Addendum

Part two: high-level segment (continued)

Statements by heads of delegations (item 5 of the agenda for the high-level segment)

1. During the high-level segment statements were made by heads of delegation of the following parties, listed in the order in which they spoke: Sri Lanka, Maldives, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Indonesia, China, Japan, Switzerland, European Union and its member States, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Cambodia, Paraguay, India, Guinea, Kenya, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Zimbabwe, Iraq, Cote d’Ivoire, Palau, Malaysia, Seychelles and Nepal. Following those statements the representative of South Sudan also made a statement.

2. Representatives of all parties who spoke thanked the Government and people of Indonesia for their hospitality in hosting the current meeting and remarked on the beauty of the island of Bali. Many thanked UNEP and the Ozone Secretariat, the Multilateral Fund secretariat and implementing agencies, donor countries, the assessment panels, international organizations and other stakeholders for their roles in ensuring the success of the meeting and the successful development and implementation of the Protocol, and congratulated the members of the bureau on their election.

3. Many representatives reiterated their commitment to the objectives of the Protocol, and some countries that had not yet ratified certain amendments affirmed their intention to do so. Many representatives described their countries’ efforts to meet their obligations under the Protocol. Achievements included the phase-out of the production and consumption of controlled substances, in a number of cases ahead of the deadlines established under the Protocol; the promotion of alternative substances and technologies, including climate-friendly technologies; training and capacity-building; awareness-raising; and the enhancement of cooperation among government ministries, public and private stakeholders, international organizations and the parties themselves. Several representatives referred to their attempts to ensure that phase-out was achieved in a sustainable manner. Some also noted the synergistic effects of their phase-out efforts, such as climate co-benefits and strengthened procedures and security measures related to other controlled substances.
Representatives praised the Montreal Protocol, characterizing it as the most successful international mechanism for environmental protection and citing it as a model for multilateral environmental agreements and for cooperation between developed and developing countries. Many called on the expertise gained through implementation of the Protocol to be used to accelerate destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances and development of alternatives to those substances, as well as to address new challenges such as climate change.

In the context of the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund many representatives spoke about the financial challenges faced by the parties, in particular parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol. Representatives of such parties on donors to provide adequate financial assistance to ensure that accelerated HCFC phase-out targets could be achieved. Representatives of donor countries noted the effects of the global economic crisis on their countries and the need to ensure that funds were used as efficiently as possible, while reaffirming their commitment to ensuring that the Protocol continued to function effectively and recognizing the need for financial assistance under paragraph 1 of Article 5.

A number of representatives were pleased to announce the approval of their country’s HCFC phase-out management plans. Many representatives from parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 spoke about the challenges their countries faced in implementing their phase-out plans, saying that sustained financial and technical support were needed to ensure that targets could be met. Many also emphasized the need for effective, regionally appropriate and economically, technically and environmentally viable alternatives to HCFCs.

A large number of representatives spoke about the control of HFCs. Many supported taking steps under the Protocol to begin addressing HFCs, arguing that their expanding use resulted almost entirely from the Protocol’s controls on CFCs and HCFCs and that doing so would yield important climate benefits. Others said that the parties should not address HFCs; they said, among other things, that they were beyond the scope of the Protocol and more appropriately addressed under the Framework Convention on Climate Change. In addition, they said that the challenges of HCFC phase-out and destruction of banks of ozone-depleting substances still remained and that viable alternatives to HFCs were not available in all sectors. At the same time, many representatives acknowledged that the negative impacts of high-GWP alternatives on the climate had to be carefully considered.

In that regard, several representatives urged that synergies with other multilateral environmental agreements be enhanced to address the broader climate change issues arising from implementation of the Protocol.

Methyl bromide use, particularly in quarantine and pre-shipment applications, remained a concern. Several representatives observed that commercially and technically viable alternatives were available, and urged parties using methyl bromide, particularly for quarantine and pre-shipment, to make use of them. Representatives from developing countries called attention to the need for shared information on alternatives and the transfer of technologies. Some proposed improved monitoring and the harmonization of trade standards as a more strategic means of reducing quarantine and pre-shipment use.

Many representatives agreed that ensuring the environmentally sound management and destruction of the growing amount of ozone-depleting substances, including those contained in banks, would enhance efforts to protect the ozone layer and mitigate climate change. A number of representatives of developing countries said that they were hampered in their ability to deal with banks of ozone-depleting substances due to a lack of material and financial resources and called upon the Multilateral Fund to provide assistance in that area. One representative described his country’s success in developing effective destruction technologies and offered to share knowledge on the subject.

A number of representatives said that institutional strengthening had played an important role in building the capacity of developing countries to implement the Protocol. They called for continued funding for institutional strengthening for the accelerated phase-out of HCFCs; eliminating production and consumption of methyl bromide, including for quarantine and pre-shipment applications; destruction of obsolete ozone-depleting substances; and control of illegal trade and illegal disposal of such substances.

In his statement, the representative of Nepal appealed to the parties to reconsider his country’s request to be treated as a party in accordance with paragraphs 8 and 9 of Article 4 of the Montreal Protocol, reiterating the arguments made during the preparatory segment.
13. A statement was made by the representative of South Sudan, the world’s newest country. He affirmed his Government’s commitment to ratifying the Protocol and its amendments, and requested the support of the parties to enable South Sudan to achieve the targets of the Protocol.