



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/35/61  
24 November 2001



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Thirty-fifth Meeting  
Montreal, 5-7 December 2001

**STUDY ON DEFINING A STARTING POINT FOR DETERMINING THE REMAINING  
ODS CONSUMPTION ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING BY THE MULTILATERAL FUND:  
FOLLOW-UP TO DECISION 34/66(a)**

## **Introduction**

1. The Executive Committee discussed at its 34<sup>th</sup> Meeting “proposals on implementing the framework on the objectives, priorities, problems and modalities for strategic planning of the Multilateral Fund in the compliance period”.

2. In the context of that discussion “Several representatives wished to see an agreed definition of sustained permanent aggregate reductions in production and consumption. Differing views were expressed on how to establish a baseline figure instead of the national aggregate consumption concept that would enable the remaining ODS consumption eligible for funding to be determined. It was proposed that the following alternative approaches could be applied in the line of discussions on strategic planning when determining such a baseline:

- The baseline figure should be based on very recently reported consumption data;
- Some adjustments should be allowed in exceptional circumstances for example, in cases of ODS imports, stockpiling or illegal imports, and natural sectoral growth; and a suitable method should be developed for incorporation of ongoing projects in the baseline figure; or
- The Montreal Protocol baseline for compliance in respect of the different controlled substances should be used.” (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/34/58, paragraph 89).

3. Subsequently, the Executive Committee decided to request the Secretariat, *inter alia*, “to prepare a document that included a definition of the starting point for determining the sustained reduction of each Article 5 country, taking into consideration the need to address properly the alternative approaches outlined in paragraph 89 above” (Decision 34/66 sub-paragraph a).

4. This paper is submitted in response to Decision 34/66(a).

## **Objective of the paper**

5. The objective of this paper is to provide statistical analysis to be used by the Executive Committee for decision-making on the starting point for determining the remaining ODS consumption eligible for funding. The analysis covers Annex A CFCs only, as they account for about 78% of ODS consumption by Article 5 countries. For the other controlled substances they are either funded on the basis of sectoral agreements, e.g. halon and methyl bromide, or their baselines for compliance have not been established (TCA and CTC).

6. Specifically the analysis will examine the implications of using as the starting point, the very recent consumption data and the Montreal Protocol baseline; the need for adjustment of the starting point in exceptional circumstances; and the method for incorporating the consumption captured in on-going projects.

7. As these elements depend on data reported by Article 5 countries in accordance with Article 7 and on other data, an overview of the relevant decisions of the Executive Committee and the Meetings of the Parties in this regard is included in the first part of the paper to provide a contextual basis for the methodology used and the findings and conclusions made which are presented in the second part.

## Part I

### An Overview of the relevant decisions of the Executive Committee and the Parties

#### Background

8. The purpose of establishing the Multilateral Fund was “to provide financial and technical cooperation, including the transfer of technologies, to Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol to enable their compliance with the control measures set out in Articles 2A to 2E of the Protocol”. To achieve this compliance, the Fund “shall meet all agreed incremental costs of such Parties”.

9. Since the establishment of the Fund more than US \$1,200 million have been disbursed from the Multilateral Fund to eligible Article 5 countries to meet the agreed incremental costs of investment projects for the phase out of the production and consumption of some 191,000 ODP tonnes of controlled substances; and for non-investment projects including funding of institutional strengthening projects in 108 Article 5 countries.

10. Of the current 179 Parties to the Montreal Protocol, 135 are classified to be operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol, including 7 Parties who were so reclassified and are therefore not beneficiaries of the Multilateral Fund.

#### Data reporting and data reconciliation

11. Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol requires Parties to the Protocol to provide to the Ozone Secretariat statistical data on their annual production and consumption of controlled substances in Annexes A, B, C and E. Such data is used by the Ozone Secretariat to calculate each Party’s baseline for compliance with one or more of the applicable control measures of the Protocol. Now that the grace period granted to Article 5 Parties is over, the data is being used to determine the status of compliance of these Parties with the freeze in the production and consumption of Annex A CFCs.

12. Regular reporting by Article 5 countries of their data increased with the preparation and subsequent approval of their country programmes and institutional strengthening projects. In approving a country programme, the Executive Committee requests the country concerned to report annually its consumption (and production) in accordance with Article 7. The Executive Committee also requests a report on the status of the progress in the implementation of the country programme to be submitted annually to the Fund Secretariat in accordance with a format designed specifically to indicate the actual use of each controlled substance and its distribution among the industrial sectors (e.g., aerosol, foam, refrigeration, etc.).

13. With the rise in the number of investment projects, it became clear that sectoral consumption data included in project proposals did not tally with country programme data and was often different from that reported to the Ozone Secretariat.

14. The Executive Committee and the Meeting of the Parties took a number of decisions requesting reconciliation of the data reported to the Ozone and Fund Secretariats. Thus, the Executive Committee decided at its 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting (1995) that “where ODS data contained in a

project submitted differed significantly from the data in a country programme, countries should update the ODS consumption figures in their country programmes for that sector, and submit with the project request the revised figures and a detailed explanation of the reasons for the variation”. In the same year, the Seventh Meeting of the Parties decided that “the [Ozone] Secretariat should be entitled to seek clarification on data reported under Article 7 if there is a discrepancy with the data in the country programme of the country concerned”; and “that it should be established through these clarifications, which are the best available and most accurate data. Should the clarification not result in an agreement, the data provided by the Party to the [Ozone] Secretariat should be used” (Decision VII/20).

15. Several other decisions were taken by the Executive Committee concerning project and sector data, and the Eleventh Meeting of the Parties decided, *inter alia*, “to note that data collection on ozone-depleting substances sectors is important in assisting a Party to meet its obligations under the Protocol and that the Parties might wish to consider the burden of collecting sector data and other sector data required in the context of the Montreal Protocol at a future meeting.” (Decision XI/23).

#### Data verification

16. The Executive Committee took several decisions regarding consumption data reported in project proposals and its relationship to compliance baseline data, and to the overall consumption to be phased out from the implementation of projects. In particular, the Committee decided at its 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting “to request Implementing Agencies and countries submitting projects, with the assistance of the Secretariat, to provide the most up-to-date sectoral ODS consumption data and data for the country as a whole when submitting proposals, to enable countries to better assess the impact of the project proposals on their ability to meet both their own phaseout programmes and their Montreal Protocol obligations” (Decision 27/14).

17. The Committee also decided at its 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting (1999) that “where there was an apparent discrepancy between a country’s baseline data on consumption of ozone-depleting substances, data on amounts already phased out or planned for phase out under projects already funded with resources of the Multilateral Fund and amounts to be phased out under projects proposed for approval, the countries and the relevant Implementing Agencies should be requested to provide an explanation of the discrepancy to the Sub-Committee on Project Review” (Decision 28/36 (a)).

18. The Executive Committee further requested the Implementing Agencies at its Thirty-first Meeting (2000) “to attempt to reconcile sector consumption data against the data from the Ozone Secretariat, taking into account the fact that the sectoral data should be seen as estimated breakdowns of the data officially reported to the Ozone Secretariat, and to report this information to the Committee at its 34<sup>th</sup> Meeting” (Decision 31/12(b)).

#### Montreal Protocol baseline for compliance

19. The country programmes which were prepared prior to the establishment of the Montreal Protocol compliance baseline included varying baseline years ranging from 1989 to 1995. The progress in the implementation of such country programmes needed to be referred to a specific baseline year against which it could be assessed.

20. In its discussion on which baseline year to use in future country programmes, the Executive Committee decided at its Twenty-second Meeting, *inter alia*, “to adopt, beginning in 1998, the baseline year of the Montreal Protocol as the baseline year for the Multilateral Fund”, and “to use, until it is feasible to use the baseline year of the Montreal Protocol as the baseline year for the Multilateral Fund, the baseline data from the country programme, the consumption data from the previous year and the unconstrained growth indicated in the country programme, while making it clear in the report that the latter figure is an extrapolation made at an early stage of the ODS phase-out programme in the country concerned” (Decision 22/68).

#### Approved Projects and Compliance

21. The Executive Committee began in 1996 to address the contribution to compliance with the Montreal Protocol, of ODS phaseout arising from the implementation of investment projects, three years ahead of the onset of the CFC freeze control measure of 1999 (since projects approved in 1996 would only be completed in 1999). Thus, the Committee decided at its Nineteenth Meeting (1996) “to request the Implementing Agencies and countries to include with each project proposal submitted for approval by the Executive Committee a brief description of how the project would contribute to helping the country to achieve the 1999 freeze” (Decision 19/4).

22. A similar decision was taken at the Twentieth Meeting which requested the Implementing Agencies “to bear in mind, when preparing their business plans and deciding how to allocate projects among sectors, the commitments and control measures already in the Protocol, with which all countries were expected to comply” (Decision 20/3).

23. The two decisions were reaffirmed at the Twenty-second Meeting which recommended that the requirement of Decisions 19/4 and 20/3 could be effected by including the sector background in the project description (Decision 22/20).

24. The Executive Committee re-emphasised the importance of implementing these decisions at its Twenty-third Meeting by deciding to further request the Implementing Agencies to be more specific on how projects would assist countries to meet the freeze (Decision 23/39).

## **Part II**

### **Methodology, Findings, and Conclusions**

#### **Methodology**

25. The methodology employed in this paper is governed by the requirements of the two approaches proposed in Decision 34/66. One approach has its starting point in the past, during the grace period where the consumption is known with greater certainty since it is based on the average consumption of the three years 1995, 1996, 1997: the Montreal Protocol baseline approach. The other approach has its starting point in the most recent consumption which is by definition a one year consumption during the compliance period and is a reflection of specific circumstances in that year.

26. The methodology will examine the most recent consumption data reported by Article 5 Parties, and will provide an analysis of such consumption in relation to that reported for previous years. The purpose of this analysis is to assess whether the most recent consumption is a continuation of a consumption trend that had started in earlier years in some countries, or is a reflection of a high or a low consumption year in countries whose consumption in previous years exhibited such fluctuations.

27. The methodology will also examine data concerning approved projects to determine the status of the implementation of these projects and the suitability of incorporating the consumption associated with the ongoing projects in the determination of the remaining consumption.

28. Finally, the methodology will assess the impact of utilizing the two approaches in determining the remaining CFC consumption eligible for funding, and whether any adjustment is needed.

#### **Data and Data Analysis**

##### *Sources of data:*

29. The following sources of data were consulted:

- (a) The Ozone Secretariat electronic database which, *inter alia*, records CFC production and consumption since 1986.
- (b) The Multilateral Fund Secretariat electronic database which comprises sub-sets of data from:
  - (i) Inventory of approved projects, which provides data on the amount of consumption to be phased out from approved projects;
  - (ii) Annual progress reports of the Implementing Agencies, which provide data on the status of implementation of approved projects including the amounts of ODS phased out.

- (iii) Annual reports on the progress in the implementation of country programmes, which provides the distribution of ODS consumption per user sector in a given year.

*Validation of data:*

30. The Fund Secretariat, in cooperation with the Implementing Agencies, has requested countries to verify their consumption data with regards to their compliance baselines, ODS distribution among user sectors and the ODS from approved but not implemented projects. This was the basis for the preparation of the 2001 business plans and the 2002 draft business plans. In the case of the latter, 109 Article 5 countries were requested to, *inter alia*, verify their remaining ODS consumption per substance and sector. The Fund Secretariat provided each of these countries, through the Implementing Agency, a profile of its consumption including most recent Article 7 data or data reported through country programme implementation reports and the ODS in approved but not implemented projects. Eighty-one countries responded, 10 of which slightly modified their remaining consumption data.

*Limitations of data:*

31. Consumption due to stockpiling, illegal trade, recycled and reclaimed CFCs and CFCs imported premixed with polyols is very difficult to determine. Only in few examples, one Article 5 country reported to the Fund Secretariat (country programme implementation report) a sharp increase in CFC consumption which was almost double its Article 7 consumption for the same year; another country reported substantially less consumption to the Fund Secretariat compared with its Article 7 consumption. In the first case, the high consumption reported to the Fund Secretariat represented imports of CFC-11 premixed with polyols. In the second case, the higher consumption reported under Article 7 could represent stockpiling. It should be noted that some Article 5 countries indicated in their implementation of country programme progress reports that consumption due to illegal trade was not accounted for in their data.

*General observations*

32. Based on the data reported by Article 5 countries in accordance with Article 7, the following observations can be made:

- (a) 99 Article 5 Parties have consistently reported their Article 7 data for the years 1995-1999, including 63 who also reported 2000 data;
- (b) CFC consumption of the 99 countries increased gradually from 1990 and reached its peak of about 166,600 ODP tonnes in 1995 and subsequently decreased on annual basis through 1999 and 2000, with the reported consumption in 1999 amounting to about 110,800 ODP tonnes. The 1999 consumption represents 76% of the Montreal Protocol baseline (about 146,300 ODP tonnes) for Annex A CFCs;
- (c) The 99 countries are divided according to their CFC baseline consumption into 64 low-volume-consuming Article 5 countries (LVCC) whose CFC baseline consumption is 360 ODP tonnes or less, and 35 non-low volume-consuming

countries (NLVCC) with baseline consumption higher than that;

- (d) The 64 LVCCs had a total consumption of about 4,700 ODP tonnes in 1999, and the 35 non-LVCCs had a total consumption of about 106,000 ODP tonnes;
- (e) The 1999 consumption of the 10 largest non-LVCCs amounted to 86,000 ODP tonnes or 78% of the total consumption of the 99 Article 5 countries.

#### Analysis of very recent consumption data

33. The very recent consumption data (either 1999 or 2000) for each country was compared with those of the preceding two years to establish a consumption pattern and trend.

34. It was then compared to both the Montreal Protocol baseline (1995-1997) and to the average consumption of the years 1995-1999 or 1995-2000, as applicable. The comparison both to the baseline consumption and to the consumption over longer time periods were required to examine the percentage reduction represented by the most recent consumption, and therefore its sustainability.

#### Result of the analysis

35. The most recent consumption of the 99 countries amounted to 73% of the Montreal Protocol baseline consumption and 78% of the 1995-1999/2000 consumption averages.

36. 48 countries showed linear reduction in consumption for the last 3 consecutive years while the other 51 countries showed irregular consumption patterns.

37. The very recent consumption of 79 countries was below both the Montreal Protocol baseline and the consumption average of 1995-1999/2000 amounting to 70 and 92% of the baseline and the consumption average respectively.

38. The very recent consumption of 18 countries was higher than the Montreal Protocol baseline, representing 118% of the baseline; and was also higher than that of the consumption averages of 1995-1999/2000 in the case of 16 countries, representing 110% of these consumption averages.

39. The very recent consumption was higher than the Montreal Protocol baseline in the case of 6 countries but lower or equal to the consumption averages of 1995-1999/2000.

40. Annex I provides the results of this analysis.

#### Method for incorporation of ongoing projects

41. The Multilateral Fund has been funding ODS phase-out in Article 5 countries since 1991, and it usually takes an average of 36 months from the time of project approval for a project to complete and realize the phase-out. Therefore, the ODS which is funded but has not been phased out continues to form part of the reported consumption of the country concerned. As a result the ODS consumption reported by an Article 5 country in any given year could include as part of its data the ODS consumption already funded, but not phased out.



42. In order to determine the remaining ODS consumption eligible for funding, or the unfunded consumption of each country, it is necessary to net out from the reported consumption this portion of funded but not implemented consumption. The importance of netting out this funded consumption is that this portion of the reported ODS consumption will disappear once these projects are implemented. This ensures that the Multilateral Fund does not fund the same consumption twice.

### Determination of a Starting Point

#### *First Approach: Montreal Protocol baseline as the Starting Point*

43. The Montreal Protocol baseline has been established for almost all Article 5 countries, and it represents the average consumption of each country for the years 1995-1997.

44. The Multilateral Fund has been funding projects in Article 5 countries since 1991. Not all of the projects were completed by the end of 1997; consumption associated with these projects formed part of the reported consumption by the countries concerned. In order to use the Montreal Protocol baseline as the starting point, the Montreal Protocol baseline consumption should first be adjusted to offset the ODS consumption in approved but not implemented projects as at 31 December 1997.

45. To determine the remaining ODS consumption eligible for funding, the consumption associated with projects approved since 1997 should be deducted from the adjusted baseline.

46. The above procedure could be expressed as follows:

$$\text{Remaining unfunded consumption} = \text{Baseline consumption minus consumption from ongoing projects at 31 December 1997 minus consumption from projects approved in 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001.}$$

47. Annex II presents the results of using this approach for 99 Article 5 countries.

#### *Second Approach: Very recent consumption as the Starting Point*

48. To calculate the remaining ODS consumption eligible for funding using this approach, the following procedure applies: subtract from the very recent consumption (e.g., 2000 consumption) the ODS consumption from ongoing projects as at 31 December 2000, and the ODS consumption from projects approved in 2001.

49. The results of using this approach are tabulated in Annex III for 99 Article 5 countries.

## **Findings**

### Montreal Protocol baseline as the Starting Point

50. The results of applying the Montreal Protocol baseline as the starting point for determining the remaining unfunded CFC consumption for each Article 5 country are provided in Annex II. The results indicate the following:

- (a) The remaining unfunded CFC consumption for the 99 Article 5 countries listed in Annex II is 71,873 ODP tonnes (68,690 ODP tonnes for NLVCC and 3,183 ODP tonnes for LVCC) which represents 49% of their Montreal Protocol baseline CFC consumption of 146,317 ODP tonnes.
- (b) On a country-by-country basis the remaining consumption ranges from 6.21% to 100% of their Montreal Protocol baseline consumption with six countries (Jordan, Romania, Cameroon, Congo, Gabon and Ghana) having negative value for their remaining unfunded consumption.

### The very recent consumption as the Starting Point

51. The results of applying the very recent consumption (either 1999 or 2000) as the starting point for determining the remaining unfunded CFC consumption for each Article 5 country are provided in Annex III. The results indicate the following:

- (a) The remaining unfunded CFC consumption of the 99 Article 5 countries listed in Annex III amounts to 66,947 ODP tonnes (61,825 ODP tonnes for NLVCC and 3,120 ODP tonnes for LVCC). The unfunded consumption represents 61% of the very recent consumption reported by these countries under Article 7.
- (b) On a country-by-country basis, the remaining unfunded consumption represents 6.25% to 100% of the latest consumption reported. Six countries (India, Jordan, Morocco, Congo, Swaziland and Tanzania) showed negative values for their remaining unfunded consumption.

### Comparison of the results from applying the two approaches

52. Annex IV provides the remaining unfunded consumption for each country resulting from the two approaches. The remaining unfunded consumption for the 99 countries is 6,926 ODP tonnes higher in the case of the Montreal Protocol baseline than the very recent consumption, or a difference of 9.6%.

53. On a country-by-country basis, the results are less consistent and exhibit wide variations.

54. The two approaches yield negative values for the remaining unfunded consumption for 6 countries in each case. Two of these countries, Congo and Jordan, have negative values for their remaining unfunded consumption under the two approaches. The other countries have negative values only under one of the approaches.

55. Some of the plausible reasons for the negative values could be that the consumption of some of the funded projects was overestimated (some foam and recovery and recycling projects), derived from stockpiled or unofficial imports, or was due to the use of CFC-11 premixed with polyols. Such consumption is not included in data reported under Article 7.

56. The negative values could also be due to drastic drop in consumption in very recent years compared to earlier years either because of conscious efforts to restrict ODS consumption or due to economic factors.

#### The need for adjustment

57. The exceptional circumstances mentioned in paragraph 89 in the report of the 34<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee as possible reasons for adjustment could indeed have led to funding phaseout of consumption that was not an official consumption according to the Montreal Protocol. With the exception of some use of CFC-11 premixed with polyols, it is virtually impossible to quantify the amount of consumption from the other sources mentioned. Therefore, it is equally difficult to propose a procedure to apply a standard adjustment to the remaining unfunded consumption derived from either approach.

58. It should, however, be noted that of the 99 Article 5 countries covered by the analysis, 64 countries are low-volume-consuming countries. Most of them have Refrigerant Management Plans approved for the purpose of compliance with both the 50% and 85% reduction in accordance with Decision 31/48. Consequently, any adjustment in the remaining consumption of any of these countries should be made in the context of this decision. It should also be noted that the issue of adjustment might not arise for some of the large-volume-consuming countries that have national phaseout plans or sectoral plans.

#### Conclusions

59. Both the Montreal Protocol baseline or the very recent consumption approaches could be used to determine the remaining unfunded consumption. Globally, they yield similar results but on a country-by-country basis the results vary significantly.

60. Adjustment to the remaining unfunded consumption is difficult to quantify and might have to be considered on a case-by-case basis for some of the large-volume-consuming countries, and in the context of Decision 31/48 in the case of low-volume-consuming countries.

-----

Annex I  
Consumption of CFCs in Article 5 countries by country and level of consumption (ODP tonnes)

COUNTRY	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Baseline	Average 1995-1999	Average 1995-2000	% 1999 consumption relative to average 1995-1999	% 2000 consumption relative to average 1995-2000	% 1999 consumption relative to baseline	% 2000 consumption relative to baseline
<b>NLVCC</b>																		
Algeria	0	0	0	2,146	2,226	2,292	2,292	1,774	1,549	1,502	1474.6	2,119	1,882	1,814	79.82%	81.29%	70.87%	69.58%
Argentina	2,138	2,797	4,306	1,806	4,569	6,366	4,202	3,524	3,546	4,316	2396.7	4,697	4,391	4,058	98.30%	59.05%	91.88%	51.02%
Bangladesh	195	93	213	227	181	281	628	832	830	801		580	674		118.77%		138.02%	
Brazil	8,539	8,504	8,934	9,818	10,778	10,896	10,872	9,810	9,543	11,612	9275.1	10,526	10,547	10,335	110.10%	89.75%	110.32%	88.12%
Chile	662	675	573	892	853	933	878	674	738	658		828	776		84.77%		79.44%	
China	41,829	50,263	57,045	66,283	70,779	75,291	47,089	51,076	55,414	42,983		57,819	54,371		79.06%		74.34%	
Colombia	2,026	1,686	0	0	2,115	2,156	2,302	2,166	1,224	986	1149.3	2,208	1,767	1,664	55.81%	69.07%	44.66%	52.05%
Cuba	778	328	122	122	150	546	664	665	531	571	533.6	625	595	585	95.90%	91.20%	91.36%	85.38%
Dominican Republic	0	0	274	330	433	634	559	427	311	752	398.8	540	537	514	140.14%	77.64%	139.26%	73.85%
Egypt	2,144	1,960	2,015	1,746	1,870	1,640	1,732	1,632	1,540	1,374	1267.0	1,668	1,584	1,531	86.76%	82.77%	82.37%	75.96%
India	0	0	4,501	5,277	6,387	6,402	6,937	6,703	5,265	4,143		6,681	5,890		70.34%		62.01%	
Indonesia	0	0	5,249	4,363	6,910	8,351	9,012	7,635	6,183	5,866			8,333	7,409	79.17%		70.40%	
Iran	1,366	4,750	4,750	4,495	4,328	4,140	3,692	5,883	5,571	4,399	4156.5	4,572	4,737	4,640	92.86%	89.57%	96.22%	90.92%
Jordan	540	545	531	580	520	535	627	857	647	398	354.0	673	613	570	64.95%	62.14%	59.14%	52.60%
Korea, DPR	0	0	0	0	0	825	267	233	112	106		442	309		34.35%		24.00%	
Lebanon	0	0	0	908	726	820	735	621	475	463	527.9	725	623	607	74.34%	86.97%	63.83%	72.78%
Macedonia	0	0	0	0	206	558	514	487	63	192	49.5	520	363	311	52.92%	15.94%	36.95%	9.53%
Malaysia	3,384	3,829	3,421	3,624	4,730	3,427	3,038	3,348	2,334	2,010	1979.8	3,271	2,831	2,689	70.99%	73.61%	61.45%	60.53%
Mexico	12,037	10,291	8,513	9,198	9,652	4,859	4,859	4,157	3,483	2,838	3059.5	4,625	4,039	3,876	70.26%	78.94%	61.36%	66.15%
Morocco	604	691	1,070	630	757	707	814	886	924	871	564.0	802	840	794	103.64%	71.00%	108.56%	70.29%
Nigeria	934	1,020	1,071	1,996	1,795	1,536	4,548	4,866	4,762	4,286		3,650	4,000		107.16%		117.42%	
Pakistan	751	674	945	1,781	1,823	2,104	1,671	1,264	1,196	1,422		1,680	1,531		92.86%		84.66%	
Panama	252	377	168	359	254	440	355	358	346	301	249.9	384	360	342	83.61%	73.15%	78.32%	65.02%
Philippines	2,981	2,023	3,520	3,779	3,959	3,382	3,039	2,747	2,130	2,088	2905.2	3,056	2,677	2,715	77.99%	107.00%	68.32%	95.07%
Romania	0	0	0	1,649	960	544	763	720	582	338		676	589		57.35%		50.02%	
Sri Lanka	209	185	216	294	347	520	498	183	250	216	221.1	400	333	315	64.79%	70.26%	53.96%	55.23%
Sudan	0	601	0	320	338	635	430	306	295	295	291.5	457	392	375	75.22%	77.65%	64.55%	63.79%
Syria	1,272	1,326	1,365	1,406	2,380	2,370	2,260	2,044	1,246	1,281	1174.6	2,225	1,840	1,729	69.61%	67.92%	57.58%	52.80%
Thailand	6,660	7,904	9,057	8,053	6,865	8,248	5,550	4,448	3,783	3,611	3568.3	6,082	5,128	4,868	70.42%	73.30%	59.37%	58.67%
Tunisia	730	1,055	568	581	508	758	882	970	791	566	555.0	870	793	754	71.34%	73.64%	65.06%	63.79%
Turkey	3,519	3,223	4,118	4,451	2,661	3,789	3,759	3,870	3,985	1,791		3,806	3,439		52.08%		47.06%	
Venezuela	3,343	3,786	4,071	3,624	3,093	3,220	3,041	3,704	3,214	1,922	2705.0	3,322	3,020	2,968	63.64%	91.15%	57.86%	81.44%
Vietnam	0	303	0	0	380	480	520	500	392	294		500	437		67.25%		58.80%	
Yugoslavia	1,449	1,199	1,079	999	868	820	896	832	519	549		849	723		75.91%		64.64%	
Zimbabwe	0	0	0	218	476	462	457	435	390	229	145.0	451	395	353	58.03%	41.08%	50.74%	32.13%
<b>TOTAL CONSUMPTION BY NLVCC</b>	<b>98,342</b>	<b>110,088</b>	<b>127,695</b>	<b>141,955</b>	<b>154,877</b>	<b>160,967</b>	<b>130,382</b>	<b>130,637</b>	<b>124,164</b>	<b>106,030</b>	<b>39,002</b>	<b>140,662</b>	<b>130,436</b>	<b>115,197</b>	<b>81.29%</b>	<b>80.57%</b>	<b>75.38%</b>	<b>71.15%</b>
<b>LVCC</b>																		
Antigua and Barbuda	421	428	429	426	12	12	10	10	26	2	5.0	11	12	11	16.67%	46.15%	18.75%	46.88%
Bahamas	0	0	1	66	68	70	72	53	55	54	65.90	65	61	62	88.55%	106.95%	82.77%	101.38%
Bahrain	107	85	119	111	118	122	137	147	150	129		135	137		94.16%		95.32%	
Barbados	21	25	21	30	35	25	22	17	22	17		21	21		82.52%		79.69%	
Belize	0	0	0	0	0	16	11	20	25	25	8.8	16	19	18	128.87%	49.91%	159.57%	56.17%
Benin	58	37	44	37	37	62	58	60	54	57	54.6	60	58	58	97.94%	94.79%	95.00%	91.00%
Bolivia	0	14	0	0	76	82	87	58	74	72		76	75		96.51%		95.15%	
Botswana	0	0	12	15	8	8	5	7	3	3	2.5	7	5	5	57.69%	52.63%	45.00%	37.50%
Brunei Darussalam	0	0	59	81	63	65	80	90	63	37	46.6	78	67	64	55.22%	73.27%	47.23%	59.49%
Burkina Faso	28	29	29	31	34	34	38	38	37	31	25.4	37	36	34	87.08%	74.93%	84.55%	69.27%
Burundi	43	46	48	0	0	56	59	62	64	60	53.8	59	60	59	99.67%	90.98%	101.69%	91.19%
Cameroon	78	67	64	157	157	231	280	260	312	362		257	289		125.26%		140.86%	
Chad	26	28	30	31	32	33	35	36	38	37	36.5	35	36	36	103.35%	101.62%	106.73%	105.29%
Comoros	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	2	2.7	2	3	3	76.92%	103.18%	85.71%	115.71%
Congo	0	53	0	0	27	14	13	9	7	9	11.4	12	10	11	86.54%	107.89%	75.00%	95.00%
Costa Rica	0	267	216	222	184	159	497	95	204	152	105.9	250	221	202	68.65%	52.39%	60.72%	42.30%
Cote D'Ivoire	0	258	0	204	342	354	384	144	268	166		294	263		63.07%		56.46%	
Croatia	464	337	434	253	314	194	184	280	86	142		219	177		80.14%		64.74%	
Dominica	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	1		2	2		62.50%		60.00%	
Ecuador	604	691	403	261	78	315	269	320	272	153	230.5	301	266	260	57.56%	88.68%	50.77%	76.49%
El Salvador	0	423	645	398	256	330	312	278	195	110	99.1	307	245	221	44.90%	44.91%	35.87%	32.32%

Annex I  
Consumption of CFCs in Article 5 countries by country and level of consumption (ODP tonnes)

COUNTRY	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Baseline	Average 1995-1999	Average 1995-2000	% 1999 consumption relative to average 1995-1999	% 2000 consumption relative to average 1995-2000	% 1999 consumption relative to baseline	% 2000 consumption relative to baseline
Ethiopia	0	0	0	0	0	33	34	35	38	39	39.2	34	36	36	108.94%	107.79%	114.71%	115.29%
Fiji	38	42	8	7	0	60	27	14	13	9		34	25		36.59%		26.73%	
Gabon	0	10	0	13	12	7	11	12	12	8	13.7	10	10	11	80.00%	129.04%	80.00%	137.00%
Gambia	15	11	12	21	23	23	21	28	11	7	6.1	24	18	16	38.89%	38.09%	29.17%	25.42%
Georgia	0	0	0	0	53	13	23	31	26	22		22	23		95.65%		98.51%	
Ghana	107	97	72	24	39	44	14	49	50	47	47.0	36	41	42	115.20%	112.35%	131.78%	131.78%
Guatemala	357	357	357	357	269	231	236	207	189	191		225	211		90.61%		85.01%	
Guinea	28	29	30	30	32	37	44	46	42	40		42	42		95.69%		94.49%	
Guyana	19	17	23	59	42	91	41	28	29	40	24.4	53	46	42	87.34%	57.77%	75.00%	45.75%
Honduras	0	0	0	0	115	118	523	354	157	335	172.3	332	297	277	112.64%	62.30%	101.01%	51.95%
Jamaica	424	350	464	66	49	82	91	107	199	210	59.8	93	138	125	152.39%	47.92%	225.00%	64.07%
Kenya	230	105	47	47	273	301	167	251	245	241		240	241		100.00%		100.56%	
Lao, PDR	0	0	4	0	0	43	43	43	43	43	44.6	43	43	43	100.00%	103.08%	100.00%	103.72%
Lesotho	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	4	3	3	2.4	5	4	4	68.18%	59.02%	56.25%	45.00%
Madagascar	0	0	0	0	0	19	21	104	24	26	13.9	48	39	35	67.01%	40.12%	54.17%	28.96%
Malawi	0	23	46	88	30	62	56	56	57	51		58	56		90.43%		87.93%	
Mali	0	0	0	0	0	104	109	111	113	37	29.2	108	95	84	39.03%	34.82%	34.26%	27.04%
Mauritania	0	0	0	0	17	23	8	16	15	13		16	15		86.67%		82.98%	
Mauritius	0	0	67	64	42	24	36	27	39	19	19.1	29	29	27	65.52%	69.84%	65.52%	65.86%
Moldova	0	0	0	0	0	85	51	83	40	11	31.7	73	54	50	20.37%	63.04%	15.07%	43.42%
Mongolia	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	13	20	21	13.9	11	15	14	143.84%	95.97%	196.88%	130.31%
Mozambique	0	0	0	0	18	20	22	13	3	14		18	14		97.22%		76.36%	
Myanmar	0	0	16	0	2	49	59	55	52	31	26.3	54	49	45	63.01%	57.95%	57.06%	48.40%
Namibia	0	0	0	34	35	27	19	19	14	21	22.1	22	20	20	105.00%	108.60%	96.92%	102.00%
Nepal	0	20	20	20	20	25	27	29	33	25		27	28		89.93%		92.59%	
Nicaragua	87	90	95	100	106	110	83	56	37	53		83	68		78.17%		63.86%	
Niger	16	17	18	18	17	19	18	59	61	58	39.9	32	43	42	134.88%	93.92%	181.25%	124.69%
Oman	0	0	305	244	309	230	265	250	261	260	282.1	248	253	258	102.69%	109.33%	104.70%	113.60%
Paraguay	0	0	240	191	221	211	127	102	113	345	153.5	147	180	175	192.09%	87.59%	235.23%	104.66%
Peru	801	541	243	279	249	367	243	259	327	296		290	298		99.20%		102.19%	
Qatar	0	0	0	0	0	91	102	111	121	89	85.8	101	103	100	86.58%	85.83%	87.83%	84.67%
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0	0	6	5	5	4	3	4	2	3		4	3		93.75%		81.82%	
Saint Lucia	0	0	0	11	8	8	8	8	6	3		8	7		45.45%		37.50%	
Samoa	0	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	5		5	4		113.64%		107.14%	
Senegal	97	100	102	156	118	151	178	138	128	121	116.5	156	143	139	84.50%	83.96%	77.73%	74.84%
Seychelles	3	4	5	10	4	4	2	2	2	1	0.8	3	2	2	45.45%	40.68%	37.50%	30.00%
Swaziland	0	0	0	83	83	35	22	16	2	2	0.1	24	15	13	12.99%	0.78%	8.22%	0.41%
Tanzania	0	0	0	185	263	280	294	188	132	89		254	197		45.27%		35.04%	
Togo	41	43	45	46	48	50	34	35	37	42	37.5	40	40	39	106.06%	95.54%	105.88%	94.54%
Trinidad and Tobago	138	116	104	97	109	111	114	135	156	82		120	120		68.56%		68.33%	
Uganda	14	15	15	16	9	12	13	14	11	12		13	12		96.77%		92.31%	
Uruguay	0	416	305	223	312	232	172	193	194	111	106.8	199	180	168	61.53%	63.52%	55.78%	53.67%
Zambia	35	22	24	25	38	23	30	29	27	24	23.3	27	27	26	90.23%	89.44%	87.80%	85.24%
<b>TOTAL CONSUMPTION BY LVCC</b>	<b>4,300</b>	<b>5,218</b>	<b>5,231</b>	<b>4,847</b>	<b>4,821</b>	<b>5,661</b>	<b>5,971</b>	<b>5,328</b>	<b>5,048</b>	<b>4,721</b>	<b>2,161</b>	<b>5,653</b>	<b>5,346</b>	<b>4,815</b>	<b>88.31%</b>	<b>75.14%</b>	<b>83.50%</b>	<b>67.71%</b>
<b>TOTAL CONSUMPTION</b>	<b>102,642</b>	<b>115,306</b>	<b>132,926</b>	<b>146,802</b>	<b>159,698</b>	<b>166,628</b>	<b>136,353</b>	<b>135,965</b>	<b>129,212</b>	<b>110,751</b>	<b>41,163</b>	<b>146,315</b>	<b>135,782</b>	<b>120,012</b>	<b>81.57%</b>	<b>80.27%</b>	<b>75.69%</b>	<b>70.96%</b>

## Annex II

## First Approach: Montreal Protocol baseline as the Starting Point

Country	Montreal Protocol Compliance Baseline (ODP tonnes)	CFC approved but not implemented by 31 December 1997 (ODP tonnes)	Montreal Protocol Baseline Adjusted (ODP tonnes)	CFC Approved for Phaseout 1998-2001 (ODP tonnes)	CFC Consumption Unfunded as of July 2001 (ODP tonnes)	% CFC Consumption unfunded (July 01) relative to MP baseline
	(1)	(2)	(3) = (1) - (2)	(4)	(5) = (3) - (4)	
<b>NLVCC</b>						
Algeria	2,119.5	483.1	1,636.4	583.8	1,052.6	49.66%
Argentina	4,697.2	1,538.9	3,158.3	594.0	2,564.3	54.59%
Bangladesh	580.4	123.6	456.8	12.6	444.2	76.53%
Brazil	10,525.8	2,894.0	7,631.8	3,361.6	4,270.2	40.57%
Chile	828.7		828.7		828.7	100.00%
China	57,818.7	15,720.7	42,098.0	13,005.2	29,092.8	50.32%
Colombia	2,208.2	509.8	1,698.4	241.5	1,456.9	65.98%
Cuba	625.1	3.2	621.9	36.2	585.7	93.70%
Dominican Republic	539.8	31.8	508.0	157.2	350.8	64.99%
Egypt	1,668.0	886.1	781.9	100.0	681.9	40.88%
India	6,681.0	2,860.8	3,820.2	2,730.7	1,089.5	16.31%
Indonesia	8,332.7	3,576.6	4,756.1	804.7	3,951.4	47.42%
Iran	4,571.7	1,281.8	3,290.0	1,432.0	1,858.0	40.64%
Jordan	673.3	619.0	54.3	327.2	-272.9	-40.53%
Korea DPR	441.7	150.0	291.7		291.7	66.04%
Lebanon	725.5	418.4	307.1	247.2	59.9	8.25%
Macedonia	519.7	384.0	135.7	38.5	97.2	18.70%
Malaysia	3,271.1	1,056.0	2,215.1	470.7	1,744.4	53.33%
Mexico	4,624.9	940.6	3,684.3	247.8	3,436.5	74.31%
Morocco	802.3	546.5	255.8	206.0	49.8	6.21%
Nigeria	3,650.0	654.3	2,995.7	1,197.6	1,798.1	49.26%
Pakistan	1,679.4	936.2	743.2	256.1	487.1	29.01%
Panama	384.2	85.0	299.2		299.2	77.88%
Philippines	3,055.9	496.8	2,559.1	31.7	2,527.4	82.71%
Romania	675.8	813.3	-137.5	182.4	-319.9	-47.34%
Sri Lanka	400.4	47.3	353.1	5.0	348.1	86.93%
Sudan	456.8	2.5	454.3	95.1	359.2	78.64%
Syria	2,224.6	1,050.1	1,174.5	894.0	280.5	12.61%
Thailand	6,082.1	1,717.2	4,364.9	968.4	3,396.5	55.84%
Tunisia	870.1	484.4	385.7	275.2	110.5	12.70%
Turkey	3,805.7	763.2	3,042.5	1,103.2	1,939.3	50.96%
Venezuela	3,321.6	428.5	2,893.1	374.9	2,518.2	75.81%
Vietnam	500.0	220.2	279.8	37.7	242.1	48.43%
Yugoslavia	849.2		849.2	209.1	640.1	75.38%
Zimbabwe	451.4	21.2	430.2		430.2	95.29%
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>140,662.5</b>	<b>41,745.1</b>	<b>98,917.4</b>	<b>30,227.3</b>	<b>68,690.1</b>	<b>48.83%</b>
<b>LVCC</b>						
Antigua and Barbuda	10.7		10.7	1.0	9.7	90.65%
Bahamas	64.9	12.6	52.3		52.3	80.52%
Bahrain	135.4	20.5	114.9	17.0	97.9	72.30%
Barbados	21.5		21.5		21.5	100.00%
Belize	16.0		16.0	1.7	14.3	89.38%
Benin	59.9	12.9	47.0	27.3	19.7	32.90%
Bolivia	75.7	13.8	61.9	5.0	56.9	75.12%
Botswana	6.8		6.8	1.5	5.3	77.94%
Brunei Darussaleem	78.2		78.2		78.2	100.00%
Burkina Faso	36.3	15.5	20.8	3.0	17.8	49.09%
Burundi	59.0		59.0	5.4	53.6	90.85%
Cameroon	256.9	365.1	-108.2		-108.2	-42.12%
Chad	34.6		34.6	8.8	25.8	74.57%
Comoros	2.5		2.5		2.5	100.00%

## Annex II

First Approach: Montreal Protocol baseline as the Starting Point

Country	Montreal Protocol Compliance Baseline (ODP tonnes)	CFC approved but not implemented by 31 December 1997 (ODP tonnes)	Montreal Protocol Baseline Adjusted (ODP tonnes)	CFC Approved for Phaseout 1998-2001 (ODP tonnes)	CFC Consumption Unfunded as of July 2001 (ODP tonnes)	% CFC Consumption unfunded (July 01) relative to MP baseline
	(1)	(2)	(3) = (1) - (2)	(4)	(5) = (3) - (4)	
Congo	11.9	19.2	-7.3		-7.3	-61.34%
Costa Rica	250.2	74.1	176.1	23.2	152.9	61.11%
Cote D'Ivoire	294.2	86.8	207.4	24.8	182.6	62.07%
Croatia	219.3	35.6	183.7	15.0	168.7	76.93%
Dominica	1.5		1.5		1.5	100.00%
Ecuador	301.4		301.4	76.1	225.3	74.75%
El Salvador	306.6	22.4	284.2	36.3	247.9	80.85%
Ethiopia	33.8		33.8		33.8	100.00%
Fiji	33.4		33.4	5.2	28.2	84.43%
Gabon	10.3		10.3	12.2	-1.9	-18.45%
Gambia	23.8	18.8	5.1		5.1	21.22%
Georgia	22.5	3.7	18.8		18.8	83.56%
Ghana	35.6	316.0	-280.4	15.7	-296.1	-831.74%
Guatemala	224.6	130.9	93.7		93.7	41.72%
Guinea	42.4	12.90	29.50		29.5	69.58%
Guyana	53.2	13.7	39.5		39.5	74.25%
Honduras	331.6		331.6	14.2	317.4	95.72%
Jamaica	93.2	91.2	2.0		2.0	2.15%
Kenya	239.5	40.8	198.7	8.5	190.2	79.42%
Lao, PDR	44.6		44.6		44.6	100.00%
Lesotho	5.1	3.6	1.5		1.5	29.80%
Madagascar	47.9		47.9	12.0	35.9	74.95%
Malawi	57.7		57.7	33.0	24.7	42.81%
Mali	108.1		108.1	25.8	82.3	76.13%
Mauritania	15.7	2.0	13.7		13.7	87.26%
Mauritius	29.1		29.1	24.0	5.1	17.53%
Moldova	73.3		73.3	21.9	51.4	70.12%
Mongolia	10.6		10.6		10.6	100.00%
Mozambique	18.2	6.9	11.3		11.3	61.98%
Myanmar	54.3		54.3		54.3	100.00%
Namibia	21.9	5.4	16.5		16.5	75.34%
Nepal	27.0		27.0	6.0	21.0	77.78%
Nicaragua	82.8		82.8	22.4	60.4	72.95%
Niger	32.0		32.0	5.8	26.2	81.88%
Oman	248.4		248.4	13.0	235.4	94.77%
Paraguay	146.9	55.5	91.4	32.1	59.3	40.37%
Peru	289.5	262.7	26.8		26.8	9.24%
Qatar	101.4		101.4	13.0	88.4	87.18%
Saint Kitts and Nevis	3.7		3.7	2.0	1.7	45.95%
Saint Lucia	8.3	3.0	5.3		5.3	63.86%
Samoa	4.5		4.5		4.5	100.00%
Senegal	155.8	36.1	119.7	5.0	114.7	73.61%
Seychelles	2.8		2.8		2.8	100.00%
Swaziland	24.6		24.6	4.0	20.6	83.74%
Tanzania	253.9	53.7	200.2	106.5	93.7	36.91%
Togo	39.8		39.8		39.8	100.00%
Trinidad and Tobago	120.0	28.5	91.5	18.0	73.5	61.26%
Uganda	12.8		12.8		12.8	100.00%
Uruguay	199.1	51.3	147.8	10.3	137.5	69.06%
Zambia	27.4		27.4		27.4	100.00%
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>5,654.6</b>	<b>1,815.2</b>	<b>3,839.4</b>	<b>656.7</b>	<b>3,182.7</b>	<b>56.28%</b>
<b>Grand-Total</b>	<b>146,317.1</b>	<b>43,560.3</b>	<b>102,756.8</b>	<b>30,884.0</b>	<b>71,872.8</b>	<b>49.12%</b>

Annex III  
Second Approach: Very recent consumption as the Starting Point

Country	Latest consumption (ODP tonnes)	CFC approved but not implemented as of 31 December 1999/2000 (ODP tonnes)	CFC Consumption unfunded as of 31 December 1999/2000 (ODP tonnes)	CFC Approved for Phaseout 2000/2001 (ODP tonnes)	CFC Consumption Unfunded as of July 2001 (ODP tonnes)	% of CFC Unfunded consumption (July '01) relative to latest consumption
	(1)	(2)	(3) = (1) - (2)	(4)	(5) = (3) - (4)	
<b>NLVCC</b>						
Algeria**	1,474.6	618.4	856.2		856.2	58.06%
Argentina**	2,396.7	1,204.7	1,192.0	73.8	1,118.2	46.66%
Bangladesh*	800.6	136.2	664.4		664.4	82.99%
Brazil**	9,275.1	2,074.9	7,200.2	971.3	6,228.9	67.16%
Chile*	657.5		657.5		657.5	100.00%
China*	42,983.4	13,202.0	29,781.4	3,291.3	26,490.1	61.63%
Colombia**	1,149.3	348.7	800.6		800.6	69.66%
Cuba**	533.6	8.0	525.6	28.2	497.4	93.22%
Dominican Republic**	398.8	102.1	296.7		296.7	74.40%
Egypt**	1,267.0	482.4	784.6		784.6	61.93%
India*	4,142.9	2,993.1	1,149.8	1,177.5	-27.7	-0.67%
Indonesia*	5,865.8	3,286.5	2,579.3	72.7	2,506.6	42.73%
Iran**	4,156.5	1,083.5	3,073.0	561.5	2,511.5	60.42%
Jordan**	354.0	349.3	4.7	76.8	-72.1	-20.37%
Korea DPR*	106.0		106.0		106.0	100.00%
Lebanon**	527.9	271.8	256.1	18.8	237.3	44.95%
Macedonia**	49.5	38.5	11.0		11.0	22.22%
Malaysia**	1,979.8	524.3	1,455.5	8.1	1,447.4	73.11%
Mexico**	3,059.5	306.9	2,752.6		2,752.6	89.97%
Morocco**	564.0	660.1	-96.1		-96.1	-17.04%
Nigeria*	4,286.2	929.2	3,357.0	473.7	2,883.3	67.27%
Pakistan*	1,421.8	1,137.3	284.5	33.6	250.9	17.65%
Panama**	249.9	42.0	207.9		207.9	83.19%
Philippines**	2,905.2	50.6	2,854.6		2,854.6	98.26%
Romania*	338.2	192.4	145.8		145.8	43.11%
Sri Lanka**	221.1	10.0	211.1		211.1	95.48%
Sudan**	291.5	97.6	194.0		194.0	66.54%
Syria**	1,174.6	638.1	536.5	51.3	485.2	41.31%
Thailand**	3,568.3	642.5	2,925.8		2,925.8	81.99%
Tunisia**	555.0	377.2	177.8		177.8	32.04%
Turkey*	1,791.1	718.1	1,073.0	267.0	806.0	45.00%
Venezuela**	2,705.50	406.80	2,298.70	62.80	2,235.90	82.64%
Vietnam*	293.9	116.8	177.1	34.1	143.0	48.66%
Yugoslavia*	548.6		548.6	154.5	394.1	71.84%
Zimbabwe**	145.0	5.0	140.0		140.0	96.54%
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>102,238.4</b>	<b>33,055.0</b>	<b>69,183.4</b>	<b>7,357.0</b>	<b>61,826.4</b>	<b>60.47%</b>
<b>LVCC</b>						
Antigua and Barbuda**	5.0	1.0	4.0		4.0	80.00%
Bahamas**	65.9		65.9		65.9	100.00%
Bahrain*	129.0	17.0	112.0		112.0	86.82%
Barbados*	16.5		16.5		16.5	100.00%
Belize**	8.8	1.7	7.1		7.1	80.68%
Benin**	54.6	27.3	27.3		27.3	50.00%
Bolivia*	72.2	18.8	53.4		53.4	73.96%
Botswana**	2.5	1.5	1.0		1.0	40.00%
Brunei Darussalam**	46.6		46.6		46.6	100.00%
Burkina Faso*	25.4	3.0	22.4		22.4	88.19%
Burundi**	53.8	5.4	48.4		48.4	89.96%
Cameroon*	361.5	250.0	111.5		111.5	30.84%
Chad**	36.5	8.8	27.7		27.7	75.89%
Comoros**	2.7		2.7		2.7	100.00%
Congo**	11.40	19.20	-7.80		-7.80	-68.42%
Costa Rica**	105.9	23.2	82.7		82.7	78.09%
Cote D'Ivoire*	166.2	24.8	141.4		141.4	85.08%

\* 1999 consumption

\*\* 2000 consumption



Annex III  
Second Approach: Very recent consumption as the Starting Point

Country	Latest consumption (ODP tonnes)	CFC approved but not implemented as of 31 December 1999/2000 (ODP tonnes)	CFC Consumption unfunded as of 31 December 1999/2000 (ODP tonnes)	CFC Approved for Phaseout 2000/2001 (ODP tonnes)	CFC Consumption Unfunded as of July 2001 (ODP tonnes)	% of CFC Unfunded consumption (July '01) relative to latest consumption
	(1)	(2)	(3) = (1) - (2)	(4)	(5) = (3) - (4)	
Croatia*	141.5	25.6	115.9		115.9	81.91%
Dominica*	1.1		1.1		1.1	100.00%
Ecuador**	230.5	76.1	154.4		154.4	66.98%
El Salvador**	99.1	36.3	62.8		62.8	63.37%
Ethiopia**	39.2		39.2		39.2	100.00%
Fiji*	9.4	5.2	4.2		4.2	44.68%
Gabon**	13.7	12.2	1.5		1.5	10.95%
Gambia**	6.1		6.1		6.1	100.00%
Georgia*	21.5	3.7	17.8		17.8	82.79%
Ghana**	47.0	15.7	31.3		31.3	66.60%
Guatemala*	191.1	0.0	191.1		191.1	100.00%
Guinea*	39.9		39.9		39.9	100.00%
Guyana**	24.4	13.7	10.7		10.7	43.85%
Honduras**	172.3	14.2	158.1		158.1	91.76%
Jamaica**	59.8		59.8		59.8	100.00%
Kenya*	241.1	8.5	232.6		232.6	96.47%
Lao, PDR**	44.6		44.6		44.6	100.00%
Lesotho**	2.4		2.4		2.4	100.00%
Madagascar**	13.9	12.0	1.9		1.9	13.67%
Malawi*	50.9	33.0	17.9		17.9	35.17%
Mali**	29.2	25.8	3.4		3.4	11.64%
Mauritania*	13.4	2.0	11.4		11.4	85.07%
Mauritius**	19.1	8.0	11.1		11.1	58.12%
Moldova**	31.7	21.9	9.8		9.8	30.91%
Mongolia**	13.9		13.9		13.9	100.00%
Mozambique*	13.8		13.8		13.8	100.00%
Myanmar**	26.3		26.3		26.3	100.00%
Namibia**	22.1	5.4	16.7		16.7	75.57%
Nepal*	25.0	6.0	19.0		19.0	76.00%
Nicaragua*	52.6	12.8	39.8		39.8	75.67%
Niger**	39.9	5.8	34.1		34.1	85.46%
Oman**	282.1		282.1	13.0	269.1	95.39%
Paraguay**	153.5	23.0	130.5	9.1	121.4	79.09%
Peru*	295.6	34.6	261.0		261.0	88.29%
Qatar**	85.8		85.8	13.0	72.8	84.85%
Saint Kitts and Nevis*	2.6	2.0	0.6		0.6	23.08%
Saint Lucia*	3.2	3.0	0.2		0.2	6.25%
Samoa*	4.8		4.8		4.8	100.00%
Senegal**	116.5		116.5	5.0	111.5	95.71%
Seychelles**	0.8		0.8		0.8	100.00%
Swaziland**	0.1	4.0	-3.9		-3.9	-3900.00%
Tanzania*	88.9	120.7	-31.8	39.5	-71.3	-80.20%
Togo**	37.5		37.5		37.5	100.00%
Trinidad and Tobago*	81.7	46.5	35.2		35.2	43.08%
Uganda*	12.2		12.2		12.2	100.00%
Uruguay**	106.8	11.3	95.5	6.0	89.5	83.80%
Zambia**	23.3		23.3		23.3	100.00%
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>4,196.4</b>	<b>990.7</b>	<b>3,205.7</b>	<b>85.6</b>	<b>3,120.1</b>	<b>74.35%</b>
<b>GRAND-TOTAL</b>	<b>106,434.8</b>	<b>34,045.7</b>	<b>72,389.1</b>	<b>7,442.6</b>	<b>64,946.5</b>	<b>61.02%</b>

\* 1999 consumption

\*\* 2000 consumption

## Annex IV

Remaining unfunded consumption: Comparison of applying the two approaches

Country	Remaining unfunded consumption	
	Montreal Protocol baseline	Very recent consumption
	<b>NLVCC</b>	
Algeria**	1,052.6	856.2
Argentina**	2,564.3	1,118.2
Bangladesh*	444.2	664.4
Brazil**	4,270.2	6,228.9
Chile*	828.7	657.5
China*	29,092.8	26,490.1
Colombia**	1,456.9	800.6
Cuba**	585.7	497.4
Dominican Republic**	350.8	296.7
Egypt**	681.9	784.6
India*	1,089.5	-27.7
Indonesia*	3,951.4	2,506.6
Iran**	1,858.0	2,511.5
Jordan**	-	-72.1
Korea DPR*	291.7	106.0
Lebanon**	59.9	237.3
Macedonia**	97.2	11.0
Malaysia**	1,744.4	1,447.4
Mexico**	3,436.5	2,752.6
Morocco**	49.8	-96.1
Nigeria*	1,798.1	2,883.3
Pakistan*	487.1	250.9
Panama**	299.2	207.9
Philippines**	2,527.4	2,854.6
Romania*	-	145.8
Sri Lanka**	348.1	211.1
Sudan**	359.2	194.0
Syria**	280.5	485.2
Thailand**	3,396.5	2,925.8
Tunisia**	110.5	177.8
Turkey*	1,939.3	806.0
Venezuela**	2,518.2	2,235.9
Vietnam*	242.1	143.0
Yugoslavia*	640.1	394.1
Zimbabwe**	430.2	140.0
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>68,690.1</b>	<b>61,826.4</b>
	<b>LVCC</b>	
Antigua and Barbuda**	9.7	4.0
Bahamas**	52.3	65.9
Bahrain*	97.9	112.0
Barbados*	21.5	16.5
Belize**	14.3	7.1
Benin**	19.7	27.3
Bolivia*	56.9	53.4
Botswana**	5.3	1.0
Brunei Darussaleam**	78.2	46.6
Burkina Faso*	17.8	22.4
Burundi**	53.6	48.4
Cameroon*	-108.2	111.5
Chad**	25.8	27.7
Comoros**	2.5	2.7
Congo**	-7.3	-7.8
Costa Rica**	152.9	82.7
Cote D'Ivoire*	182.6	141.4

\* 1999 consumption

\*\* 2000 consumption

## Annex IV

Remaining unfunded consumption: Comparison of applying the two approaches

Country	Remaining unfunded consumption	
	Montreal Protocol baseline	Very recent consumption
Croatia*	168.7	115.9
Dominica*	1.5	1.1
Ecuador**	225.3	154.4
El Salvador**	247.9	62.8
Ethiopia**	33.8	39.2
Fiji*	28.2	4.2
Gabon**	-1.9	1.5
Gambia**	5.1	6.1
Georgia*	18.8	17.8
Ghana**	-296.1	31.3
Guatemala*	93.7	191.1
Guinea*	29.5	39.9
Guyana**	39.5	10.7
Honduras**	317.4	158.1
Jamaica**	2.0	59.8
Kenya*	190.2	232.6
Lao, PDR**	44.6	44.6
Lesotho**	1.5	2.4
Madagascar**	35.9	1.9
Malawi*	24.7	17.9
Mali**	82.3	3.4
Mauritania*	13.7	11.4
Mauritius**	5.1	11.1
Moldova**	51.4	9.8
Mongolia**	10.6	13.9
Mozambique*	11.3	13.8
Myanmar**	54.3	26.3
Namibia**	16.5	16.7
Nepal*	21.0	19.0
Nicaragua*	60.4	39.8
Niger**	26.2	34.1
Oman**	235.4	269.1
Paraguay**	59.3	121.4
Peru*	26.8	261.0
Qatar**	88.4	72.8
Saint Kitts and Nevis*	1.7	0.6
Saint Lucia*	5.3	0.2
Samoa*	4.5	4.8
Senegal**	114.7	111.5
Seychelles**	2.8	0.8
Swaziland**	20.6	-3.9
Tanzania*	93.7	-71.3
Togo**	39.8	37.5
Trinidad and Tobago*	73.5	35.2
Uganda*	12.8	12.2
Uruguay**	137.5	89.5
Zambia**	27.4	23.3
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>3,182.7</b>	<b>3,120.1</b>
<b>GRAND-TOTAL</b>	<b>71,872.8</b>	<b>64,946.5</b>

\* 1999 consumption

\*\* 2000 consumption