTOC and nominating parties.

The US criticized MBTOC's recommendations on its CUNs more broadly, saying that the MBTOC had gone beyond its mandate in substituting its judgment for that of the nominating parties, and was not following the agreed procedures of review. Saying that MBTOC had not considered the specific circumstances of each CUN, he questioned the basis of MBTOC's across-the-board imposition of 25% transition rates, the "usage" rates assumed in the report, and how MBTOC's determined alternatives were economically feasible. In the final decision, all of the parties challenging MBTOC recommendations were granted quantities exceeding, for some categories of use, MBTOC's recommendations. The justifications for the discrepancy from the quantities recommended by MBTOC varied, ranging from technical errors, to the divulgence of new relevant information, to negotiated compromise.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on CUEs (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.20), the MOP, *inter alia*:

- permits levels of production and consumption for the agreed CUE categories for 2008 and supplemental levels for 2007;
- calls for the TEAP to take "information on domestic implementation" for related 2007 and 2008 critical uses into account when assessing supplemental CUNs for 2008;
- calls for parties to "endeavor" to allocate critical uses as agreed in the annex to the decision (listing the supplemental CUE quantities for 2007 and the CUE quantities for 2008) and to use stocks to make up differences between CUE levels and permitted levels of production and consumption for critical uses;
- calls for parties to renew their commitment to the portion of Decision IX/6 (on CUEs) that says that "critical uses ... should be permitted only if ..." sufficient stocks are unavailable, and requests parties to report on implementation of this; and
- calls on the TEAP to publish annually the stocks of methyl bromide held by parties requesting CUEs.

**Report on possible need for CUEs over the next few years:** In Tuesday's preparatory segment, Co-Chair Yahaya introduced the issue of the TEAP's report on the possible need for CUEs over the next few years, based on a review of six NMSs (Decision Ex.I/4). Switzerland expressed doubt about the value of NMSs that offer practically no reductions over time. Canada explained that NMS forecasts are affected by uncertainty as to future methyl bromide alternatives. The US said its NMS identifies policies and specific sectors where methyl bromide reductions are anticipated. The EC emphasized that its NMS reflects current trends. Co-Chair Yahaya said the issue would be forwarded to the methyl bromide contact group. (See the summary of discussions above.)

**Final Decision:** In the decision on CUEs (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.20), preambular language notes that parties submitting requests for methyl bromide for 2007 have supported their request with a management strategy as required under Decision Ex.I/4.

**QPS matters:** In the preparatory segment on Tuesday, the EC introduced a draft decision on cooperation with the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) on the use of alternatives to QPS uses of methyl bromide (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3/Add.1), with Co-Chair Land suggesting that a "subgroup" meet to discuss the issue. A "non-group" was established, chaired by Philippe Tulkens (EC), which met from Tuesday through Thursday. Chair Tulkens introduced a revised text to the preparatory segment on Friday, (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.5), which was adopted during the high-level segment later that day.

During discussions, the US, supported by Australia, and New Zealand, questioned the broad scope of the original draft decision, while Switzerland and the EIA expressed hope that the decision would be adopted. These discussions carried over into the "non-group."

"Non-group" participants also considered language requesting the TEAP to seek cooperation, with some participants preferring a more general request and another participant preferring to prescribe the scope of cooperation more specifically. Contact group participants finally reached agreement on a synthesized text provided by Chair Tulkens, which included additional paragraphs requesting the TEAP, to *inter alia*, assist the QPS Task Force in reporting on methyl bromide use for QPS by combining data sets available to each body, and by providing technical guidance on technologies aimed at minimizing emissions from methyl bromide.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on cooperation between the Montreal Protocol and IPPC on alternatives to QPS uses of methyl bromide (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/12), the MOP:

- welcomes proposals by the IPPC's Technical Panel on Forestry Quarantine for closer cooperation between IPPC and Protocol technical bodies;
- requests the TEAP to cooperate with the technical bodies of the IPPC with a view to ensuring that potentially duplicative activities are coordinated where practical;
- requests the TEAP to report on the results of its contacts and work by OEWG-27;
- requests the Secretariat to provide factual information on the definitions of QPS under the Protocol and the IPPC; and
- encourages national level officials working on the Protocol and the IPPC to cooperate more closely to ensure that the objectives of both agreements are met when domestic actions are undertaken in relation to QPS uses of methyl bromide.

**Multi-year exemptions:** In introducing the US's draft decision on criteria for approving multi-year exemptions for CUEs (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3, draft decision XVIII/G) during Tuesday's preparatory segment, Co-Chair Yahaya recalled that the issue had been discussed in previous years and that, due to the busy agenda at MOP-17, parties had agreed to postpone the item until MOP-18.

The US highlighted advantages of a multi-year approach to exemptions, including increased certainty for the producers of methyl bromide and its alternatives, and reduced workloads for Protocol bodies. He also noted intersessional comments from Australia concerning the possibility of an annual reporting

framework within a multi-year approach. In response, Cuba, the EC, Mexico and Switzerland suggested postponement of the issue, with the EC suggesting a multi-year approach might send the wrong signal at a time when parties are striving for complete phase-out. Canada noted that the US's proposal does have some merit, particularly for certain uses, and that such an approach would save parties from having to reconsider the same exemptions annually where no alternatives are available. Parties agreed to defer consideration of the issue until OEWG-27.

**Options for preventing potential harmful trade:** Co-Chair Land introduced the TEAP's report on this matter (Decision Ex.I/4). After a brief discussion, parties agreed to defer consideration of the matter until OEWG-27.

**Laboratory and analytical uses:** This issue was first considered in the preparatory segment on Tuesday, when Norway introduced a draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3/Add.2). After bilateral discussions with CTOC, Norway submitted a revised draft decision to the preparatory segment on Thursday (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.12), which parties agreed to forward to the high-level segment, where it was adopted on Friday, with a minor amendment to reorder the categories of laboratory and analytical critical uses of methyl bromide..

Providing background information to Norway's proposal, Co-Chair Yahaya drew attention to the provisions in the TEAP's report relating to existing categories and criteria for laboratory and analytical critical uses of methyl bromide (as requested in Decision XVII/10). Noting the TEAP's inability to find replacements to methyl bromide use in laboratory and analytical work, Norway explained that its draft decision specifies a number of categories of laboratory and analytical methyl bromide use.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on laboratory and analytical critical uses of methyl bromide (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Dec XVIII/13), the MOP:

- notes with appreciation the work of CTOC and MBTOC in considering the relevance of categories of use listed in Annex IV to the report of MOP-7 to laboratory and analytical critical uses of methyl bromide;
- notes that the aforementioned committees do not favor classifying field trials as laboratory and analytical critical uses, and that parties carrying out such field trials using methyl bromide for laboratory and analytical critical uses could submit a CUN;
- recognizes that some laboratory and analytical critical uses listed in the committee's reports are applicable to both QPS and feedstock uses; and
- authorizes methyl bromide production and consumption as necessary to satisfy laboratory and analytical critical uses, given that, *inter alia*: methyl bromide is only used as a reference to calibrate equipment using methyl bromide, methyl bromide emissions levels are monitored, methyl bromide residue levels are determined, and the efficacy of methyl bromide and its alternatives for laboratory and feedstock uses is compared.

**Australia's emergency use:** On Tuesday, Executive Secretary Gonzalez reported on receipt of notification of an emergency

use of methyl bromide by Australia for non-QPS post-harvest fumigation of rice. On Thursday, Executive Secretary Gonzalez noted that following bilateral consultations with Australia, MBTOC found that the use was justified.

**DIFFICULTIES FACED BY SOME ARTICLE 5 PARTIES MANUFACTURING CFC-BASED MDIs:** On Monday, Co-Chair Yahaya recalled Decision XVII/14 relating to the difficulties faced by some Article 5 parties manufacturing MDIs using CFCs, and the draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3, Draft Decision XVIII/F) furthering this theme in the preparatory segment. A contact group was formed, chaired by Agustín Sánchez (Mexico), which met from Monday through Thursday. The draft decision was forwarded to the high-level segment on Thursday and adopted on Friday.

In discussions, many participants highlighted problems such as lack of affordable alternatives in phasing out CFCs in MDIs and the burden implied if non-CFC-based MDIs are imported. A number of participants requested financial and technical assistance for the phase-out, while one participant highlighted the need for closer cooperation and partnerships for technology transfer.

In contact group discussions, participants stressed the importance of considering the decision from a public health perspective and discussed issues relating to submission of an export manufacturing transition plan for CFC-based MDI manufacturers. A draft decision was prepared based on the contact group discussions (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.16).

**Final Decision:** In the decision on difficulties faced by some Article 5 parties manufacturing CFC-based MDIs (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/14), the MOP:

- recognizes the potential uncertainties of availability of pharmaceutical-grade CFCs in the near future and its impacts on health and local businesses who depend on its import;
- notes understanding of the need for further measures to facilitate transition to non-CFC treatments of asthma and obstructive pulmonary measure diseases in Article 5 parties;
- notes that non-Article 5 parties have made substantial progress in replacing CFC-based MDIs with alternatives but still require a limited amount of CFCs to produce MDIs;
- requests the ExCom to urgently consider funding projects to facilitate transition from CFC-based MDIs for Article 5 parties;
- requests the ImpCom to consider options for addressing potential non-compliance difficulties of Article 5 parties due to consumption of CFC-based MDIs;
- requests non-Article 5 parties manufacturing MDIs for export to provide a detailed export manufacturing transition plan to the importing parties where the exports of an active ingredient to an individual party exceeds 10 metric tonnes, and to submit reports on these activities as part of the essential-use nominations; and
- requests the TEAP to report progress to OEWG-27 and MOP-19 on recommended quantities for a limited campaign production of CFCs for MDIs for both Article 5 and non-Article 5 parties.

**STOCKPILED ODS RELATIVE TO COMPLIANCE:**

This item was discussed in the preparatory segment on Monday and Thursday and in a contact group on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. On Thursday, parties agreed to forward a revised draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.13) to the high-level segment, where it was adopted on Friday.

In introducing the issue to plenary, Co-Chair Yahaya recalled that in 2005, the ImpCom had discussed scenarios in which parties had stockpiled ODS, taking as its starting point an analysis prepared by the Secretariat (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/7, Annex). He also explained that the matter was discussed in a contact group at OEWG-26, chaired by Maas Goote (Netherlands). Goote then suggested that the three proposed options for dealing with cases of possible non-compliance that had been discussed at OEWG-26 could be the starting point for discussions at MOP-18.

Contact group discussions addressed potential inconsistencies with the data reporting requirements contained in Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, some participants' concerns with broadening the definition of "production" contained in Article 1 of Protocol, and the unknown scope of the problem of stockpiles in the context of compliance. Participants also discussed the necessity of wording regarding possible future stockpile scenarios relative to compliance, and a paragraph was added to the draft decision to specify that the ImpCom would address such cases within the established non-compliance procedures.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on the treatment of stockpiled ODS relative to compliance (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/15), the MOP:

- notes that the Secretariat had reported that parties that had exceeded the allowed level of production or consumption of a particular ODS in a given year had, in some cases, explained that their excess production or consumption represented one of four scenarios, which are listed in the decision;
- requests the Secretariat to maintain a consolidated record of the cases where the parties have explained that their situations were the consequence of the three possible non-compliance scenarios, and incorporate this record in the documentation of the ImpCom for information purposes only;
- recognizes that new scenarios not covered by the four scenarios listed in the decision will be addressed by the ImpCom in accordance with the non-compliance procedure of the Protocol and the established practice thereunder; and
- agrees to revisit the issue at MOP-21, with a view to considering further action.

**FEASIBILITY STUDY ON DEVELOPING A SYSTEM FOR MONITORING THE TRANSBOUNDARY**

**MOVEMENT OF ODS:** A feasibility study on developing a system for monitoring the transboundary movement of ODS (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/6) was considered in the preparatory segment on Monday, when the EC submitted a draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.3). The EC, Mexico and New Zealand submitted a revised draft decision to the preparatory segment on Wednesday (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP3.Rev.1), when it was forwarded to the high-level segment, and adopted on Friday. The

issue was also discussed in a contact group on Wednesday and Thursday.

In plenary, the study was first summarized by some of its authors, Duncan Brack (Chatham House), Ezra Clark (EIA) and Alexander von Bismarck (EIA). Many parties then acknowledged the importance of addressing illegal transboundary trade in ODS, and described national efforts to address the issue.

In the contact group, the main point of discussion was whether the Secretariat should assess the suitability of the UN commodity trade statistics database (UNComTrade), or whether more options should also be assessed. This issue was resolved by calling on member states to share their experiences in using the Global Risk Identification and Detection software (eGRID) and UNComTrade. In addition, Burkina Faso lobbied for language calling for the exchange of information between Article 5 and non-Article 5 parties

**Final Decision:** In the final decision on preventing illegal trade in ODS through systems for monitoring transboundary movement (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/16), the MOP:

- urges parties to implement Article 4B (control of trade with parties) and decisions related to trade;
- encourages parties to consider actions to improve ODS monitoring and to share information between Article 5 and non-Article 5 parties; and
- encourages parties to share their experience using UNComtrade and eGRID.

**DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST GUIDELINES FOR GROUPS SUCH AS THE TEAP AND ITS TOCs:** On Monday Co-Chair Land introduced a note by the Secretariat on issues for the attention of the MOP (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/2), explaining that Canada proposed guidelines for disclosure of interests at MOP-17 and that parties had agreed to defer the matter until MOP-18. He also introduced a revised proposal on disclosure of interest guidelines from Canada (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3/Add.3). A contact group, chaired by Paul Krajnik (Austria), then met from Monday through Thursday, when a revised draft decision was introduced in the preparatory segment (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.15). Parties agreed to forward the draft decision to the high-level segment, where it was adopted on Friday.

Contact group discussions centered on the necessity and scope of the proposed illustrative list of interests, with some participants preferring a more extensive list and others suggesting that such a list might preclude a large number of existing TEAP members from certain assessment activities. Participants also discussed the form for disclosure of interests and the possibility of a distinction between "real" and "potential" conflicts of interest. Participants also debated whether to specify how the TEAP should respond to conflicts of interest, with some finding specification limiting and others preferring such an approach as it was considered more objective than the current one. The final version of the draft decision was based on the existing code of conduct for the TEAP, its TOCs and temporary subsidiary bodies, but with: greater elaboration of conflicts of interest and actions to mitigate conflicts; a requirement for the

TEAP to publish annual reports and descriptions of financial and other relevant interests; and an annex containing an illustrative list of types of interests that should be disclosed.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on disclosure of interest guidelines for bodies such as the TEAP and its TOCs (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/17), the MOP decides to update text in the existing code of conduct for the TEAP, its TOCs and temporary subsidiary bodies, with text that provides that:

- members of these bodies shall annually disclose activities including business, government or financial interests in the production of ODS, their alternatives, and products containing ODS or their alternatives, which might call into question their ability to discharge their duties and responsibilities objectively;
- members of the TEAP, its TOCs and temporary subsidiary bodies must also disclose any financing, from a company engaged in commercial activities, for their participation in these bodies;
- a conflict of interest would only arise when an interest of a member, or his or her personal partner or dependant, would influence the expert's work;
- should there be a likely conflict of interest, a member shall take appropriate action, including seeking the advice of the Co-Chair or not participating in the determination of an issue either fully or in part;
- the Co-Chairs shall seek to avoid conflicts of interest, which could include requesting a member to take appropriate action, such as requesting a member to take no role or a restricted role in the determination of an item;
- in the case of a serious conflict of interest, where a member has been nominated by a party, that party shall be advised by the Co-Chair(s) of the conflict at the earliest opportunity;
- cases of conflicts or likely conflicts arising from the Co-Chairs should be raised with the President of the MOP; and
- the TEAP shall report annually on the relevant interests, and the resolution of any conflicts or likely conflicts.

The decision also contains an annex with an illustrative list of interests for the guidance of members of the TEAP, its TOCs and temporary subsidiary bodies.

#### **KEY CHALLENGES TO BE FACED BY THE PARTIES IN PROTECTING THE OZONE LAYER OVER THE NEXT DECADE:**

This item, originally proposed by Canada (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3, draft decision XVIII/H), was addressed in the preparatory segment on Monday. Canada noted intersessional responses to the proposal from other parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/INF/5), and a contact group was established, co-chaired by Philippe Chemouny (Canada) and Marcia Levaggi (Argentina), which met from Tuesday through Friday. During contact group deliberations, participants discussed two revised "non-papers" proposed by the contact group Co-Chairs. A final draft decision was introduced to the preparatory segment on Friday (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/34), when it was adopted during the high-level segment.

During plenary discussions, the EU, Argentina, Japan, Fiji, the US, China, New Zealand, India, Norway and others welcomed

the Canadian proposal. Delegates registered general agreement on the timeliness of launching a review process on the future of the Montreal Protocol and its institutions, and on the early setting of an agenda for future discussions. Several ideas were put forward on the substance of the future review process, with parties focusing on the need to explore a number of key categories of issues, among them the future of the Multilateral Fund, HCFCs, methyl bromide, compliance, and synergies with other MEAs. Support was expressed for holding a two-day workshop or "dialogue," back-to-back with OEWG-27. The contact group debated the arrangements and agenda for the dialogue, the prospective participants, and the content of the background document.

Differences emerged on some aspects of the draft decision, including on the need for indicating that the review process is initiated to develop long-term strategic planning of the ozone regime. This language was eventually removed. Parties debated the participation of other MEA Secretariats. Other issues concerned the exact wording of the seven broad categories proposed for discussion at the dialogue, including volumes of ODS phased out and/or produced per substance and per category of parties. The latter category was the last to be resolved, when "produced" was replaced with "phased-in."

**Final Decision:** In the decision on dialogue on key future challenges to be faced by the Montreal Protocol (UNEP/OzL.Pro/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/34), the MOP decides:

- to convene a two-day open-ended dialogue immediately preceding OEWG-27, with the participation of the Assessment Panels, the Ozone Secretariat, the Multilateral Fund Secretariat and the implementing agencies, and with relevant MEAs and NGOs as observers;
- to request the Ozone Secretariat to prepare by 30 April 2007, a background document, containing: a summary of key achievements of the Protocol and lessons learned; volumes of ODS phased out and phased in, including feedstocks, by substance and by category of parties; forecasts of future trends in production and consumption and emissions from ODS banks; compilation of submissions by parties; factual information on agenda topics; data on ODS phased out and phased in under Multilateral Fund projects; and an overview of the current and future state of the ozone layer;
- that the summary of key issues arising from the dialogue will be presented to OEWG-27; and
- that Khaled Klaly (Syria) and Tom Land (US) are to be Co-Chairs of the dialogue.

An annex to the decision contains the following key items for discussion:

- key achievements of the Protocol;
- scientific assessment, analysis and monitoring of the ozone layer;
- phasing out HCFCs;
- management, control and/or phase-out of ODS other than HCFCs;
- compliance, enforcement and illegal trade beyond 2010;

- cooperation and coordination with other MEAs and processes; and
- future of the Multilateral Fund beyond 2010.

**COMPLIANCE AND REPORTING ISSUES:** This item was considered in the preparatory segment on Wednesday. The parties agreed to forward a bundle of draft decisions on non-compliance (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.1), as amended to exclude Tanzania, to the high-level segment.

ImpCom President Mikheil Tushishvili (Georgia) presented a summary of ImpCom's thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh meetings (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/36/7). He discussed key items including: progress on data reporting by most parties; clarification of deviations in data; Bangladesh's notification of non-compliance (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/INF/10/Add.1); and approval and monitoring of compliance plans of action.

Concerning reporting on very small (*de minimis*) quantities of ODS, ImpCom President Tushishvili explained that the Protocol provides no guidance. Noting possible approaches proposed by the Secretariat (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/INF/7, Annex II), he said ImpCom recommended a combination approach, and invited the MOP to decide whether to set a *de minimis* level. The EU suggested deferring the issue until OEWG-27 and inviting submissions on the Secretariat's proposed approaches by March 2007 (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.6), while the US, with Australia, supported a return to the historical practice of reporting data to one decimal place. The EU said it could accept reporting to one decimal place and that it would withdraw its draft decision. The Secretariat said it would take note of parties' comments.

**Final Decisions:** The MOP adopted 14 decisions on non-compliance and data reporting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decisions XVIII/18-33). The decisions note non-compliance by Armenia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Dominica, Ecuador, Greece, Kenya, Pakistan, Paraguay and Serbia, and potential non-compliance by the Islamic Republic of Iran and Eritrea. Additional decisions relate to: a change in baseline data, and revised plans of action on certain ODS.

#### **ADJUSTMENT OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:**

This item was discussed in the preparatory segment on Monday, when a contact group was formed, chaired by Laura Berón (Argentina), which met from Monday through Friday. During Friday's preparatory segment, Chair Berón reported on contact group discussions and explained that participants had decided not to submit a draft decision.

In plenary, Co-Chair Land recalled the discussion at OEWG-26 on the Canadian proposal to adjust the Protocol's provision concerning production of CFCs to meet the basic domestic needs of Article 5 parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/3, Chapter II). Participants highlighted the importance of information on determining the size of Article 5 party needs and for affordable pharmaceutical-grade CFCs for MDIs in Article 5 parties.

In the contact group, participants discussed CFC production figures for non-Article 5 parties for meeting basic domestic needs of Article 5 parties in 2008-2009. Participants considered statistics regarding maximum quantities for CFC production for meeting basic domestic needs based on an EU informal paper. The group also considered a draft proposal by Canada, which

suggested introducing a limit of 10% of 1995-1997 production levels for CFC production to meet basic domestic needs. Some participants expressed concern regarding the effects of mandatory caps on products other than pharmaceuticals and on the MDI sectors in Article 5 parties, and suggested using a voluntary limit. After some debate, participants agreed on Thursday to produce a report to reflect contact group discussions, rather than a draft decision.

After more deliberations, Chair Berón provided a report to the plenary on Friday, noting that the group recognized that while it would be possible to reduce production for basic domestic needs further, it was important to continue to ensure an adequate supply of pharmaceutical-grade CFCs for MDIs. Instead of adjusting the Protocol, parties agreed to endorse the conclusions of the contact group, noting that non-Article 5 parties need to ensure an accelerated phase-out of their production for basic domestic needs. The meeting also agreed to note that through voluntary initiatives, total annual production of CFCs to meet the basic domestic needs of Article 5 parties are estimated to be approximately 2000 ODP-tonnes in 2007 and 1500 ODP-tonnes in 2008 and in 2009.

**OTHER MATTERS: N-propyl bromide:** This item was discussed in the preparatory segment on Tuesday and Wednesday. In tabling a draft decision proposed by the EC and Norway during Tuesday's preparatory segment (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.2), the EC noted n-propyl bromide (NPB) is not yet controlled under the Montreal Protocol, and, supported by Switzerland, noted its concern with the increasing use of n-propyl bromide. She suggested that the TEAP obtain more information on NPB and assess global emissions. After informal consultations with the US, the EC submitted a revised draft decision to the preparatory segment on Wednesday (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/CRP.2/Rev.1), which parties agreed to forward to the high-level segment, where it was adopted on Friday.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on n-propyl bromide (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1 Decision XVIII/9), the MOP requests:

- the SAP to update and publish by OEWG-27 information on the emissions and ODP of n-propyl bromide, including how ODP varies with location and season; and
- the SAP to pay particular attention to improving the data on production and uses and providing information on the availability, ODP and toxicity of alternatives, as well as on regulations affecting them.

#### **Cooperation with the International Civil Aviation**

**Organization:** Recalling the work undertaken by the Halons Technical Options Committee with ICAO, the US requested the Secretariat to facilitate further collaboration by working with the ICAO Secretariat. Parties agreed to take note of the intervention and agreed to consider the issue at a future date.

**2008 Beijing Olympic Games:** China presented on the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games, explaining the steps being undertaken by the government to incorporate a "green concept" into the Games. She noted that mainstreaming ozone protection was a major theme.

**DATES AND VENUE FOR MOP-19:** In the preparatory segment on Monday, and in the high-level segment on Friday,

Canada noted its willingness to host MOP-19, which will take place in the year of twentieth anniversary of the signing of the Protocol. Parties adopted a decision during the high-level segment on Friday.

**Final Decision:** In the decision on MOP-19 (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.2/Rev.1, Decision XVIII/36), the MOP agrees to convene MOP-19 in Montreal, Canada, from 17-21 September 2007.

### **CLOSING PLENARY**

The closing plenary was held on Friday evening. Delegates adopted the meeting report with minor textual amendments (UNEP/OzL.Pro.18/L.1, Add.1, Add.2, and Add.3). Delegates then adopted most decisions, before breaking at 5:55 pm to await revised draft decisions on essential- and critical-use nominations. After plenary reconvened at 9:20 pm, these were also adopted, with the EU, the US and the Russian Federation making brief comments to explain the final text of the decisions and to thank those involved in negotiating them. Parties also adopted the decision on dates and venue for MOP-19. MOP-18 President Mulungula thanked delegates, the Secretariat and others for their hard work, and India for hosting the meeting, and gavelled the meeting to a close at 9:54 pm.

### **A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF MOP-18**

The eighteenth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (MOP-18) opened with one the heaviest agenda in years, with items ranging from critical-use nominations and exemptions for methyl bromide, to the difficulties faced by developing country (Article 5) parties in transitioning to CFC-free metered-dose inhalers (MDIs), to disclosure of interest guidelines for members of the TEAP and its committees, to cases of non-compliance, and finally, to future challenges facing parties in protecting the ozone layer. The more controversial items provoked protracted discussion in a multitude of contact groups and informal “non-groups.” As the stacks of documents steadily piled up on delegates’ desks, they practically obscured the stark fact that MOP-18 was opening the gateway to the Montreal Protocol’s future. A disturbing background to the meeting was provided by reports that the largest ever recorded hole in the ozone layer was observed this fall, and that the rosy scientific predictions for the ozone layer’s restoration are off the mark by ten or fifteen years.

This brief analysis considers some of the main issues addressed at MOP-18, and what the outcomes suggest about the vitality of the Montreal Protocol on the eve of its 20th anniversary.

#### **THE ASCENT**

Delegates arrived in New Delhi prepared to tackle a large number of complicated agenda items in an evident spirit of compromise. The three dozen decisions passed unanimously were, to many, a refreshing demonstration of the maturity of the Protocol.

The issues receiving prime consideration at MOP-18 served as markers for this MOP’s place in the Protocol’s lifespan. Some perennial issues, such as methyl bromide critical use nominations

and CFC-free MDI’s, were as visible as ever. In light of the fast approaching 2010 phase-out of many ODS in Article 5 parties, discussions gravitated towards the feasibility of this deadline, especially related to CFC-free MDIs. For some developing country participants, the difficulty of accessing technologies needed to produce CFC-free MDIs is a major concern, since failure to adopt alternative technologies means risking non-compliance. Lack of technology transfer was an often-heard complaint. The situation moved one participant to evoke the current options as “either the devil, or the deep blue sea.” While the Multilateral Fund exists to assist Article 5 parties in the conversion process, this did not appear to quell the fears of many parties. And some non-Article 5 (developed country) parties noted that while these concerns are legitimate, they should not be overblown, since the transition is merely an issue of time. Interestingly, doctors in India are acting as ozone educators, as they urge patients to transfer to costlier CFC-free MDIs, arguing that these inhalers address both personal and environmental health.

At the other end of the phase-out schedule are the non-Article 5 parties that seem to cling to their methyl bromide addiction. Though still a contentious issue, critical-use nominations from parties did not spark an acrimonious debate at this year’s meeting, since many controversies were cleared up in bilateral consultations between the parties and MBTOC.

Several participants questioned the example that the “methyl bromide guzzlers” are setting for developing countries, which are working towards a phase-out. Grumblings were heard that the entrenched interests of some major members of the Protocol may impact on the attitude of Article 5 members, which may affect the integrity of the ozone regime as a whole.

#### **APPROACHING THE PEAK**

The Canadian initiative to hold a workshop to discuss the key challenges in protecting the ozone layer over the next decade emerged as a primary interest for many MOP-18 delegates, despite their daily need to grapple with more immediate and troublesome issues. A proposal on the matter was first discussed at OEWG-26, and burgeoned at MOP-18. Clearly, the two-day workshop (later rechristened the “dialogue”) planned to take place just before next year’s OEWG-27, will not be an ordinary seminar. In a surprising show of unanimity, the parties captured in the dialogue’s agenda the seven crucial issues whose discussion will likely shape the next era of ozone protection. Among these, in the view of some seasoned participants, two issues stood out in even sharper relief: the looming problem of HCFCs, and the future of Protocol institutions, in particular the Multilateral Fund.

The steep increase in HCFC production and consumption in countries like China and India, which actually mirrors the historic rise of CFCs, sharply contrasts with the 2016 deadline for freezing HCFCs by Article 5 countries, scheduled for 2016. Some participants questioned the viability of HCFC controls without Multilateral Fund assistance. However, while the Multilateral Fund significantly assisted with the first transition from ODS, it is not mandated to serve another transition, this time from HCFCs. That leaves developing countries with high

costs and less outside support, hardly an encouraging prospect. Some parties are therefore urging a fully-funded, accelerated phase-out of HCFCs. This item might well steal the limelight at MOP-19, in advance of the Fund's replenishment in 2008. If parties agree to replenishment in order to assist with HCFC phase-out, the Protocol would need to be amended to respond to this new situation. Therefore, the problem of HCFCs is intimately linked to the Montreal Protocol's future. It is also linked to the climate regime, since HCFCs have global warming potential.

### **BEYOND THE CLOUDS**

Parties at MOP-18 showed healthy enthusiasm in beginning to address the future of the Montreal Protocol, no matter how amorphous it appears at this stage. Arguably, this problem leads to more questions than answers, but at least the parties are demonstrating a willingness to move ahead. They have several months to ponder the future before offering their initial views at OEWG-27. Will the Multilateral Fund be replenished, or will funding be turned over to the GEF? Will the approaching phase-out schedules provoke a spike in illegal trade? How can countries effectively deal with the complex relationship between the ozone and the climate regimes, in terms of CFCs and HCFCs? These are a few of the enticing questions whose answers the parties will seek to answer.

The Montreal Protocol is a pioneering example for other conventions, whether in the kindergarten stage or approaching respectable seniority. However, this does not mean that the Protocol is home free, rather, it faces a daunting transition. While parties congratulated themselves on a successful MOP-18, some warned that a redoubling of efforts to comply with the phase-out schedules is indispensable to the ozone regime's continuous existence. One participant eloquently referred to the current stage of the Protocol as the "Edmund Hillary step," i.e., the last push towards the peak of Mount Everest. The Montreal Protocol is close to achieving its redeeming goal of ridding the world of substances that destroy the ozone layer, although the final ascent – completing phaseouts in non-Article 5 parties and supporting Article 5 parties as they meet their own commitments – may prove to be the most difficult. The sobering debate that unfolded in the air-conditioned halls of Vigyan Bhawan over the week was a poignant reminder that the view from the summit may turn out to be either opaque, or bathed in spectacular sunlight. As a delegate mused, while the Montreal Protocol is close to completing its lifespan, reincarnation is always a possibility.

### **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

**FIFTIETH MEETING OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL FUND'S EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:** The fiftieth meeting of the Executive Committee will be held from 6-10 November 2006, in New Delhi, India. For more information, contact: Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund; tel: +1-514-282-1122; fax: +1-514-282-0068; e-mail: [secretariat@unmfs.org](mailto:secretariat@unmfs.org); internet: [http://www.multilateralfund.org/show/page/50th\\_meeting\\_.htm](http://www.multilateralfund.org/show/page/50th_meeting_.htm)

**TWELFTH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE UNFCCC AND SECOND MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL:** UNFCCC COP 12 and Kyoto Protocol COP/MOP 2 will take place from 6-17 November 2006, in Nairobi, Kenya. These meetings will coincide with the twenty-fifth meetings of the UNFCCC's subsidiary bodies. 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://www.unfccc.int>

**SECOND MEETING OF THE PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS REVIEW COMMITTEE (POPRC):** This Stockholm Convention meeting will take place from 6-10 November 2006, in Geneva, Switzerland. For more information, contact: Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention; tel: +41-22-917-8191; fax: +41-22-797-3460; e-mail: [ssc@pops.int](mailto:ssc@pops.int); internet: <http://www.pops.int>

**EIGHTH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE BASEL CONVENTION:** Basel COP-8 will be held from 27 November - 1 December 2006, in Nairobi, Kenya. For more information, contact: Secretariat of the Basel Convention; tel: +41-22-917-8218; fax: +41-22-797-3454; e-mail: [baselcop8@unep.ch](mailto:baselcop8@unep.ch); internet: <http://cop8.basel.int/>

**CSD INTERGOVERNMENTAL PREPARATORY MEETING:** The fifteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development will be preceded by an Intergovernmental Preparatory Meeting, which will take place from 26 February - 2 March 2007, at UN headquarters in New York. This is the second, or policy year, of the implementation cycle during which the Commission will continue its focus on the following areas: energy for sustainable development, industrial development, air pollution/atmosphere and climate change. For more information, contact: UN Division for Sustainable Development; tel: +1-212-963-8102; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: [dsd@un.org](mailto:dsd@un.org); internet: [http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/csd15/csd15\\_ipm.htm](http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/csd15/csd15_ipm.htm)

**THIRD CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS:** POPs COP-3 is scheduled for 30 April - 4 May 2007, in Dakar, Senegal. For more information, contact: Stockholm Convention Secretariat; tel: +41-22-917-8191; fax: +41-22-797-3460; e-mail: [ssc@pops.int](mailto:ssc@pops.int); internet: <http://www.pops.int/>

**FIFTEENTH SESSION OF THE UN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT:** The fifteenth session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD-15) will be held from 30 April - 11 May 2007, at UN headquarters in New York. For more information, contact: UN Division for Sustainable Development; tel: +1-212-963-8102; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: [dsd@un.org](mailto:dsd@un.org); internet: <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/policy.htm>

**THIRTY-EIGHTH MEETING OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL'S IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE:** The Implementation Committee will hold its thirty-eighth meeting in Nairobi, Kenya, from 31 May - 1 June 2007. For more information, contact: Ozone Secretariat; tel: +254-20-762-


3850/1; fax: +254-20-762-4691; e-mail: ozoneinfo@unep.org; internet: <http://hq.unep.org/ozone/Events/meetings2006and2007.asp>

**TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL'S OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP:** This meeting is scheduled for 4-8 June 2007, 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; internet: <http://hq.unep.org/ozone/Events/meetings2006and2007.asp>

**OPEN-ENDED DIALOGUE ON THE FUTURE KEY CHALLENGES OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** This meeting is scheduled for 2-3 June 2007, 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

**NINETEENTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** MOP-19 is scheduled to take place from 17-21 September 2007, in Montreal, Canada. For more information, contact: Ozone Secretariat; tel: +254-20-762-3850/1; fax: +254-20-762-4691; e-mail: ozoneinfo@unep.org; internet: <http://ozone.unep.org/>


For more information on upcoming meetings, please visit: <http://www.iisd.ca/upcoming/linkagesmeetings.asp?id=5>



**IISD Reporting Services brings you MEA Bulletin, a publication that provides updated information focused specifically on the activities of key multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and their secretariats. It contains details of new reports, announcements, meetings (both large and small), implementation activities and other news.**

The new publication was made possible with support from UNEP's Division of Environmental Conventions, and is prepared by a team of experts who also work on EMB and Linkages Update.

The MEA Bulletin is distributed through MEA-L. To receive further issues of MEA Bulletin, visit: <https://www.iisd.ca/email/mea-l.htm>



**GLOSSARY**

CFCs	Chlorofluorocarbons
CUEs	Critical-use exemptions
CUNs	Critical-use nominations
CTC	Carbon tetrachloride
CTOC	Chemicals Technical Options Committee
ExCom	Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol
HBFCs	Hydrobromofluorocarbons
HCFCs	Hydrochlorofluorocarbons
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
ImpCom	Implementation Committee of the Montreal Protocol
IPCC/TEAP Special Report	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change/Technology and Economic Assessment Panel Special Report on Safeguarding the Ozone Layer and the Global Climate System
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
MBTOC	Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee
MDI	Metered-dose inhaler
MTOC	Medical Technical Options Committee
Multilateral Fund	Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol
NMS	National Management Strategy
NPB	n-propyl bromide
ODP	Ozone-depletion potential
ODS	Ozone-depleting substances
OEWG	Open-ended Working Group
QPS	Quarantine and pre-shipment
SAP	Scientific Assessment Panel
TEAP	Technology and Economic Assessment Panel
TEAP QPS Task Force	TEAP Task Force on uses of methyl bromide for QPS
TOCs	Technical Options Committees