



Distr.: General
19 October 2011

Original: English



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

**Ninth meeting of the Conference of
the Parties to the Vienna Convention
for the Protection of the Ozone Layer**

**Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to
the Montreal Protocol on Substances
that Deplete the Ozone Layer**

Bali, Indonesia, 21–25 November 2011

**Issues for discussion by and information for the attention of the
Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention at its ninth
meeting and the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to the
Montreal Protocol**

Note by the secretariat

Addendum

Introduction

1. Chapter I of the present addendum summarizes further work related to the forthcoming Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties completed since the preparation of the note by the Secretariat (UNEP/OzL.Pro.23/2) and before 20 October 2011. It includes an update on issues related to the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, and essential-use and critical-use nominations.

2. Chapter II includes additional information on matters that the Secretariat would like to bring to the parties' attention, including a review of its activities since the preparation of the original note by the Secretariat.

**I. Overview of items on the agenda for the Twenty-Third Meeting of
the Parties to the Montreal Protocol**

**A. Supplemental report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel
replenishment task force (item 4 (a) (i) of the provisional agenda)**

1. Introduction

3. The Technology and Economic Assessment Panel replenishment task force has produced a highly detailed, transparent report that responds to the requests made by the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting. The present section has been prepared by the Secretariat (and reviewed by some members of the replenishment task force for accuracy) to provide the parties with a brief and less technical overview of the supplemental report, its assessment framework and the scenarios considered by the Panel, in addition to the Panel's response to many of the sensitivity analyses requested by the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting. While the Secretariat has endeavoured to make the present section as accessible as possible, the report is inherently

technical in nature. The parties may wish to review this summary in conjunction with the full supplemental report.

2. Overview

4. In May 2011, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, following the terms of reference developed by the Twenty-Second Meeting of the Parties, prepared an estimate of the funding necessary for the 2012–2014 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund and for the subsequent two trienniums. Its initial assessment for the 2012–2014 replenishment included six funding scenarios that resulted in a range for 2012–2014 of between \$245.2 million and \$653.5 million.

5. At its thirty-first meeting, the Open-ended Working Group, after reviewing the Panel's initial report and considering the new information arising from the sixty-fourth meeting of the Executive Committee (which took place after the Panel's May 2011 report was prepared), agreed to request the Panel to consider additional items, and to present a supplemental report and new funding estimates for consideration by the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties. Just as with the initial report, the supplemental report includes six funding scenarios. As a result of the additional information available to the Panel, however, the estimates made in the supplemental report include a much narrower range for the 2012–2014 replenishment period: between \$463 million and \$523 million.

6. The following paragraphs include a brief overview of the assessment framework, the scenarios considered by the Panel and the Panel's response to the sensitivity analyses requested by the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting.

3. Assessment framework

7. In accordance with decision XXII/3, the assessments prepared by the Panel took into account various factors in estimating the level of resources required during the triennium 2012–2014 and the two subsequent trienniums. Those factors included the requirements of the Protocol, the guidelines of the Executive Committee and the Committee's early experience in approving hydrochlorofluorocarbon (HCFC) phase-out activities.

8. With regard to the Executive Committee's early experience, the Panel took note of the fact that the Committee had decided to address HCFCs through national HCFC phase-out management plans. The first phase of those plans was to be designed to facilitate compliance with the 2013 freeze and the 2015 10 per cent reduction step. In extrapolating from the Committee's approvals of HCFC phase-out plans to date, the Panel's assessments took into account the fact that the approvals had, in many cases, supported party desires to phase out more HCFCs than required to meet the 2013 and 2015 targets. To take into account the fact that many parties might achieve different levels of reductions beyond the 10 per cent step, the task force assessments included three scenarios: one assuming that the Executive Committee would fund the remaining phase I plans to the level needed to achieve the 10 per cent reduction, one assuming that the remaining plans would average a 15 per cent reduction and one assuming a 20 per cent reduction.

9. In addition, the task force noted that in approving plans to date the Executive Committee had funded sectoral distributions that took into account diverse national use patterns and phase-out strategies. For example, consistent with the parties' direction that the Multilateral Fund should address higher ozone-depleting-potential substances first, the Committee approved several phase I plans that called for significant reductions of HCFC-141b in the foam subsector, along with smaller components aimed at reducing a portion of HCFC use in the refrigeration and air-conditioning manufacturing subsector and the servicing sector. In contrast, a number of the plans approved included reductions in the foam and servicing sectors only.

10. Based on this diverse funding history, the primary assessments prepared by the task force included two scenarios for modelling the composition of reduction packages for those countries whose phase I plans had not yet been approved. The first package assumed that 90 per cent of the reductions would come from foams, that zero would come from refrigeration and air-conditioning manufacturing and that 10 per cent would come from servicing (known as the "90-0-10" package). The second package assumed that 75 per cent of reductions would come from foams, 15 per cent from refrigeration and air-conditioning manufacturing and 10 per cent from servicing (known as the "75-15-10" package). When these two scenarios were combined with the 10 per cent, 15 per cent and 20 per cent reduction scenarios discussed above, the result was that both the May and October task force assessments included six funding scenarios for national HCFC phase-out management plans.

11. Before reviewing the estimated total costs of the various scenarios, one final assessment framework factor merits note. While the reduction levels and the sectoral distribution of reductions were important in the Panel's assessments, another key factor was the Panel's estimates for funding

the cessation of HCFC production. In that regard, the Panel assumed that the HCFC production closure would proceed and be funded in parallel with reductions in HCFC consumption, and would be funded at the same level as CFC production closure had been funded (\$3 per kilogram). While these assumptions were made in the absence of Executive Committee guidelines for HCFC productions sector phase-out, their impact is significant; in the Panel's May assessment, HCFC production closure costs constituted between 20 per cent and 30 per cent of the total funding, compared to approximately 40 per cent in its most recent assessment.

4. Funding scenarios

12. The scenarios and the estimated funding requirements provided in both the Panel's May 2011 and October 2011 assessments are shown in table 1.

Table 1

HCFC reduction scenarios and funding estimated in the May and October 2011 assessments funded reductions from baseline

<i>Funded reductions from baseline</i>	<i>May assessment</i>	<i>October assessment</i>
Subsector reduction package 75-15-10%		Subsector reduction package 75-15-10%
10%	306.1	471.7
15%	481.3	505.2
20%	653.5	544.5
Subsector reduction package 90-0-10%		Subsector reduction package 90-0-10%
10%	245.2	463.1
15%	386.1	491.2
20%	529.3	523.8

13. As noted above, the Panel's October 2011 assessment benefited greatly from the 2010 data submitted by the parties and the decisions of and national HCFC phase-out management plans approved by the Executive Committee at its sixty-fourth meeting. Using this information, the Panel was able to narrow the range of funding needed for the 2012–2014 time frame to between \$463.1 million and \$544.5 million. On this basis, the Panel concluded in its October assessment that the most likely average estimate for the 2012–2014 replenishment was \$500 million, with variability of +/- 8 per cent.

14. As to subsequent trienniums, the Panel prepared new indicative funding requirements for the trienniums 2015–2017 and 2018–2020. The term "indicative" is used because the assumptions for the composition of the reduction package and for cost-effectiveness values continue to be subject to significant uncertainty.

15. To assess potential future costs, the Panel initially evaluated a reduction package in which it was assumed that 55 per cent of the reductions would come from foams, 20 per cent from refrigeration and air-conditioning manufacturing and 25 per cent from servicing (known as the "55-20-25" package). To perform this evaluation, the Panel amended its cost-effectiveness assumptions to take account of and apply perceived trends. Specifically, cost-effectiveness figures were adjusted downwards by about 15 per cent, except for extruded polystyrene conversions, where they were increased from \$2.56 per kilogram to \$4.85 per kilogram.

16. As noted above, the estimates for the 2015–2017 and 2018–2020 replenishments were \$790 million and \$796.9 million, respectively. Alternative reduction packages, "55-15-30" and "55-25-20" (i.e., increasing or decreasing the percentage of refrigeration and air conditioning versus servicing), yielded 2015–2017 values of between \$774.1 million and \$806.4 million and 2018–2020 values of between \$784.2 million and \$819.8 million. All the above costs included production closure estimated on the same basis as that used for the first triennium.

17. In noting the substantial difference in estimated needs for the 2012–2014 and subsequent replenishments, the Panel suggested that the replenishment levels for the two trienniums could not be considered in isolation from each other, and that the implementation of the "stable and sufficient" funding concept introduced in decision XIX/6 could not be achieved simply by averaging the assessed requirements for the two trienniums, since it was no longer possible at that stage to consider the approval of additional consumption reductions for stage I national HCFC phase-out management plans.

5. Review of the Panel's responses to some of the sensitivity analyses requested by the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting

18. At its thirty-first meeting, the Open-ended Working Group also requested the Panel to undertake a series of sensitivity analyses to assess the impact of using specified alternative assumptions or scenarios (see annex III to document UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.1/31/6). A broad overview of the result of much of that complex analysis is summarized below.

19. *Inflation rates on institutional strengthening:* The task force was requested to review the financial impact of inflation on the funding requirement for institutional strengthening for the periods 2012–2014 and 2015–2017. To do this, the funding was estimated at the 2011 price level, and an inflation rate of 3 per cent for the years 2012–2014 was used. The Panel concluded that an annual 3 per cent inflation correction would increase the institutional strengthening funding by \$1.34 million for the triennium 2012–2014 and an annual 5 per cent correction would add almost 1 million (i.e., would increase the funding by \$2.27 million). In relation to the triennium 2015–2017, an annual 3 per cent inflation correction would increase the funding by \$4.32 million, while an annual 5 per cent correction would increase it by \$7.51 million. It should be noted that the Executive Committee will review institutional strengthening activities and their funding before the replenishment for the triennium 2015–2017.

20. *Sector distribution with higher servicing sector ratio:* The Panel was requested to assume that the remaining approvals of phase I HCFC phase-out management plans included a higher percentage of refrigeration and air conditioning or servicing than that assumed in the May assessment (the “75-15-10” reduction package). Specifically, the Panel was requested to assess the funding implications of the “75-5-20” and “70-20-10” packages. The results of that analysis, in addition to those of an assessment of the implications of a “55-20-25” reduction package, can be found in table 3-5 of the Panel's report. As compared to the standard “75-15-10” reduction scenario, the results of the three scenarios investigated ranged from a maximum of \$3 million–\$14 million, and 2–4 metric tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent saved per year.

21. *Production sector funding scenarios:* The Open-ended Working Group also requested information on the potential impact of varying parameters related to the funding of HCFC production closures, and consideration of production sector costs over the coming three trienniums. The impacts assessed by the Panel are summarized in table 2.

Table 2

Potential impacts of varying certain assumptions on the funding of HCFC production

<i>Funding category</i>	<i>Triennium 2012–2014</i>	<i>Triennium 2015–2017 (indicative)</i>	<i>Triennium 2018–2020 (indicative)</i>
Consumption sector	276–315	581	568
Production option 1, base-case: \$3/kg for all HCFCs - quantity equal to funded consumption sector phase-out	184–225	209	229
Production option 2: base-case with no funding for swing plants	167–204	185	202
Production option 3: base-case funded at \$1.50/kg	92–113	104	114
Production option 4: HCFC-22 to feedstock; compensation only for HCFC-141b/142b at \$3/kg	88–108	73	81
Production option 5: \$3/kg compensation for reductions from Montreal Protocol baseline consumption for all HCFCs	72–88	120	132

22. *Zero and -3 per cent growth rates for support activities:* The Panel was also requested to analyse the cost impact of assuming no growth or -3 per cent growth in funding for support activities. Support activities considered included those for the Compliance Assistance Program, core unit costs of the implementing agencies and the costs related to the Executive Committee and the Multilateral Fund Secretariat. The analysis found that assuming a zero per cent growth rate would save \$5.834 million in the 2012–2014 replenishment period and \$11.7 million in the period 2015–2017. In contrast, using a -3 per cent growth rate would save \$11.455 million in the 2012–2014 replenishment period and \$22.459 million in the 2015–2017 replenishment period.

23. Set out below are changes in cost-effectiveness figures and their consequent impact on the next three replenishments, taking into account a number of issues.

24. *Possible economies-of-scale in large consuming countries:* While the Panel was requested to consider the impact that economies of scale in large-consuming countries could have on cost-effectiveness value assumptions, the Panel did not deem it possible to adjust cost-effectiveness values on that basis, given the various parameters that influenced both incremental capital and incremental operational costs. The Panel expressed the belief that, while it could be argued that at the enterprise level larger production lines would benefit compared to smaller lines, the idea could not be applied at the country level. Furthermore, the Panel stated that, if it was expected that there was, with the exception of China, no clear relation between the level of consumption and prevalence of large (or small) enterprises, then it would not prove possible to apply a reduced cost-effectiveness to larger-consuming countries.

25. *Possible improvements in cost-effectiveness over time:* The Panel noted that, in the May assessment, such improvements were already included for the long-term relative to the short-term scenarios. Depending on the subsector, the reduction in cost-effectiveness assessed was between 5 per cent and 50 per cent, resulting in an overall reduction of about 20 per cent for all refrigeration and air-conditioning sectors for the long-term. This reduction arose through, for example, the proliferation of trained trainers, the lower refrigerant and system component costs as production quantities increased and reduced costs for product development and redesign. The Panel also noted, however, that it was not possible to quantify the impact for some aspects, for example, production line equipment costs, which tended to fall over time simply because many conversions took place in a short period, technical knowledge increased, implementation techniques improved and the large market supported competition.

26. *Possible improved cost-effectiveness for those HCFC phase-out management plans that go beyond 10 per cent reductions:* The Panel did not deem it possible to quantify improvements, if any, as a result of the absence of knowledge of the sectoral or subsectoral allocation of the countries involved. The Panel noted that, were a country to implement a significant reduction in a sector (i.e., approaching 100 per cent) over a period of time, it could be argued that improvements in cost-effectiveness might be realized towards the end of the conversion period. On the other hand, given that many of those cost reductions would be sensitive to global-scale changes, it was unlikely that any specific country could yield an appreciable reduction. Thus, for more modest increases in reductions (e.g., approaching 25 per cent), the Panel found that there was unlikely to be any appreciable change in cost-effectiveness.

27. *Update of weighted average cost-effectiveness for each sector and for groups of countries, based on all HCFC phase-out management plans, HCFC demonstration projects and investment projects approved by the Executive Committee at its sixty-fourth meeting, taking into account special circumstances and experiences of some parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5:* The Panel noted that the aggregate weighted cost-effectiveness information from approvals at the sixty-fourth meeting of the Executive Committee was influenced principally by the cost-effectiveness figures arising from the national HCFC phase-out management plan submitted by China, and that, since that plan was agreed to after substantial political negotiations, it did not appear technically valid to use the resulting cost-effectiveness values as the basis for determining funding requirements in other countries. Consequently, and given the paucity of detailed information on cost-effectiveness for relevant sectors, the Panel did not feel that it could respond effectively to the request. That said, section 5.2 of the Panel's report included the cost-effectiveness values for refrigeration and air conditioning as they were applied in calculations for the report.

28. As it relates to the foams sector, the Panel's supplemental assessment included a comprehensive update of the information provided in the May 2011 replenishment report so that they could also be applied for the trienniums after 2012–2014. This included an evaluation of the estimated maximum penetration values in parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 for various HCFC alternative options based exclusively on technical and cost considerations. The alternatives were identified as "current" when they were applied at the present time whereas the designation "longer term" was used to imply that the technology was anticipated to be available within the coming three to five years. Specifically, table 4-2 of the Panel's supplemental assessment was used as the basis to build a scenario of preferred alternatives by subsector and factory size. Based on this information and the data of approved and submitted projects, the cost-effectiveness values – by subsector and company size – were estimated in table 4-3 of the Panel's report. Specific consideration was given to the participation of capital from parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 in the most globalized subsectors (domestic refrigeration, continuous lamination).

29. *Higher penetration rates of low-global-warming-potential alternatives:* The Panel was requested to assess the impact of varying proportions of low-global-warming-potential applications assumed in the commercial refrigeration and air-conditioning sectors. The cost-related importance of

this variance rests on the fact that Executive Committee rules allow 25 per cent additional funding for conversions to low-global-warming-potential technologies. The cost-effectiveness applied in the calculations for refrigeration and air conditioning is \$11.1 per kilogram (including the 25 per cent additional funding for an average of 25 per cent penetration of low-global-warming-potential solutions). This implies that the cost-effectiveness without any low-global-warming-potential applications would be \$10.45 per kilogram. These values have been used for all calculations for not-yet-approved national HCFC phase-out management plans for the period 2012–2014 in the October report. As noted above, cost-effectiveness values for refrigeration and air conditioning have been reassessed in the Panel's October report for the trienniums after 2012–2014. This resulted in a value of \$8.8 per kilogram for the refrigeration and air-conditioning sectors, and a value of \$9.35 per kilogram for these sectors if the additional 25 per cent funding for a 25 per cent manufacturing share of low-global-warming-potential options was applied.

30. The Panel's analysis of this factor concluded that, for stage I national phase-out management plans remaining to be approved, zero penetration of low-global-warming-potential solutions would result in a saving of \$600,000–\$1.6 million, which was noted as being negligible in comparison to the total funding requirement; this is shown in table 3-4. Using the incremental capital and operational costs indicated above, application of low-global-warming-potential solutions to 50 per cent of the refrigeration and air-conditioning sector consumption would increase the funding requirement by \$600,000–\$1.6 million. Estimates for all funding requirements are based on the actual costs incurred and year 2011 prices.

31. *Alternative growth rates between 2009 and 2013 taking into account available Article 7 data up to September 1:* The Panel was also requested to examine alternative growth rates for HCFCs between 2009 and 2013, taking into account available data submitted pursuant to Article 7 of the Protocol up to 1 September 2011. In that regard, the Panel found that, because some 80 per cent of consumption to be addressed in stage I national HCFC phase-out management plans had been approved and funded, any assumed change in the growth rate would not be expected to have a significant impact on the overall funding requirement for the replenishment in the first or subsequent trienniums.

32. *List of the alternatives that had been included under low-global-warming-potential calculations and an overview of how the incremental costs included in table 5-7 of the Panel's May report were calculated for low-global-warming-potential alternatives, explaining the reasons for the large range of costs:* The Panel noted that the costs for low-global-warming-potential alternatives included in the May report were estimated according to the expert's judgement. For incremental capital costs this was based on such factors as production line equipment (refrigerant supply, charging, evacuation, pressure/leak, heat exchanger forming, safety system for flammables), product redesign and training. For incremental operational cost, this was based on such aspects as refrigerant cost, heat exchanger materials, piping, compressors, electrical and safety systems (for flammable, higher toxicity fluids). Cost data were obtained from existing national HCFC phase-out management plan proposals, real costs from demonstration projects and the experience of experts. The overall incremental capital cost and incremental operational cost were then weighted according to the average annual HCFC consumption for that subsector, in order to obtain a combined value for refrigeration and for air conditioning. The report includes a list of low-global-warming-potential foam technologies (see table 4.1) and low-global-warming-potential refrigerants analysed (see table 5.1).

B. Nominations for essential-use exemptions for 2012 and 2013 (item 4 (b) (i) of the provisional agenda)

33. On 3 August 2011, the Secretariat received a request from Mexico for an emergency essential-use exemption for 6 metric tonnes of pharmaceutical-grade CFC-12 for the production of metered-dose inhalers in Mexico. In accordance with the emergency-use provision set forth in decision VIII/9, the Secretariat consulted the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, which noted the party's need and its agreement to offset that consumption by destroying an equal amount of CFC-11 available in its stockpile. Accordingly, and pursuant to the procedure set out in paragraph 10 of decision VIII/9, the Secretariat, in consultation with Panel, authorized the emergency use.

C. Nominations for critical-use exemptions for 2012 and 2013 (item 4 (b) (iii) of the provisional agenda)

34. In the 2011 round of nominations, the Panel received 19 nominations for critical-use exemptions for pre-plant soil uses (1 for 2012 and 18 for 2013). The Panel's May 2011 report included interim recommendations for all the nominations except for the research nominations for 2012 and 2013 and the nomination for cured pork, which were categorized as "unable to assess". In addition,

three recommendations were subject to minority reports, and the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee made a further three of its recommendations contingent on further substantiation by the party concerned.

35. Since the thirty-first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, the Committee engaged in further discussions with parties leading up to the preparations of its final recommendations to the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties. The Committee's subcommittees also evaluated the need for and feasibility of holding another subcommittee meeting. As to the outstanding issues related to the commodities and structures nominations, the subcommittee agreed a process for electronic review and collaboration.

36. In contrast, after consultation with members and careful consideration of the complex issues involved particularly in the final evaluation of the nominations for soils, the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee co-chairs decided to hold a face-to-face meeting with all members who had indicated an intention to take part fully in evaluating those nominations. The Committee then met from 10 to 12 October 2011 in Leusden, the Netherlands, to finalize its recommendations on the nominations, to discuss procedural issues related to the assessments and to prepare its final report. The four co-chairs, eight additional members of the soils subcommittee, two members of the quarantine and pre-shipment subcommittee and one economist attended the meeting. Bilateral consultations with the United States of America were held by teleconference on the afternoon of Tuesday, 11 October.

37. As a result of the discussions between the Committee and the nominating parties after the thirty-first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, and based on the Panel's deliberations, both the amounts nominated by parties and those recommended by the Committee have changed. Specifically, following correspondence between the Committee and the United States seeking further clarification of aspects of that party's nomination for various research activities, the party withdrew its nomination. Accordingly, both the part of the research nomination that was recommended by the Committee in its May 2011 report, and the part that was categorized as "unable to assess", have now been withdrawn. Furthermore, following consultation with the Committee and national experts, the United States reduced its nominations for cucurbits, peppers, tomatoes and nurseries to levels lower than those that were included in the Committee's interim recommendation but were made subject to further substantiation from the party. Consequently, the Committee agreed on the final recommendations that are summarized in table 3.

Table 3

Consolidated summary of the final recommendations by the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee on the nominations for critical-use exemptions of methyl bromide submitted in 2011 for 2012 and 2013 (in metric tonnes)

<i>Country and sector</i>	<i>Final nominations for 2013</i>	<i>Final recommendations for 2013</i>
1. Australia		
1. Strawberry runners	29.760	29.760
2. Packaged rice	2.374	2.374
2. Canada		
1. Strawberry runners	5.596	5.261
2. Mills	7.848	7.848
3. Japan		
Fresh chestnuts	3.317	3.317
4. United States		
1. Cucurbits*	(11.899) rev. 3.867	3.867
2. Eggplants (field)	1.381	1.381
3. Nursery stock*	(0.541) rev. 0.476	0.476
4. Ornamentals	48.164	40.818
5. Orchard replant	6.230	6.230
6. Pepper (field)*	(5.673) rev. 5.604	5.604
7. Strawberry (field)	531.737	461.186
8. Strawberry runners	3.752	3.752
9. Tomatoes (field)*	(10.741) rev. 9.107	9.107
10. Commodities	0.822	0.822
11. Mills and food processing structures	25.334	25.334
12. Cured pork	3.730	3.730

<i>Country and sector</i>	<i>Final nominations for 2013</i>	<i>Final recommendations for 2013</i>
Total	689.120	610.888

* denotes revised nominations

The table does not include withdrawn nominations

38. Detailed information on each nomination recommendation and evaluation comments for soil nominations can be found on pages 23–40 of the Panel’s final report on the evaluation of critical-use nominations. Detailed information on the commodities and structures related nominations can be found on pages 46–54 of that same report.

39. As noted above, three minority reports were submitted in relation to the Panel’s May 2011 recommendations. Since the Open-ended Working Group’s discussions at its thirty-first meeting, the minority report on the Canadian nomination for strawberry runners has been withdrawn. That said, the United States nominations for the use of methyl bromide for strawberry fruit production in California in 2013, and for the use of methyl bromide for cured pork are still subject to minority reports. While the full, signed minority reports are included in the Panel’s final report, the minority report for strawberry fruit was submitted by four members who believed that the new data submitted by the United States substantiated their request for a higher level than that recommended by the majority, and the minority report for cured pork issued by one member expressed the belief that the party had not provided sufficient information on a number of factors including the infeasibility of some alternatives and efforts taken to minimize the use and emissions of methyl bromide.

40. The parties may wish to consider this information and prepare a related decision for adoption by the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties.

II. Matters that the Secretariat would like to bring to the parties’ attention

A. Secretariat activities

41. Since the completion of document UNEP/OzL.Pro.23/2, the Secretariat has participated in various meetings, including joint meetings of the Ozone officers from Latin America and the Caribbean, South and South-East Asia and French-speaking and English-speaking Africa. During those meetings, representatives of the Secretariat gave presentations and held an open dialogue on the discussions that took place during the thirty-first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, and the substantive and logistical issues related to the coming joint ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties and related meetings. The Secretariat also used those network meetings to engage in informal consultations related to compliance with the Protocol and the ratification of its amendments.

42. With regard to ratification, representatives of the Secretariat also held consultations with representatives of Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan on the ratification of the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol. In addition to those meetings, representatives of the Secretariat also participated in meetings in Washington D.C., including meetings of the Council of the Global Environment Facility, and meetings to discuss issues related to the joint ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties, including the 2012–2014 replenishment, the contribution of the Montreal Protocol to the global environment, and the amendment proposals being considered by the parties.

43. As part of its continuing effort to promote synergies, representatives of the Secretariat also participated in the third session of the Joint Task Force on Environmental Indicators, held in Geneva from 18 to 20 October 2011, and in a discussion on the Protocol’s contribution to the green economy. Lastly, representatives of the Secretariat went on an exploratory mission to Bali, Indonesia, to visit and discuss issues related to the new conference facilities and to continue planning with the Government of Indonesia for the joint ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties.

B. Upcoming twenty-fifth anniversary of the Montreal Protocol

44. The year 2012 will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Montreal Protocol. To help parties commemorate this anniversary, the Secretariat will be updating the Montreal Protocol press package. While the Secretariat does not currently foresee engaging in activities such as those undertaken five years ago during the twentieth anniversary celebrations, it would welcome parties' thoughts on other ways in which the twenty-fifth anniversary might be celebrated.

ADVANCE