



Distr.: General
26 April 2013

Original: English



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

**Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to
the Montreal Protocol on Substances that
Deplete the Ozone Layer
Thirty-third meeting**
Bangkok, 24–28 June 2013
Items 3–13 of the provisional agenda*

Issues for discussion by and information for the attention of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol at its thirty-third meeting

Note by the Secretariat

Introduction

1. Section I of the present note sets out a summary of the issues on the agenda for discussion by the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer at its thirty-third meeting. Several of the issues on the agenda for the meeting are discussed in the 2013 progress report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and will require the input and recommendations of the Panel. When the progress report is complete the Secretariat will prepare an addendum to the present note that will summarize the Panel's findings on those issues.
2. Section II of the present note sets out information on matters that the Secretariat would like to bring to the parties' attention, including matters related to the current status of the process for recruiting staff members to fill three of the most senior managerial positions of the Secretariat, matters related to the scheduling and venue of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties and progress in the ratification of the amendments to the Montreal Protocol in the light of decision XXIV/2 of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties.

I. Summary of issues for discussion by the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-third meeting

Agenda item 3

2013 progress report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel

3. The issues covered in the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's 2013 progress report that are relevant to matters on the provisional agenda for the current meeting are discussed in the present note.

* UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.1/33/1.

Agenda item 4

Issues related to exemptions under Article 2A–2I of the Montreal Protocol

(a) Nominations for essential-use exemptions for 2014 and 2015

4. In accordance with decision IV/25, China and the Russian Federation submitted requests for essential-use exemptions for chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) for metered-dose inhalers applicable to 2014. The Russian Federation nomination for metered-dose inhalers was received on 5 March 2013, several weeks after the deadline of 31 January required by paragraph 8 of decision VIII/9. In addition, the Russian Federation requested an exemption for the use of 85 metric tonnes of CFC-113 for 2014 for certain applications in the aerospace industry.

5. The Medical Technical Options Committee of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel met in Beijing, from 13 to 15 March 2013, to review the exemption requests for metered-dose inhalers and to prepare its recommendations on those requests. The Panel's Chemicals Technical Options Committee met in Mauritius, from 26 to 28 February 2013, and considered, among other things, the exemption requested by the Russian Federation for aerospace uses. The Secretariat's addendum to the present note will include a summary of the Panels' recommendations on those requests. In the meantime, the sums nominated by each party are presented for the information of the parties in table 1.

Table 1

Essential-use nominations for CFCs submitted in 2013 for 2014 and 2015 (in metric tonnes)

<i>Party</i>	<i>Approved for 2013</i>	<i>Nominated for 2014</i>	<i>Nominated for 2015</i>
Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5			
Russian Federation (metered-dose inhalers)	212	212	-
Russian Federation (aerospace)	95	85	-
Subtotal: parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5	307	297	-
Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5			
China (Metered-dose inhalers)	388.82	236.6	221.59
Subtotal: parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5	388.82	236.6	221.59
Total	695.82	533.6	221.59

(b) Nominations for critical-use exemptions for 2014 and 2015

6. The Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee met in London from 3 to 5 April 2013; at that meeting the Committee's three subcommittees met separately to deliberate as necessary. The decisions of the Committee will, however, be adopted by the Committee as a whole. Among the items on the subcommittees' agendas were the evaluation of nominations for methyl bromide critical-use exemptions and the proposal for interim recommendations on the quantity of methyl bromide eligible for such exemptions. In 2013, three parties (Australia, Canada and the United States of America) submitted five nominations for critical uses of methyl bromide for pre-plant soil use and post-harvest use in 2015.

7. The Panel's interim recommendations will be summarized in the Secretariat's addendum to the present note. In the meantime, the parties submitting critical-use exemption nominations in 2013 and the quantities that they have nominated are listed in table 2.

Table 2

Summary of the nominations for 2015 critical-use exemptions for methyl bromide submitted in 2013 (in metric tonnes)

<i>Nominating party and sector</i>	<i>Nomination</i>
1. Australia Strawberry runners	29.76
2. Canada Strawberry runners	5.261
3. United States of America Strawberry fruit	373.66
Dates	0.31
Cured pork	3.24
Total	412.231

(c) Handbook on critical-use nominations for methyl bromide (decision XXIII/14, paragraph 2; report of the Sixteenth Meeting of the Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro.16/17), annex I, paragraph 29)

8. By decision XXIII/14, the parties requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, in view of its May 2011 progress report, to consider whether the guidelines and criteria for the preparation of critical-use nominations of methyl bromide needed modification to take into account the situation of parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol and to report on the issue to the Open-ended Working group at its thirty-third meeting. Considering the possibility that parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 might wish to submit nominations for critical-use exemption two years in advance of their phase-out years, as done by some parties not so operating, the Panel looked into the request under decision XXIII/14 and updated the handbook on critical use nominations for consideration by the parties at the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties, held in November 2012.

9. At the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties, concerns were expressed by a number of parties regarding the alteration the Committee had made to the decision-making process (section 2.6.1) and to the economic guidelines that had been carefully negotiated by the parties in paragraph 6 of decision Ex.I/4. The Panel is expected to issue the next draft handbook for further consideration by the parties.

10. The addendum to the present note will include more information on the Panel's work on the handbook.

(d) Quarantine and pre-shipment use of methyl bromide (decisions XXIV/15, paragraph 1; XXIII/5, paragraph 6)

11. In decision XXIV/15, the parties recalled the need for improved reporting on methyl bromide consumption for quarantine and pre-shipment uses and recalled further that by decision XXIII/5, in particular its paragraph 3, parties had been urged to comply with the reporting requirements of Article 7 and to provide data on the amount of methyl bromide used for quarantine and pre-shipment applications annually. Those parties in a position to do so were invited, on a voluntary basis, to supplement such data by reporting to the Secretariat information on methyl bromide uses recorded and collated pursuant to the recommendation of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures.

12. By the same decision, parties that had not yet established procedures for data collection on methyl bromide use for quarantine and pre-shipment or that wished to improve existing procedures were invited to consider using the elements identified as essential by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel in section 10.4.4 of its 2012 progress report.

13. Furthermore, in paragraph 6 of decision XXIII/5, the parties requested the Panel to provide, for consideration by the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-third meeting, a concise report based on the information that parties reported to the Secretariat by 31 March 2013 in accordance with paragraph 2 of decision XXIII/5. As at 31 March 2013, one Party had submitted such information.

14. In accordance with paragraph 1 of decision XXIV/15, the parties are expected to consider, at the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, whether to ask the Panel to undertake an analysis of trends in Article 7 data on methyl bromide use for quarantine and pre-shipment, taking into account the information submitted in accordance with decision XXIII/5 and how to improve that information.

15. The addendum to the present note will include a summary of the Panel's findings and recommendations.

(e) **Uses of controlled substances as process-agents (decisions XXII/8, paragraph 5; XVII/6, paragraph 6; XXIV/6, paragraph 4)**

16. In some chemical processes, ozone-depleting substances are used as process agents, or catalysts, to enable the manufacture of final products. Decision X/14 outlines the uses of controlled substances as process agents and the emission limits for such substances. Table A of the decision lists the process agent applications that are approved under the Montreal Protocol and table B notes the maximum "make-up" quantity and the maximum level of allowable emissions from the listed exempted processes in the countries listed in the table. Over the years, the parties have requested the Panel to review the two tables and make recommendations on whether to amend them.

17. In paragraph 5 of decision XXII/8, the parties requested the Panel, beyond the reporting and assessment in respect of process agent uses requested for 2011, to review in 2013, and every second year thereafter, progress made in reducing process agent uses and to make any additional recommendations to parties on further actions to reduce uses and emissions of process agents. In paragraph 6 of decision XVII/6, the parties had requested the Panel and the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol to report to the Open-ended Working Group at its twenty-seventh meeting, in 2007, and every other year thereafter unless the parties decided otherwise, on the progress made in reducing emissions of controlled substances from process-agent uses; on the associated make-up quantity of controlled substances; and on the implementation and development of emissions-reduction techniques and alternative processes and products using ozone-depleting substances. Furthermore, in paragraph 6 of decision XXIII/7, the parties requested the Panel to provide the Open-ended Working Group, at its thirty-second meeting, with a summary report updating the Panel's findings on process agent uses listed in table A of decision X/14 and, taking into account relevant information from previous investigations including a descriptive overview of such processes, information on alternatives, quantities used as reported in accordance with Article 7 of the Protocol, estimated emissions from process agent uses and their impact on the ozone layer and climate, as well as practicable measures to avoid and reduce such emissions. In response to the request, the Panel managed to review five of the 14 remaining uses (i.e. numbers 1, 2, 6, 9 and 14) and reported that three (i.e. numbers 10, 11 and 12) were no longer used, thus could be removed from Table A. The Panel also indicated that it would review the remainder in future progress reports. At the request of the Panel's Chemicals Technical Options Committee, the Secretariat sought specific information from three parties listed as users of the uses that had not yet been reviewed by the Panel, namely, China, the European Union and the United States of America. Responses were received from all three parties. The Panel's findings from the continuing review will be summarized in the addendum to the present note. The report of the Executive Committee requested in decision XVII/6 is being sought via the Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund.

18. Another issue of relevance to process agent uses, as well as to feedstock uses, is the production of vinyl chloride monomer. By decision XXIV/6, parties with vinyl chloride monomer production facilities in which carbon tetrachloride is used that have not yet reported the information requested by the parties in decision XXIII/7 were requested to provide such information to the Panel before 28 February 2013 to allow the Panel to clarify whether such use in a particular facility was a feedstock use or process agent use. The addendum to the present note will include a summary of the Panel's findings on that issue.

Agenda item 5

Report by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on additional information on alternatives to ozone-depleting substances (decision XXIV/7, paragraph 1)

19. In decision XXIV/7, the parties requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, in consultation with non-Panel member experts with relevant expertise, if necessary, to update information on alternatives and technologies in various sectors and to prepare a draft report for consideration by the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-third meeting and a final report to be submitted to the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties. According to the decision, the Panel's report was to describe all available alternatives to ozone-depleting substances that were commercially available, technically proven and environmentally sound, taking into account their efficacy, health, safety and environmental characteristics, cost-effectiveness, and their use, including in high ambient temperatures and high urban density cities.

20. The report was also to update information provided by previous Panel reports on alternatives being developed; identify barriers and restrictions to the adoption and commercial use of certain environmentally sound alternatives to ozone-depleting substances; estimate, if possible, the approximate quantity of alternatives with negative environmental impacts that could be or could have been avoided or eliminated by parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 and parties not so operating in the process of phasing-out ozone-depleting substances; and identify opportunities for the selection of environmentally sound alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) in the future. Finally, the decision invited the Panel to take into account any information by parties to the Secretariat provided that was relevant to its report.

21. The Panel established a task force in response to decision XXIV/7. As at 31 March 2013, relevant information had been submitted by two parties and had been forwarded to the Panel for its consideration. The addendum to the present note will include a summary of the task force's report.

Agenda item 6

Information on ozone-depleting substance transition policy measures (report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/10), paragraph 187)

22. At the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties, a conference room paper containing a draft decision on information on policy measures aimed at achieving the transition away from ozone-depleting substances was proposed by some parties. The draft decision proposed the compilation of information on approaches to ozone-depleting substances aimed at minimizing the negative climate effects of that transition. The intention behind the draft decision was to provide parties with information on policies, control measures and other initiatives aimed at avoiding a transition from ozone-depleting substances to alternatives with high global warming potential. Differing views on the proposal were aired during the discussion and the parties agreed to defer further consideration of the matter to the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The draft proposal is set out in section A of annex I to the present note.

Agenda item 7

Organizational issues related to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel

(a) **Report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on operational and organizational issues (decision XXIV/8, paragraphs 1 and 3)**

23. At the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties, the parties considered the report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's task force on decision XXIII/10. The report addressed many issues relating to the operation and procedures of the Panel and its subsidiary bodies. The parties adopted decision XXIV/8, taking into account the report. It was recognized that the task force had been unable to complete its work on the reorganization plans and proposed operating procedures for its technical options committees and that the Panel would continue to address those issues.

24. By decision XXIV/8, the parties requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to make recommendations on the future configuration of its technical options committees to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-third meeting, bearing in mind anticipated workloads. The decision also requested the Panel and its technical options committees to make available to the parties their standard operating procedures.

25. The Panel established a task force in response to decision XXIV/8. A summary of the report of the task force will be set out in the addendum to the present note.

(b) **Status of the membership of the Panel and its technical options committees (decision XXIII/10, paragraphs 10 and 11)**

26. The new terms of reference of the Panel, approved under decision XXIV/8, provide that the Meeting of the Parties will appoint the members of the Panel and its technical options committees for a period of no more than four years, with the possibility of reappointment for further four-year terms (sections 2.3 and 2.5). In paragraph 9 of decision XXIII/10, the parties agreed that the terms of all the members of the Panel and its technical options committees would expire at the end of 2013 and 2014, respectively, in the absence of reappointment by the parties prior to that time, except for those experts that had already been nominated for four-year terms in previous decisions. In the same decision, the parties agreed that they might revisit the status of Panel and technical options committee membership

at its twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth meetings, respectively, if more time was needed by parties to submit nominations. The status of the reappointment of the Panel members is provided below.

27. The following decisions relate to the reappointment of members of the Panel:

(a) Decision XXII/22 in 2010: endorsing Ms. Marta Pizano as Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel for a term of four years (up to end of 2014); Ms. Pizano is also the Co-Chair of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee but parties are yet to renominate and reappoint her to that position;

(b) Decision XXIII/21 in 2011: reappointing or endorsing Mr. Masaaki Yamabe as a senior expert for a term of four years (to the end of 2015) and Mr. Keiichi Ohnishi as a new Co-Chair of the Chemicals Technical Options Committee for a term of four years (to the end of 2015);

(c) Decision XXIV/19 in 2012: reappointing or endorsing Mr. Stephen O. Andersen as a senior expert for a term of one year (to the end of 2013); Ms. Bella Maranion as Co-Chair for a term of four years (up to the end of 2016); Mr. Lambert J. M. Kuijpers as Co-Chair of the Panel and the Refrigeration, Air-conditioning and Heat Pumps Technical Options Committee for a term of two years (to the end of 2014); Mr. Daniel P. Verdonik as Co-Chair of the Halons Technical Options Committee for a term of four years (to the end of 2016); Mr. Ashley Woodcock as Co-Chair of the Medical Technical Options Committee for a term of four years (to the end of 2016); Mr. David Catchpole as Co-Chair of the Halons Technical Options Committee for a term of four years (to the end of 2016); and Mr. Paul Ashford as Co-Chair of the Flexible and Rigid Foams Technical Options Committee for a term of four years (to the end of 2016).

28. With regard to renomination of the other Panel members, the status is as below. Any update of the situation will be provided in the addendum to the present note

(a) The Russian Federation has renominated Mr. Sergey Kopylov as Co-Chair of the Halons Technical Options Committee for a four-year term;

(b) Ms. Michelle Marcotte and Mr. Ian Rae are withdrawing from the Panel after the end of 2013;

(c) The membership or co-chairship of Mr. Mohamed Besri, Mr. Jiang Biao, Mr. Roberto Peixoto, Mr. José Pons Pons, Mr. Ian Porter, Mr. Miguel Quintero, Ms. Helen Tope and Ms. Shiqiu Zhang is under consideration.

29. The situation of the technical options committees may be considered alongside the work that the Panel's task force is undertaking on reorganization plans of the technical options committees under decision XXIV/8. The Working Group may wish to consider the membership status and reappointment of Panel members and make appropriate recommendations to the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties.

Agenda item 8

Controlled substances used on ships, including prior informed consent (decision XXIV/9, paragraph 3; report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/10), paragraph 74)

30. At the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, held in 2012, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel presented an assessment of ozone-depleting substances used to service ships and the Secretariat provided information on how parties regulated and reported on the use of ozone-depleting substance to service ships. Subsequently, a conference room paper by Croatia and the European Union was put forward at the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties to request the Panel to provide a range of additional information that could help to address the complex underlying issues at the national and global levels and to identify possible alternatives to the ozone-depleting substances used in the maritime sector. The decision was discussed in a contact group and there were some elements of the draft decision that the parties could not agree on, including the use of a prior informed consent procedure in respect of ozone-depleting substances on ships. Nonetheless the parties adopted decision XXIV/9, in which it was agreed that the Open-ended Working Group would revisit the issue at its thirty-third meeting.

31. In the same decision, the Panel was requested to provide, together with its 2013 progress report, an updated version of the information provided in its previous progress reports on transport refrigeration in the maritime sector. The decision also invites parties to encourage relevant stakeholders to minimize the use of controlled substances in newly built ships and to consider environmentally benign and energy-efficient alternatives whenever they were available.

32. The addendum to the present note will include a summary of the Panel's findings.

Agenda item 9

Review by the Scientific Assessment Panel of RC-316c (decision XXIV/10, paragraph 2)

33. In early 2012, the Russian Federation reported that it was testing a chemical, RC-316c, as an alternative to CFC-113 in the aerospace industry. That chemical had been identified in the Chemicals Technical Options Committee during the presentation on the 2012 progress report at the thirty-second Open-ended Working Group meeting in 2012, as a new CFC not currently controlled by the Montreal Protocol. Discussions at that meeting and the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties resulted in decision XXIV/10.

34. Decision XXIV/10 invites parties in a position to do so to provide environmental assessments of RC-316c (1,2-dichloro-1,2,3,3,4,4-hexafluorocyclobutane, CAS 356-18-3), a chlorofluorocarbon not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, and any guidance on practices that can reduce intentional releases of the substance. The decision also requests the Scientific Assessment Panel to conduct a preliminary assessment of RC-316c and to report to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-third meeting on the ozone-depletion potential and global-warming potential of the substance and other factors that the Panel deems relevant. The assessment of the chemical will be included in the next quadrennial assessment by the Panel, due to be issued in 2014. The Panel will also report on any preliminary results and progress to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-third meeting.

Agenda item 10

Issues related to funding

(a) Clean production of HCFC-22 through by-product emission control (report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/10), paragraph 98)

35. A proposal for a decision on clean production of HCFC-22 through by-product emission control was discussed at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and at the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties, with intersessional consultations taking place between the two meetings. The draft decision was developed in response to the fact that certain facilities or production lines emitting HFC-23 as a by-product of HCFC-22 production did not earn emissions reduction credits under the Clean Development Mechanism. Accordingly, the decision proposed that the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund consider proposals for cost-effective demonstration projects aiming to eliminate those by-product emissions and requested the Panel to conduct a study on the costs and benefits of such projects. The demonstration projects would be aimed at gathering information to facilitate a better understanding of the implications of the phase-out of HFCs over the next two decades. The proposal was not intended to further accelerate phase-out, but rather only to give greater consideration to what might be the unintended consequences of the continued production of HCFC-22 over the next two decades.

36. During the discussion of the draft decision various views were expressed. Those opposing it said that the by-product emissions at issue were already controlled under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol, that the phase-out of HCFC-22, which fell within the mandate of the Montreal Protocol, would in time naturally lead to a reduction in HFC-23 emissions, that any financial resources available to the Multilateral Fund should be focused on current priorities, including the accelerated phase-out of HCFCs, and that care should be taken not to weaken efforts to protect the ozone layer by considering issues outside the Protocol's mandate. Representatives speaking in favour of the proposal said that it offered an opportunity to reap climate co-benefits from the phase-out of HCFCs.

37. Although some key issues, such as the source and nature of the proposed funding, were agreed in the informal group which convened during the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties, there was no agreement on several aspects of the purposes for which such funding could be used. Since consensus was not reached on the proposal, the parties agreed to defer further discussion to the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The draft decision is contained in section B of annex I to the present note.

(b) Additional funding for the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol to maximize the climate benefit of the accelerated phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/10), paragraph 105)

38. At the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, Switzerland introduced a draft decision on additional funding for the implementation of the Montreal Protocol to maximize the climate benefit of the accelerated phase-out of HCFCs. The draft decision would, among other things, request the Executive Committee to assess a number of options related to the establishment of a funding window to maximize climate co-benefits of the HCFC phase-out and agree on procedures and terms of reference for its functioning based on certain specified conditions. Following informal consultations, the Working Group agreed to forward the draft decision for consideration by the parties at the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties.

39. At the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties, the representative of Switzerland said that intersessional work on the draft decision had been fruitful and clarified that it did not seek to create new obligations for, or reduce the present obligations of, those parties that contributed to the Multilateral Fund, but rather aimed to mobilize additional voluntary contributions for activities with minimal climatic impacts.

40. Various views in favour and against the proposal were expressed during the ensuing discussion and no agreement was reached on the draft decision as a whole. The parties accordingly agreed to defer further discussion of it to the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

41. The draft decision is set out in section C of annex I to the present note.

(c) Funding of production facilities for hydrochlorofluorocarbons (report of the 24th Meeting of the Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/10), paragraph 114)

42. A draft decision on funding of production facilities for HCFCs was introduced by India at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The draft decision, which referred to the funding provisions in decision XIX/6, would urge the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to finalize the discussions on the guidelines for the funding of production facilities and would request the Committee to take into consideration proactive regulatory actions adopted by some parties to limit production. Following informal discussions, the Working Group agreed to forward the draft decision for further discussion at the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties.

43. At the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties, differing views on the draft decision were expressed, with some parties saying that the decision was not needed because there was no need to reiterate the elements of decision XIX/6, which the Executive Committee was already working hard to implement within the guidelines for funding production facilities for HCFCs and other important tasks related to the production sector. In addition, proactive regulatory actions taken by parties to limit production of HCFCs did not come under the category of incremental costs eligible for funding. Some parties expressed the view that, while proactive actions to comply with control measures were commendable, it was not part of the mandate of the Multilateral Fund to provide retroactive compensation for such measures. Other parties were of the view that the issues raised by the draft decision were of great relevance to the achievement of the HCFC phase-out targets for parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 and should be given high priority, given the high social and economic implications of non-compliance. Owing to a lack of consensus, including in an informal group that was established to address the issue, the parties agreed to defer further consideration of the item to the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The draft decision is set out in section D of annex I to the present note.

(d) Terms of reference for the study on the 2015–2017 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

44. Since its provisional inception in 1990, the Multilateral Fund has operated with three-year funding cycles and the parties have accordingly adopted decisions on the replenishment of the Fund in 1993, 1996, 1999, 2002, 2005, 2008 and 2011. The 2011 replenishment decision covers the period 2012–2014. It has been the parties' custom, in the year preceding the end of each funding cycle, to develop terms of reference for a study designed to estimate the funds necessary to enable parties to achieve compliance during the forthcoming replenishment period. For the parties' convenience, the terms of reference established for the 2011 replenishment study in decision XXII/3 are set out in annex II to the present note. The parties may wish to consider matters related to the replenishment and to forward their views on any related considerations to the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties for its consideration and action.

Agenda item 11**Implications of the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development for small island developing States with regard to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol (report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/10), paragraph 125)**

45. A draft decision on the implications of the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development for small island developing States with regard to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol was discussed at the thirty-second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and put forward for further consideration by the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties.

46. The original proponents of the proposal – Saint Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago – were not in attendance at the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties, and the representative of Grenada said that he had been asked to convey a request from Saint Lucia that discussion of the proposal be deferred to the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The Meeting of the Parties accordingly agreed to defer the discussion of the draft decision until the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

47. The draft proposal is set out in section E of annex I to the present note.

Agenda item 12**Proposed adjustments to the Montreal Protocol**

48. The Working Group is expected to consider any proposals for adjustments to the Montreal Protocol submitted pursuant to paragraph 9 of Article 2 of the Protocol. Such proposals, if any, were to be transmitted to the Secretariat in time to enable them to be communicated to the parties by 21 April 2013, which is six months before the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties, scheduled from 21 to 25 October 2013. As at 26 April 2013, no proposals for adjustments had been received by the Secretariat.

Agenda item 13**Proposed amendments to the Montreal Protocol**

49. The Working Group is expected to consider any proposals for amendments to the Montreal Protocol submitted pursuant to Article 9 of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and paragraph 10 of Article 2 of the Protocol. Such proposals, if any, were to be submitted to the Secretariat in time to enable them to be communicated to the parties by 21 April 2013, which is six months before the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties, scheduled from 21 to 25 October 2013. As at 26 April 2013, two proposals for amendments had been received by the Secretariat. One joint proposal by Canada, Mexico and the United States of America and another, separate, proposal by the Federated States of Micronesia, both seek to amend the Montreal Protocol by phasing down HFCs, which are being used predominantly as replacements for ozone-depleting substances being phased out under the Montreal Protocol. On 17 April 2013, Morocco sent a communication to the Ozone Secretariat stating that it would like to co-sponsor the amendment proposal of the Federated States of Micronesia.]

II. Matters that the Secretariat would like to bring to the parties' attention**A. Secretariat missions**

50. In accordance with the parties' directives on participation in or monitoring of activities in other forums, the Secretariat has participated in and contributed to several meetings since the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties in 2012. Specifically, the Secretariat has attended the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel meetings in Moscow and has attended or will attend the regional network meetings in Australia, Bahrain, Colombia, Gambia, Saint Kitts and Nevis and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

B. Secretariat interactions with other international bodies

51. In addition to the meetings reported above, the Secretariat has been engaged with other international bodies. During the first universal session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), held in February 2013,

the Secretariat met with the Executive Secretary of the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to discuss and exchange information on cross-cutting issues related to climate and ozone protection, in particular the current status of the proposed amendments to the Montreal Protocol aimed at controlling production and consumption of HFCs. In addition, and at the invitation of the climate change secretariat, the Secretariat has participated in an informal meeting of officials of treaty bodies and experts in international law to exchange views and information on various treaty regimes under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action with the aim of developing a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change applicable to all parties. The meeting took place in Bonn, Germany, on 15 and 16 April 2013.

C. UNEP Governing Council meeting

52. The Secretariat participated in the first universal session of the UNEP Governing Council, which was held in Nairobi in February 2013. In the margins of the meeting, the Secretariat held bilateral consultations with some parties to the Montreal Protocol that had not yet completed the ratification of some amendments to the Montreal Protocol. The consultations were intended to explore processes that would enable expedited ratification of those amendments and how the Secretariat could assist the parties concerned in that effort. Consultations were held with the representatives of Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Haiti, Kenya, Mauritania and Saudi Arabia. The Secretariat also witnessed the signing of an agreement between UNEP and South Sudan for start-up funds to enable that country to establish the national ozone unit that would coordinate activities to phase out ozone-depleting substances under the Montreal Protocol. The agreement was signed between UNEP, as an implementing agency of the Multilateral Fund, and the environment minister of South Sudan.

D. Application of paragraph 8 of Article 4 of the Montreal Protocol to the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol and efforts to promote ratification of pending amendments to the Protocol

53. By paragraphs 1 quinquies and 2 quinquies of Article 4 of the Montreal Protocol, the import and export of HCFCs to non-parties to the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol was banned with effect from 1 January 2004 for parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 and from 1 January 2013 for parties operating under that paragraph. In November 2012, however, the parties adopted decision XXIV/2, which exempted some parties from the application of trade measures effective 1 January 2013. In paragraph 1 of the decision the parties determined that Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chad, Ecuador, Haiti, Kenya and Nicaragua were in full compliance with Article 2, Articles 2A–2I and Article 4 of the Protocol, including its Beijing Amendment, and that that determination would expire at the end of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties.

54. In the same decision, the parties also agreed that other states might notify the Secretariat, by 31 March 2013, if they intended to ratify, accede to or accept the Beijing Amendment as soon as possible and could certify that they were in full compliance with Articles 2, 2A–2I and Article 4 of the Protocol, as amended by the Copenhagen Amendment, and submit data to the Secretariat.

55. Since the adoption of decision XXIV/2, Botswana, Djibouti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Papua New Guinea and Saudi Arabia have written to the Secretariat, providing the necessary information, and are in good standing pursuant to paragraph 4 of decision XXIV/2. The States that have not written to the Secretariat are Kazakhstan, Libya and Mauritania. The following parties have since ratified various amendments to the Montreal Protocol: Botswana, Chad, Djibouti, Ecuador and Iran (Islamic Republic of). The nine remaining States that are still non-parties to some amendments to the Protocol are: Bahrain, Bolivia, Haiti, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Libya, Mauritania, Papua New Guinea and Saudi Arabia.

56. The status of parties covered by decision XXIV/2 is summarized in table 3.

Table 3

<i>Parties in good standing per paragraph 2 of decision XXIV/2</i>	<i>Parties in good standing after having written to the Secretariat per paragraph 4 of decision XXIV/2</i>	<i>Parties that have not written to the Secretariat per paragraph 4 of decision XXIV/2</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bahrain 2. Bolivia (Plurinational State of) 3. Chad* 4. Ecuador* 5. Haiti 6. Kenya 7. Nicaragua* 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Botswana* 2. Djibouti* 3. Iran (Islamic Republic of)* 4. Papua New Guinea 5. Saudi Arabia 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kazakhstan** 2. Libya 3. Mauritania

* *Already ratified*

** *Party not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5*

57. Parties may wish to urge all remaining non-party States to the amendments to the Montreal Protocol to ratify those amendments as soon as possible so as to avoid trade restrictions in respect of ozone-depleting substances.

E. Side events associated with the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group

58. At the time of the preparation of the present note, the Secretariat is able to inform the parties that the following event is planned to be held on the days immediately after the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

59. On 29 and 30 June 2013, immediately following the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, the second international conference on the theme “advancing ozone and climate protection technologies: next steps” will be held. The conference is sponsored by the United Nations Development Programme, UNEP, the Climate and Clean Air Coalition to Reduce Short-Lived Climate Pollutants, the United States of America, the European Commission and the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy. The conference will focus on alternatives to ozone-depleting substances for the air-conditioning, foams, refrigeration and other sectors, with a special focus on standards for climate-friendly alternatives. Presentations will be designed for a wide audience, including Montreal Protocol party representatives, national ozone officers and representatives of industry, environmental organizations and academia. The conference website (www.BangkokTechConference.org) provides further information and online registration. Registration is free.

F. Organizational issues regarding the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties

60. Further to decision XXIV/25, on the dates and venue of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, the Secretariat undertook a mission to Kyiv in late March 2013 to discuss with the relevant authorities of the Government of Ukraine issues relating to the schedule and venue of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties.

G. Changes in the staffing of the Ozone Secretariat

61. Efforts to ensure a smooth transition in the Ozone Secretariat continue as the recruitment process progresses for the three key management positions. The recruitment of the Senior Administrative Officer is in its final stages, and it is hoped that a new Officer will be on board in time for the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. Ms. Ruth Batten continues to serve in the post in the meantime through an extension of her contract. The post of Deputy Executive Secretary was advertised on 16 April 2013. Meanwhile, Ms. Megumi Seki continues to serve in the post on an interim basis. The post of Executive Secretary is also expected to be advertised in April 2013. Some parties have reiterated the need to ensure minimal disruption for the continued success of the operation of the Montreal Protocol.

Annex I

A. Information on ozone-depleting substance transition policy measures

Draft decision submitted by Australia, Canada, Croatia, the European Union, New Zealand and the United States of America

The Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties decides:

Recognizing that in its decision XIX/6 the Meeting of the Parties encouraged parties to promote the selection of alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons to minimize environmental impacts, in particular impacts on climate,

Recognizing also that there is a need for more information on the environmental implications of possible transitions from ozone-depleting substances,

1. To request the Ozone Secretariat to prepare a report that compiles current information about reporting systems, policies and initiatives on a national, regional or global scale that relate to promoting the transition from ozone-depleting substances to alternatives that are environmentally sound, to provide a preliminary version of the report to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-third meeting and to provide a final version of the report to the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties;
2. To invite parties to provide to the Ozone Secretariat, by 31 March 2013, information relevant to paragraph 1 above;

B. Clean production of hydrochlorofluorocarbon-22 through by-product emission control

Draft decision submitted by Burkina Faso, Canada, Comoros, Egypt, Mexico, Senegal and the United States of America

The Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties decides:

Recognizing the opportunity to facilitate a clean production approach to the manufacture of hydrochlorofluorocarbon-22 (HCFC-22) for both controlled and feedstock uses,

Recalling decision XVIII/12, in which the parties requested the Ozone Secretariat to facilitate consultations by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel with relevant organizations to enable the Panel to draw on the work already carried out under those organizations, including work relating to HCFC-22,

Recalling also the report of the Panel submitted pursuant to decision XVIII/12, in particular the section on the role of the Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change with respect to hydrofluorocarbon-23 (HFC-23) by-product emissions resulting from the production of HCFC-22,

Recognizing the relationship of HFC-23 to the controlled substance HCFC-22, given that the production of HCFC-22 results in the by-production of emissions of HFC-23 and that the production of HCFC-22 for feedstock uses is expected to continue beyond the phase-out of production for uses controlled under the Montreal Protocol,

Acknowledging that emissions of HFC-23 are covered by the Kyoto Protocol and affirming that the present decision is not intended to affect such coverage,

Recognizing the need to address uncontrolled HFC-23 by-product emissions in order to avoid impacts on the climate system resulting from their release and recognizing also that the technology to control such emissions is readily available,

1. To request the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol to consider proposals for one or more cost-effective demonstration projects to eliminate by-product emissions of HFC-23 during the production of HCFC-22 for facilities or production lines that are not earning emission reduction credits under the Clean Development Mechanism;
2. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, in consultation with the Scientific Assessment Panel, to conduct a study of the potential costs and environmental benefits of the implementation of HFC-23 by-product control measures related to the production of HCFC-22 by facility or production line, excluding the costs and benefits associated with existing Clean

Development Mechanism projects when relevant, and to prepare a report 60 days before the thirty-third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group so as to assist the parties in further considering this issue;

C. Additional funding for the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol to maximize the climate benefit of the accelerated phase-out of HCFCs

Draft decision submitted by Switzerland

[The Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties decides,

Recalling that decision X/16 recognizes the importance of implementing the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and takes note of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and perfluorocarbons as alternatives to ozone-depleting substances that have substantial impacts on the climate system,

Recalling the report submitted by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to the Open-ended Working Group at its thirtieth meeting on alternatives to hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) in the refrigeration and air-conditioning sector for parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol with high ambient temperatures and unique operating conditions, based on the request made in decision XIX/8,

Recalling that decision XIX/6 encourages parties to promote the selection of alternatives to HCFCs that minimize environmental impacts, in particular impacts on climate, as well as meeting other health, safety and economic considerations,

Recalling also that decision XIX/6 requests that the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, when developing and applying funding criteria for projects and programmes for the accelerated phase-out of HCFCs, give priority to cost-effective projects and programmes that focus on, among other things, substitutes and alternatives that minimize other impacts on the environment, including on the climate, taking into account global-warming potential, energy use and other relevant factors,

Recalling further that in the guidelines for the preparation of HCFC phase-out management plans adopted by the Executive Committee at its fifty-fourth meeting the Committee encourages countries and agencies to explore potential financial incentives and opportunities for additional resources to maximize the environmental benefits of HCFC phase-out management plans in accordance with subparagraph 11 (b) of decision XIX/6 of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties,

Recalling that the June 2007 Group of Eight summit declaration stated that: "We will also endeavour under the Montreal Protocol to ensure the recovery of the ozone layer by accelerating the phase-out of HCFCs in a way that supports energy efficiency and climate change objectives",

Taking note of the report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel task force about additional information on alternatives to ozone-depleting substances submitted for consideration by the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-second meeting,

Aware of the increasing availability of low-global-warming-potential alternatives to ozone-depleting substances, including in the refrigeration, air-conditioning and foam sectors,

Concerned about the potential for unfettered growth in the production, consumption and use of alternatives with high global-warming potential as a result of the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances, particularly HCFCs,

Noting that paragraph 2 of Article 10 of the Montreal Protocol stipulates that: "The mechanism established under paragraph 1 shall include a Multilateral Fund. It may also include other means of multilateral, regional and bilateral cooperation",

Noting also that paragraph 4 of Article 10 of the Montreal Protocol stipulates that: "The Multilateral Fund shall operate under the authority of the parties who shall decide on its overall policies",

Taking into account the decisions taken by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol about resource mobilization, in particular at its sixty-seventh meeting,

Paragraph 1, option 1

1. To request the Executive Committee to consider options to further minimize impacts on the environment other than ozone layer depletion – in particular on the climate, taking into account global-warming potential, energy use and other relevant factors – of the projects and programmes financed under the Multilateral Fund, in particular for the phase-out of HCFCs, by assessing the feasibility and usefulness of a funding window to maximize the climate co-benefits of HCFC phase-out based on the following three options:

- (a) Receiving voluntary contributions independently or additionally to pledged contributions;
- (b) [Concluding agreements with other entities to facilitate cooperation and synergies on projects;]
- (c) [Resource mobilization;]

Paragraph 1, option 2

Willing to facilitate the minimization of impacts on the environment in addition to ozone layer depletion, in particular on the climate – taking into account global-warming potential, energy use and other relevant factors – of the projects and programmes financed under the Multilateral Fund, in particular for the phase-out of HCFCs,

1. To request the Executive Committee to assess the feasibility and usefulness of a funding window to maximize the climate co-benefits of HCFC phase-out based on the following three options:

- (a) Receiving voluntary contributions independently or additionally to pledged contributions;
- (b) [Concluding agreements with other entities to facilitate cooperation and synergies on projects;]
- (c) [Resource mobilization;]

2. Also to request the Executive Committee, taking into account the assessment referred to in paragraph 1 of the present decision, to consider establishing such a funding window and developing terms of reference and procedures for its functioning within the existing framework of the Multilateral Fund, including under the following conditions:

- (a) The funding window should be used only for providing additional funding to programmes and projects eligible for Multilateral Fund financial assistance;
- (b) The funding window should be used for providing additional funding only when the implementation of alternatives minimizing climate impacts cannot be approved for cost reasons, in particular because it would increase the incremental costs of a project above the relevant cost-effectiveness threshold;
- (c) The climate impact of alternatives should be established with the help of the Multilateral Fund Climate Impact Indicator;
- (d) Financial support from the funding window would be approved within cost-effectiveness thresholds calculated in United States dollars per tonne of CO₂ equivalent [established in such a way that it would remain below the average cost effectiveness of climate change mitigation projects approved under other multilateral environment facilities during a past period of time to be defined];
- (e) **option 1** [Any greenhouse-gas emission reductions achieved with the support of resources from the funding window would not be eligible for emissions credits of any type]; **option 2** [Any funds received through emission credits generated by greenhouse-gas emissions reductions achieved with resources from the funding window should be collected by the funding window];
- (f) Resources from the funding window could be provided on a loan basis for the funding of project components focusing on improving energy efficiency;
- (g) If resources under the funding window are insufficient to cover the eligible costs of submitted projects, available resources could be allocated taking into account the significance of the climate impact that would be achieved by such projects;

(h) Reporting about the use of the funds available would be provided appropriately to every contributor;

3. To [call upon] [invite] Governments, organizations and, in particular, multilateral and/or financial institutions already or not traditionally contributing to the Multilateral Fund to indicate to the Multilateral Fund secretariat their interest in contributing to such a funding window [and to consider making additional support available to the funding window once established];

4. To request the Executive Committee to report to the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties on the progress made in the establishment of the funding window;]

D. Funding of production facilities for hydrochlorofluorocarbons

Draft decision submitted by India

The Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties decides:

Recalling decision XIX/6, which states that funding through the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol shall be stable and sufficient to meet all agreed incremental costs to enable parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol to comply with the accelerated phase-out schedule for hydrochlorofluorocarbons for both the production and consumption sectors,

Recognizing that there is limited time before the first control measures on hydrochlorofluorocarbons for parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 come into force with a freeze at the baseline level in 2013 and a 10 per cent reduction from the baseline in 2015,

Noting that parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 with production facilities for hydrochlorofluorocarbons may be at risk of being in non-compliance with those control measures if adequate assistance is not provided through the Multilateral Fund,

1. To reiterate the intent of decision XIX/6, which is to provide stable and sufficient funding through the Multilateral Fund to meet all agreed incremental costs to enable parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 to comply with the accelerated phase-out schedule for hydrochlorofluorocarbons, including the production sector;

2. To urge the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to finalize as a priority matter the guidelines for funding of production facilities for hydrochlorofluorocarbons;

3. To request the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund, while finalizing such guidelines, to take into consideration in particular the proactive regulatory actions taken by some parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol to limit production of hydrochlorofluorocarbons in facilities in their countries beyond those required for compliance with the relevant control schedule;

E. Implications of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development outcome document for small island developing States regarding the implementation of the Montreal Protocol

Draft decision submitted by Saint Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago

The Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Parties decides:

Recalling that, of the 197 parties to the Montreal Protocol, 39 are recognized by the United Nations as small island developing States,

Recognizing that the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 20 to 22 June 2012, recognizes that the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances is resulting in a rapid increase in the use and release of high-global-warming potential hydrofluorocarbons to the environment,

Recognizing decision XIX/6, in which the parties agreed to accelerate the phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons and encouraged parties to promote the selection of alternatives to them that minimized environmental impacts, in particular impacts on the climate, as well as meeting other health, safety and economic considerations,

Acknowledging that the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development reaffirms that small island developing States remain a special case for sustainable development in view of their unique and particular vulnerabilities, including their small size, remoteness, narrow resource and export base and exposure to global environmental challenges and external economic shocks,

To recognize that small-island developing States have unique and particular vulnerabilities and to take those vulnerabilities into account in considering their efforts to meet the Montreal Protocol requirements for the phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons and their efforts to select and make the transition to longer-term energy-efficient, ozone- and climate-friendly alternatives.

Annex II

Terms of reference for the study on the 2012–2014 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

Recalling the parties' decisions on previous terms of reference for studies on the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol,

Recalling also the parties' decisions on previous replenishments of the Multilateral Fund,

1. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to prepare a report for submission to the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties, and to present it through the Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-first meeting, to enable the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Parties to take a decision on the appropriate level of the 2012–2014 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund;

2. That, in preparing the report referred to in the preceding paragraph, the Panel should take into account, among other things:

(a) All control measures and relevant decisions agreed upon by the parties to the Montreal Protocol and the Executive Committee, in particular those related to the special needs of low-volume- and very-low-volume-consuming countries, and decisions agreed upon by the Twenty-Second Meeting of the Parties and the Executive Committee at its sixty-first and sixty-second meetings insofar as those decisions will necessitate expenditure by the Multilateral Fund during the period 2012–2014;

(b) The need to allocate resources to enable all parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol to maintain compliance with Articles 2A–2E, 2G and 2I of the Protocol;

(c) The need to allocate resources to enable all parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 to meet 2013 and 2015 compliance obligations in respect of Articles 2F and 2H of the Protocol;

(d) Rules and guidelines agreed upon by the Executive Committee at all meetings, up to and including its sixty-second meeting, for determining eligibility for the funding of investment projects, non-investment projects, including institutional strengthening, measures to combat illegal trade and sectoral or national phase-out plans, including hydrochlorofluorocarbon phase-out management plans, measures to manage banks of ozone-depleting substances and ozone-depleting substance destruction projects;

(e) The impact that the international market, ozone-depleting substance control measures and country phase-out activities are likely to have on the supply of and demand for ozone-depleting substances, the corresponding effects on the price of ozone-depleting substances and the resulting incremental costs of investment projects during the period under review;

3. That, in preparing the report referred to above, the Panel should consult widely all relevant persons and institutions and other relevant sources of information deemed useful;

4. That the Panel shall strive to complete the report referred to above in time to enable it to be distributed to all parties two months before the thirty-first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group;

5. That the Panel should provide indicative figures for the periods 2015–2017 and 2018–2020 to support a stable and sufficient level of funding, on the understanding that those figures will be updated in subsequent replenishment studies;