



联合国



环境规划署

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/53/60
26 October 2007

CHINESE
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

执行蒙特利尔议定书
多边基金执行委员会
第五十三次会议
2007年11月26日至30日，蒙特利尔

评估和确定氟氯烃消费和生产淘汰活动中符合资格的增支
费用的备选办法（根据第 52/4 号决定采取的行动）

（讨论文件）

执行蒙特利尔议定书多边基金执行委员会的会前文件不妨碍文件印发后执行委员会可能作出的任何决定。
为节省经费起见，本文件印数有限。请各代表携带文件到会，不索取更多副本。

一、导言

1. 本文件是由基金秘书处为回答第 52/4 号决定而编制的，根据此决定，执行委员会决定“请秘书处编制关于评估和确定氟氯烃消费和生产淘汰活动的符合资格的增支费用的备选办法的文件，供执行委员会第五十三次会议讨论”。这是执行委员会首次尝试探讨淘汰氟氯烃活动增支费用问题。秘书处理解执行委员会的任务就是对该问题进行初步分析，以明确和确定对氟氯烃消费和生产淘汰活动的增支费用产生影响的问题。

2. 缔约方第十九次会议的决定，尤其是调整《蒙特利尔议定书》关于氟氯烃控制时间表的第 XIX/6 号决定，以及关于 2009-2011 年多边基金补充基金的职权范围研究的第 XIX/10 号决定，为执行委员会提供了解决氟氯烃淘汰活动供资的具体指导。与这些决定有关的需要包括：

- (a) 实现并坚持遵守除氟氯烃以外的其他消耗臭氧层物质控制时间表；
- (b) 对与 1995 年后各类设施和第二次转换有关的资格标准做出必要的修改；
- (c) 对第 5 条缔约方中氟氯烃消费量较低和极低的国家给予特别关注；
- (d) 编制加快氟氯烃淘汰活动的国家淘汰管理计划，并协助进行调查，改善基准数据建立过程中的可靠性；
- (e) 对关注下列方面的成本效益项目确立优先地位：
 - (一) 根据各国具体情况，淘汰消耗臭氧层潜力较大的第一批氟氯烃；
 - (二) 考虑到全球变暖的可能性、能源使用和其他相关因素，使用替代品和替代技术，尽量减少对包括气候在内的环境造成的影响；
 - (三) 特别关注中小企业；以及

3. 该决定还呼吁缔约方按照多边基金的各项方案，采取一切实际措施，确保市场中最好的和对环境无害的替代品，以及相关技术能够以公平和最惠条件从第 2 条缔约方转让给第 5 条缔约方。

4. 除了需要考虑除臭氧层保护外的各类环境的影响外，尤其是对气候的影响和能源的使用，所有这些要点都被列入现有的除氟氯烃外其他消耗臭氧层物质供资的指导方针。执行委员会面临的挑战是，怎样将这些新的要求纳入资助淘汰氟氯烃的活动，换言之，氟氯烃淘汰活动的具体内容会对供资指导方针产生怎样的影响。这一切也决定了最初分析的目的，就是确定和定义氟氯烃淘汰活动的具体内容，尤其是那些影响淘汰活动增支费用的内容。只要可能，执行委员会就会提出明确的决策建议。但是，鉴于所涉及的问题的巨大范围，执行委员会可能要召开多次会议才能解决部分问题。因此，本文阐述了各种问题，拟定应当进一步研究的范围，并针对基金秘书处向执行委员会汇报进度的时间表中应采取进一步

行动提出了建议。

二.1 评估多边基金氟氯烃淘汰活动供资的法律上的前提

5. 为了获得多边基金对淘汰消耗臭氧层物质的援助，批准《蒙特利尔议定书》及其《修正案》是必不可少的。但是，为了激励非签署国批准《议定书》和《修正》，已经向它们提供了有限的资金，帮助其以制定国家方案和推进能力建设。因此，有些国家没有批准造就多边基金的《伦敦修正》的情况下，多年来一直从多边基金获得投资和非投资性的供资。

6. 在《蒙特利尔议定书》执行十余年后，大多数第 5 条缔约方都非常熟悉《蒙特利尔议定书》和多边基金的程序，并针对《蒙特利尔议定书》制定了较为完善的国家法律框架。虽然仍需要激励性的政策，但也应当为其设定明确的截止日期标准。

政策建议

* 《哥本哈根修正》：批准或加入《哥本哈根修正案》是第 5 条缔约方从多边基金获得淘汰氟氯烃消费活动供资的先决条件。

* 《北京修正》：批准或加入《北京修正案》是第 5 条缔约方从多边基金获得淘汰氟氯烃生产活动供资的先决条件。

7. 对非签署国来说，执行委员会可能会考虑提供资金，用于进行氟氢烃调查，编制加快淘汰氟氯烃管理计划，但这些非签署国的政府应承诺在今后 12 个月内批准必要的《修正案》。在承诺履行之前，不会进一步提供资金。

二.2 多边基金有关除氟氯烃外消耗臭氧层物质淘汰活动供资的现行政策和指导方针继续适用

8. 自从多边基金于 1991 年建立以来，执行委员会已履行其“为项目资格制定标准和为基金支助的各项活动的执行制定指导方针”的职能，这一点在缔约方第四次会议通过的职权范围中已经阐明。因此，执行委员会始终以缔约方第四次会议上核准的“增支费用类别指示性清单”（第 IV/19 号决定）作为最终政策指导。16 年来，执行委员会已制定了涵盖《蒙特利尔议定书》控制的除氟氯烃外的所有物质淘汰活动的资助标准和指导方针。这是一个长期的过程，要处理运作中出现的各种政策问题，并在各种物质被引入《蒙特利尔议定书》管辖下的受控物质清单时接受各种物质。最近接受受控物质扩大清单的例子是自 1997 年以来正在执行的各种倡议，旨在制定淘汰甲基溴的指导方针。目前，制定有关淘汰氟氯烃活动的供资标准和指导方针的努力应当被视为执行委员会制定由多边基金支助的活动的业务政策和指导方针的新一轮行动。

9. 这种理解是重要的，因为它确保多边基金大部分现有的整套标准和指导方针能够一直

* 根据现行《蒙特利尔议定书》关于氟氯烃化合物的控制时间表。

有效，并适用于氟氯烃的淘汰，而且没有必要重新讨论或确认这些政策。例如，目前关于执行委员会在第十五次会议上通过的处理向非第 5 条国家出口问题的政策（UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/15/45 号文件第 146 段和第 147 段决定的副本附于附件一中），以及有关跨国公司的政策（UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/30 号文件第 88 段的决定的副本附于附件一中）应当继续适用于氟氯烃淘汰活动供资中的类似问题。

政策建议

10. 除非另有规定，多边基金现在除氟氯烃外消耗臭氧层物质淘汰活动供资方面的现行政策和指导方针将适用于资助氟氯烃的淘汰活动。

二.3 加快氟氯烃淘汰管理计划和氟氯烃调查

11. 加快氟氯烃淘汰管理计划对第 5 条缔约方拟订其遵守缔约方第十九次会议商定的氟氯烃淘汰时间表的行动方针至关重要。多边基金已经资助了两项类似的行动：国家方案拟订行动和行业/国家氟氯化碳/消耗臭氧层物质淘汰计划，并对每一行动制定了指导方针（在执行委员会第三次会议上就国家方案指导方针做出的决定和就编制执行和管理国家消耗臭氧层物质淘汰计划的第 38/65 号决定）。国家调查一直是每一行动不可分割的一部分，并为计划拟订行动提供了事实依据。

12. 对大多数国家来说，国家方案拟订行动在资助氟氯化碳淘汰活动的早期阶段并在确定氟氯化碳基准之前进行。这种方法有助于各国就国家淘汰行动计划达成全国共识。但是，因为这是在很多替代技术仍在不断发展，氟氯化碳的消费和生产数据往往在缺乏基准数据时通过推断得出，所以，随着对技术选择和转换费用的日益了解，在执行过程中对数据的修改和更新就很必要。执行委员会对国家方案的核准一直采用的方法是，赞同各国在淘汰有关消耗臭氧层物质的国家战略上做出承诺，而不是将眼光局限于个别项目或这些方案拟议的供资水平。

13. 与国家方案相比，从 2001 年以后核准的国家/行业淘汰计划，氟氯化碳和其他消耗臭氧层物质的基准已经确定，大多数消耗臭氧层物质的替代技术已经具备，其费用已经明确。这一切为推行基于绩效的供资打下了基础，针对采取年度线性削减措施的每个国家的最高可资助消费上限的承诺与多边基金原则上同意的供资承诺相一致。

14. 关于时间安排，氟氯烃淘汰的计划拟订类似于该国的方案拟订行动，因为它将在淘汰方案的开始而且很可能在确定基准之前进行。从替代技术的发展状况来判断，无论从替代品的可用性和其费用的了解上，氟氯烃的淘汰都可能遇到类似的不确定性。无论是国家还是多边基金的具有约束力的承诺，只要是以基于绩效的国家淘汰计划的形式，都可能是不成熟的，尤其是有依赖氟氯烃制造行业的大中型消费国。淘汰战略的其中一个可能性就是分阶段实施，接纳替代技术更发达和提供新技术的行业。这应该属于方案拟订行动的总体考虑。

15. 但是，具有约束力的国家淘汰计划的可能性不应当被排除。如果一个国家目前只有少

量的氟氯烃用于维修业，该国可能考虑做出承诺，大大早于已调整的氟氯烃淘汰时间表，并利用正在进行的有关氟氯化碳淘汰活动的结束性淘汰管理计划的势头。

16. 与国家方案相关的其中一个担忧是，在没有对消费上限做出承诺时，可能存在不只一次资助相同水平的消费量的风险。部分原因是因为从 1991 年多边基金成立活动至 1995-1997 年氟氯化碳基准建立之间的时间较长，另外一部分原因是因为没有从国家总体消费水平中扣除单独供资的项目的淘汰量。对氟氯烃来说，现在至基准年 2009 年和 2010 年的期限少于三年，这一点应该会减少相同消费量双重供资的风险。此外，如果供资方式，即单独项目的供资和行业计划，能得到适当的方法支助，以考虑已淘汰量，也会有助于减少这一风险。这有助于在国家淘汰计划水平上保持基于业绩供资的优势。

17. 由于国家氟氯烃淘汰管理计划是一项战略性规划行动，需要在资助活动开始之前进行，所以国家氟氯烃调查是整体计划的一部分，尽快落实非常重要。利用现有的国家方案指导方针和编制行业/国家淘汰计划的指导方针将是一个很好的起点，可对这些指导方针进行修订使之符合氟氯烃淘汰的具体需要。

采取进一步行动的建议

18. 秘书处应当与执行机构一起审查国家方案和行业计划的现行指导方针（在执行委员会第三次会议上采取的决定和第 38/65 号决定），并向就编制氟氯烃淘汰管理计划向第五十四次会议提出指导方针草案建议，须考虑可能性如下：

- (a) 将氟氯烃调查纳入编制氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的程序；
- (b) 在确定基准之前确定国家氟氯烃消费/生产的上限；
- (c) 制定氟氯烃国家淘汰管理计划执行的时间框架和方式，包括执行阶段的可能性、个别项目的用途，行业计划和根据国家具体情况，按国家总体水平核算氟氯烃淘汰量的方法。

二.4 资助的优先地位和成本效益阈值

19. 多边基金一直根据环境影响和成本效益的双重考虑方法确定资助的优先地位，后者以估计的每公斤消耗臭氧潜能值单位费用来表示（美元/公斤/ODP）。在实施这一标准的过程中，对低消费量国家和中小型企业的特别需求给予了应有的关注，本文稍后将对此进行讨论。

20. 继续遵守这一标准可以满足优先地位的确定标准，对重视成本效益项目和缔约方第十九次会议第 XIX/6 号决定所载的较高的消耗臭氧潜能值的项给予优先地位。但是，现行标准不包括该决定要求的侧重于“考虑到全球变暖的可能性、能源使用和其他相关因素，能够尽量减少对环境，包括对气候的其他影响的替代品”。

21. 假定具备替代技术，并且消耗臭氧潜能值相等，为了获得更大的气候利益，可优先考

考虑全球变暖潜能值低的替代品。如果必须考虑能源使用因素，将需要根据环境考虑建立优先地位的顺序。例如，首先是消耗臭氧潜能值，然后是全球变暖潜能值，最后是能源使用。关于能源效率的考虑，需考虑它是否是依据技术的理论值，或是此类技术安装和实施后的实际影响。

22. 尽管这只是环境影响，根据费用确定的替代品排序可能会改变选择的顺序，因为大多数对环境无害的替代品不可能是费用最低的。因此，环境影响和成本效益之间的平衡可能值得进一步的考虑。

23. 目前的成本效益阈值是在行业基础上制定的，UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/16/20 号文件(随附)的第 32 段对其进行了总结。它们是根据受资助的项目的经验制定的费用标准。与氟氯化碳相比，氟氯烃消费的行业数量可能更少，因为它主要集中在泡沫塑料和制冷两大行业。生产传统上被视为另一个行业。

24. 在资助氟氯烃淘汰活动中，如果成本效益阈值仍是反映人们关注成本效益和环境影响，包括气候和能源使用的适当方式，那就迫切需要根据现有数值制定新的成本效益阈值，可从下列观念着手：

- (a) 在环境对臭氧层保护、气候、能源使用的影响和其他因素之间排列优先次序，包括在计量单位方面使用 ODP 吨取代公吨；
- (b) 费用与环境影响之间的平衡；
- (c) 将概念转化为可执行的建议；
- (d) 依据现有替代品，检查和制定泡沫塑料和制冷行业的增支费用范围；以及
- (e) 提出资助方式，如单独项目、集体项目、行业计划和国家淘汰计划。

采取进一步行动的建议

25. 秘书处应当召集有关泡沫塑料、制冷和其他相关领域的专家小组，依据现有数据，研究制定资助氟氯烃淘汰活动的新的成本效益阈值的方法。这应当包括确定概念和提出上文第 23 段所列问题的行动建议。

二.5 低消费量国家和中小型企业

26. 根据现行分类，低消费量国家是氟氯化碳消费基准低于 360 ODP 吨的国家。根据该定义，低消费量国家的数量是 102 个，而第 5 条国家的总数量为 144 个。很低消费量国家没有明确的定义。给予低消费量国家组别的特殊考虑是使其项目获得资助的一个双重机会。这使低消费量国家能够：

- (a) 按照成本效益阈值与所有其他资金申请国平等竞争资助；以及

- (b) 获得为低消费量国家提供的专用款，根据专用款，这些国家的资金申请不受成本效益阈值的限制。

27. 执行委员会关于低消费量的决定的副本附于附件一中。

28. 秘书处的记录显示，低消费量国家通过专用款获得资助的项目，占该组别国家获得资助的项目总数很小的比例，因为从成本效益方面来说，这些国家的大多数项目与其他项目一起公平竞争，并和其他项目一起获得了资助。

29. 对来自非低消费量国家的中小型企业给予的特别关注是：当这些企业提出集体项目的申请时，采用更优惠的成本效益阈值。中小型企业的定义和有关这些企业的优惠政策在第 25/56 号决定中已详细阐明，其副本附在附件一中。

30. 根据《蒙特利尔议定书》第 7 条报告的数据，获得多边基金和在 2005 年报告氟氯烃消费数据的国家的第 5 条缔约方总共 117 个国家，有 90 个国家的消费量低于 360 公吨，10 个国家的消费量低于 360-1,000 公吨，17 个国家的消费量多于 1,000 公吨。另外第 5 条约方还有 23 个国家没有报告氟氯烃消费数据(其中三个国家目前被划分为非低消费量国家)。关于所涉及的低消费量国家，在使用公吨和使用 ODP 吨的定义之间似乎有很大的相似性。

政策建议

31. 在确定氟氯烃淘汰的成本效益阈值和这些阈值对低消费量国家和中小型企业的潜在影响变得更为人们所知之前，低消费量国家和中小型企业的现行分类应当一直维持下去。然后有可能审查这些分类，现行政策和针对这些国家和企业的供资安排。

二.6 资金申请资格截止日期

32. 执行委员会决定“根据技术发展，不考虑任何项目以转换 1995 年 7 月 25 日之后，委员会第十七次会议前一天，安装了基于消耗臭氧层物质的生产能力的企业”。这一政策出台的背景是：多边基金正在资助 1991-1999 年之间的消耗臭氧层物质淘汰项目，当时对第 5 条国家没有任何有约束力的目标。虽然这样做的目的是阻止消耗臭氧层物质消费量的增长，最终在 1999 年降低氟氯化碳的基准量，但那一时期在建立和扩大新的基于消耗臭氧层物质的产业方面并没有遇到实际的障碍，所以最终获得了多边基金对此能力转换的资助。同时，对已资助的淘汰量的逐项核算并没有在持续的国家总体水平上进行。因此，已获资助的氟氯化碳淘汰的总吨数可能是国家方案一个行业所估计的消费量的好几倍。

33. 在逐项供资方式方面仍存在一些担忧，个别项目的淘汰量没有根据国家总体水平核算，有可能导致不只一次资助相同的消费量，不必要地扩大多边基金的义务。同时，必须向第 5 条国家的行业发出明确的信号：即替代技术已经具备，他们应当停止向依赖消耗臭氧层物质的行业投资。1995 年该政策的通过限制了多边基金的义务，向各行业发出了一个迫切的信号，以停止对即将淘汰的技术的投资。

34. 考虑到该政策的背景，下文提出了三种选择，作为可能的新的氟氯烃截止日期，并讨

论了每一项方案的根本原因：

- (a) 执行委员会第五十三次会议的前一天（2007年11月25日）：该提案的根本原因是：1995年7月25日是执行委员会第十七次会议的前一天。
- (b) 2009年12月31日：该提案的根本原因是它是计算基准的两年期的第一年年底，当时的生产能力应该有助于基准的确定，因此被视为有资格资助淘汰氟氯烃消费和生产活动。因此，任何非该日期的新的能力或能力扩展都无助于基准的确定，而且应是不合格的；以及
- (c) 替代技术的适用性：该提案的根本原因是，有关投资的商业决策应当面向有发展前景的技术，而且不对那些即将淘汰的技术投资。反之，替代技术在商业市场中的存在是放弃依赖于氟氯烃技术的先决条件。这是第17/7号决定的依据。该提案被不同行业氟氯烃替代技术的不平衡性复杂化，有可能难以提出一个统一的截止日期。

采取进一步行动的建议

35. 秘书处应当召集有关泡沫塑料、制冷和其他相关领域的专家小组（也已在上文第24段说明），审议各种选择，包括上文有关新的资金申请资格截止日期的三种选择，并向第五十四次会议报告其结果。

二.7 第二阶段转换

36. “第二阶段转换”一词最早出现在第17/17号决定中，在向执行机构就编制国内制冷保温泡沫转换项目提供建议的背景下，执行委员会于1995年通过此决定，决定内容为：

- (a) 因为氟氯烃不是第5条国家受控物质，所以HCFC-141b厂的转换增支费用没有资格获得供资；
- (b) 执行机构应当在编制项目时注意到对氟氯烃的推断；以及
- (c) 在拟订氟氯烃项目时，某一技术的选择应当有充分理由，并包括对第二阶段转换中未来潜在成本的估计。

37. 关于不资助第二阶段转换的第19/2号决定由执行委员会在1996年后的两次会议中做出，相关段落现引述如下：

- (a) 注意到缔约方第七次会议控制氟氯烃的第VII/3号决定，并进一步注意到涉及氟氯烃转换的项目应当按照该决定以及其他相关因素审议；以及
- (b) 将来如果建议转换为氟氯烃，应当请求执行机构提供建议此种转换的充分说明，连同证实文件，上面有执行委员会规定的过渡性物质要达到的标准，并应说明有

关企业已同意承担随后转换为非氟氯烃物质的费用。

38. 其他有关该问题的决定载于附件一中。多边基金项目逐步采用的氟氯烃分配显示，这些氟氯烃大多集中在泡沫塑料项目中。用于选择氟氯烃的理由包括高度安全，尤其是对于小型工业来说，采用碳氢化合物的迁址费用，以及市场需求的影响。

39. 在意见提出承担第二阶段转换费用的承诺是根据最初的氟氯烃控制时间表，该时间表规定此技术的使用期限大约为 40 年至 50 年，即从 20 世纪 90 年代中期采用氟氯烃到 2040 年淘汰。这一时间比氟氯烃技术按其自然规律发展和准备好升级的生命周期要长很多。但是按照增支费用的原则，如果调整氟氯烃淘汰时间表造成氟氯烃技术在其自然生命周期结束之前提早退出，那么第二阶段转换的供资可能仅限于该技术的剩余使用寿命。但是如前所述，第二阶段转换可能引起安全和一些使用方面的迁址费用问题。

40. 自从大多数企业接受多边基金的援助转换为氟氯烃以来，已经有近十年了。秘书处的清单中已列出了全部的项目。问题是，这些企业目前的状况如何。有些企业可能已转换为非消耗臭氧层物质替代品；另一些企业可能已破产；还有一些可能转到其他的业务。如果能提供有关这些企业的现状报告，更多地了解问题的范围，可能有助于就第二阶段的转换做出决策。同时，对氟氯烃转换为替代品的最终选择的潜在费用需要更多的研究和了解。

采取进一步行动的建议

41. 执行机构和有关国家臭氧机构应当把在多边基金援助下转换为氟氯烃的企业调查列入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划，特别指明转换的年份、目前使用的技术和能力、如与现有的技术不同，还应包括转换时的技术和能力、过去三年氟氯烃的消费水平、替代技术和计划下次转换的时间。

42. 秘书处应当统一全国调查的结果，并报告给 2009 年的执行委员会第二次会议，以方便对第二阶段转换问题的重新审查。

二.8 资助氟氯烃生产的淘汰

43. 多边基金将根据工厂关闭的假定，向消耗臭氧层物质生产淘汰活动供资，并为放弃的利益和劳工因过早关闭而造成的安置提供补偿。迄今为止该方法的好处是它避免了为确保提供生产替代品的技术和用替代技术代替消耗臭氧层物质而在增支费用的计算中产生的混乱。

44. 在涉及氟氯化碳生产淘汰活动的现有协定，每一氟氯化碳生产国需遵照下段的标准：

“[国家]同意执行委员会在第二十次会议上原则上商定的完全关闭氟氯化碳生产能力的资金是提供给国家的总资金，使它能够充分履行《蒙特利尔议定书》关于氟氯化碳生产淘汰活动的要求，不得给相关活动提供额外的多边基金资源，包括生产替代品的基础设施的发展，替代品的进口和使用现有氟氯化碳基础设施的任何氟氯设备的最终关闭。”

45. 该段被解释为：准备生产 CFC-11/12 和 HCFC-22 的所有的周期生产车间，已因停止氟氯烃的生产而获得资助。这使人们质疑这些周期生产车间是否有资格为淘汰氟氯烃生产而接受额外的供资。

46. 第一个氟氯化碳生产淘汰协定于 1999 年结束，距离多边基金开始资助氟氯化碳消费淘汰活动并接近冻结关于氟氯化碳的承诺之后约有八至九年的时间。从其与氟氯化碳生产和消费的淘汰同步性以及其对减少氟氯化碳供应、提升促进全球履约费用的影响来说，审查氟氯化碳生产淘汰活动的时间安排是非常有必要的。由于氟氯烃在 2013 年的冻结至 2030 年最终淘汰的（不包括持续到 2040 年维修后期）期限较长，所以审议氟氯烃生产淘汰活动是很有用的。

47. 此外，按照清洁发展机制，为销毁 HCFC-22 生产的副产品 HFC-23 购买的排放抵免额，可能会促进氟氯烃的生产，因为为了要求获得抵免额，必须保持一定量 HCFC-22 的生产以实现必要的 HCFC-23 的生产。问题在于，为满足 HFC-23 产量的需要生产了多少 HCFC-22，因为第 5 条缔约方的许多生产氟氢烃的工厂已使清洁发展机制项目得到资助或计划得到资助。使该讨论进一步复杂化的是双重使用 HCFC-22，无论是用于发射用途（如制冷）或是作为原料，后者的用量正在增加。

采取进一步行动的建议

48. 秘书处应当召集关于氟氯烃生产问题的专家小组，就资助氟氯烃生产淘汰方面的如下问题向第五十四次会议检查并报告进度情况。

- (a) 现行有关根据工厂关闭的假定资助氟氯烃生产淘汰的方法的持续适用性；
- (b) 鉴于在 2013 年氟氯烃冻结至 2030 年最终淘汰的期限较长，对资助氟氯烃生产的时间安排；
- (c) 考虑 CFC/HCFC-22 周期生产车间的资金申请资格，因为氟氯化碳生产淘汰活动协定的承诺不是因关闭使用现有氟氯化碳基础设施的氟氯烃设备而再次寻求多边基金的资助；
- (d) 说明资助 HFC-23 销毁对 HCFC-22 生产的影响，以及 HCFC-22 发射用途和作为原料的双重用途的必要性；以及
- (e) 氟氯烃生产淘汰活动资金申请资格的截止日期。

三、建议概要

49. 本文的建议分为两部分，政策建议和采取进一步行动的建议，概括如下：

政策建议：

关于获得资助的法律上的前提：

* 《哥本哈根修正》：批准或加入《哥本哈根修正案》是第 5 条缔约方从多边基金获得淘汰氟氯烃消费活动供资的先决条件。

* 《北京修正》：批准或加入《北京修正案》是第 5 条缔约方从多边基金获得淘汰氟氯烃生产活动供资的先决条件。

50. 对非签署国来说，执行委员会可能会考虑提供资金，用于进行氟氯烃调查，编制加快淘汰氟氯烃管理计划，但这些非签署国的政府应承诺在今后 12 个月内批准必要的《修正案》。在承诺履行之前，不会进一步提供资金。

关于现行多边基金政策和指导方针的适用性

51. 除非另有规定，多边基金现在除氟氯烃外消耗臭氧层物质淘汰活动供资方面的现行政策和指导方针将适用于资助氟氯烃的淘汰活动。

关于低消费量国家和中小型企业

52. 在确定氟氯烃淘汰的成本效益阈值和这些阈值对低消费量国家和中小型企业的潜在影响变得更为人们所知之前，低消费量国家和中小型企业的现行分类应当一直维持下去。然后有可能审查这些分类，现行政策和针对这些国家和企业的供资安排。

采取进一步行动的建议：

关于加快氟氯烃淘汰管理计划和氟氯烃调查

53. 秘书处应当与执行机构一起审查现行的国家方案和行业计划的指导方针（在执行委员会第三次会议上做出的决定和第 38/65 号决定），并向编制氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的第五十四次会议提出指导方针草案建议，须考虑下列可能性：

- (a) 将氟氯烃调查纳入编制氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的程序；
- (b) 在制定基准之前确定国家氟氯烃消费/生产的上限；以及
- (c) 确定氟氯烃国家淘汰管理计划执行的时间框架和方式，包括可能的执行阶段、个别项目、行业计划和根据国家具体情况，按国家总体水平核算氟氯烃淘汰量的方法。

关于资助的优先领域和成本效益阈值

关于资金申请资格的截止日期

54. 秘书处应当召集有关泡沫塑料、制冷和其他相关领域的专家小组，依据现有数据，制定关于氟氯烃淘汰供资的新成本效益阈值。这应当包括概念的发展和上文第 23 段所列问题的行动建议。

55. 专家小组还应当审议各种备选办法，还包括在第 34 段讨论的新的资金申请资格截止日期的三种备选办法。

56. 秘书处应当向第五十四次会议报告关于专家小组审议的进度。

关于第二阶段转换

57. 执行机构和有关国家臭氧机构应当把在多边基金援助下转换为氟氯烃的企业调查列入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划，特别指明转换的年份、目前使用的技术和能力、如与现有的技术不同，还应包括转换时的技术和能力、过去三年氟氯烃的消费水平、替代技术和计划下次转换的时间。

58. 秘书处应当统一全国调查的结果，并报告给 2009 年的执行委员会第二次会议，以方便对第二阶段转换问题的重新审查。

关于资助氟氯烃生产淘汰活动

59. 秘书处应当召集关于氟氯烃生产问题的专家小组，就资助氟氯烃生产淘汰活动的如下问题向第五十四次会议检查并报告进度情况：

- (a) 现行有关根据工厂关闭的假定资助氟氯烃生产淘汰的方法的持续适用性；
- (b) 鉴于在 2013 年氟氯烃冻结至 2030 年最终淘汰期限较长，因而对资助氟氯烃生产活动做出的时间安排；
- (c) 考虑 CFC/HCFC-22 周期生产车间的资金申请资格，因为氟氯化碳生产淘汰协定的承诺，不寻求再次获得多边基金的供资去关闭那些使用现有氟氯化碳基础设施的氟氯烃设施；
- (d) 说明资助 HFC-23 销毁对 HCFC-22 生产的影响，以及 HCFC-22 排放用途和作为原料的双重用途的必要性；以及
- (e) 氟氯烃生产淘汰活动资金申请资格的截止日期。

基金秘书处的请求

60. 谨建议执行委员会审议核准秘书处 2008 年预算中的 150,000 美元，以支付召开专家小组会议的费用。

Annex I

**LIST OF RELATED DECISIONS OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES AND THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE IN THE ORDER OF THEIR CITATION IN THE
DOCUMENT UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/53/60**

1. Meeting of the Parties Decision XIX/6 on adjustments to the Montreal Protocol with regard to Annex C, Group I, substances (hydrochlorofluorocarbons) (2007)
2. Meeting of the Parties Decision XIX/10 on Terms of reference for the study on the 2009–2011 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol (2007)
3. Meeting of the Parties decision II/8, Annex III, on the indicative list of categories of incremental costs (1990)
4. Executive Committee decision on exports to non-Article 5 countries (1995)
5. Executive Committee decision on transnational corporations (1992)
6. Executive Committee guidelines on country programmes (1991)
7. Executive Committee guidelines on preparation, implementation and management of sector/national phase-out plans (2002)
8. Executive Committee decision on cost effectiveness thresholds taken at the 16th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1995)
9. Executive Committee decision on hydrocarbon technology (1995)
10. Executive Committee decision on safety-related costs in projects using hydrocarbon (1996)
11. Executive Committee decision on Low volume consuming countries (1995)
12. Executive Committee decision on SMEs (1998)
13. Executive Committee decision on HCFCs (1996)
14. Executive Committee decision on HCFCs (1998)
15. Executive Committee decision on HCFCs (1999)

1. Decision taken at the 19th Meeting of the Parties – Decision XIX/6 (2007)

Adjustments to the Montreal Protocol with regard to Annex C, Group I, substances (hydrochlorofluorocarbons)

“The Parties agree to accelerate the phase-out of production and consumption of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs), by way of an adjustment in accordance with paragraph 9 of Article 2 of the Montreal Protocol and as contained in annex III to the report of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties,⁴ on the basis of the following:

1. For Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol (Article 5 Parties), to choose as the baseline the average of the 2009 and 2010 levels of, respectively, consumption and production; and
2. To freeze, at that baseline level, consumption and production in 2013;
3. For Parties operating under Article 2 of the Protocol (Article 2 Parties) to have completed the accelerated phase-out of production and consumption in 2020, on the basis of the following reduction steps:
 - (a) By 2010 of 75 per cent;
 - (b) By 2015 of 90 per cent;
 - (c) While allowing 0.5 per cent for servicing the period 2020–2030;
4. For Article 5 Parties to have completed the accelerated phase-out of production and consumption in 2030, on the basis of the following reduction steps:
 - (a) By 2015 of 10 per cent;
 - (b) By 2020 of 35 per cent;
 - (c) By 2025 of 67.5 per cent;
 - (d) While allowing for servicing an annual average of 2.5 per cent during the period 2030–2040;
5. To agree that the funding available through the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol in the upcoming replenishments shall be stable and sufficient to meet all agreed incremental costs to enable Article 5 Parties to comply with the accelerated phase-out schedule both for production and consumption sectors as set out above, and based on that understanding, to also direct the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to make the necessary changes to the eligibility criteria related to the post-1995 facilities and second conversions;

⁴ UNEP/OzL.Pro.19/7.

6. To direct the Executive Committee, in providing technical and financial assistance, to pay particular attention to Article 5 Parties with low volume and very low volume consumption of HCFCs;
7. To direct the Executive Committee to assist Parties in preparing their phase-out management plans for an accelerated HCFC phase-out;
8. To direct the Executive Committee, as a matter of priority, to assist Article 5 Parties in conducting surveys to improve reliability in establishing their baseline data on HCFCs;
9. To encourage 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;
10. To request Parties to report regularly on their implementation of paragraph 7 of Article 2F of the Protocol;
11. To agree that the Executive Committee, when developing and applying funding criteria for projects and programmes, and taking into account paragraph 6, give priority to cost-effective projects and programmes which focus on, inter alia:
 - (a) Phasing-out first those HCFCs with higher ozone-depleting potential, taking into account national circumstances;
 - (b) 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;
 - (c) Small and medium-size enterprises;
12. To agree to address the possibilities or need for essential use exemptions, no later than 2015 where this relates to Article 2 Parties, and no later than 2020 where this relates to Article 5 Parties;
13. To agree to review in 2015 the need for the 0.5 per cent for servicing provided for in paragraph 3, and to review in 2025 the need for the annual average of 2.5 per cent for servicing provided for in paragraph 4 (d);
14. In order to satisfy basic domestic needs, to agree to allow for up to 10% of baseline levels until 2020, and, for the period after that, to consider no later than 2015 further reductions of production for basic domestic needs;
15. In accelerating the HCFC phase-out, to agree that Parties are to take every practicable step consistent with Multilateral Fund programmes, to ensure that the best available and environmentally-safe substitutes and related technologies are transferred from Article 2 Parties to Article 5 Parties under fair and most favourable conditions;”

2. Decision taken at the 19th Meeting of the Parties – Decision XIX/10 (2007)

Terms of reference for the study on the 2009–2011 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

“*Recalling* decisions VII/24, X/13, XIII/1 and XVI/35 on previous terms of reference for studies on the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol,

Recalling also decisions VIII/4, XI/7, XIV/39, and XVII/40 on previous replenishments of the Multilateral Fund,

1. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to prepare a report for submission to the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties, and to present it through the Open-ended Working Group at its twenty-eighth meeting, to enable the Twentieth Meeting of the Parties to take a decision on the appropriate level of the 2009–2011 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund. In preparing its report, the Panel should take into account, among other things:

(a) All control measures and relevant decisions agreed by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol and the Executive Committee, including decisions agreed by the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties and the Executive Committee at its fifty-third and fifty-fourth meetings insofar as those decisions will necessitate expenditure by the Multilateral Fund during the period 2009–2011, including scenarios which indicate eligible incremental costs and cost-efficiencies associated with implementation by Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the adjustments and decisions relating to HCFCs, and, in addition, the Panel should provide indicative figures for the periods 2012–2014 and 2015–2017 in order to provide information to support a stable level of funding that would be updated prior to figures for those periods being finalized;

(b) The need to allocate resources to enable all Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 to maintain compliance with Articles 2A–2I of the Montreal Protocol and possible new agreed compliance measures relevant to the period 2009–2011 under the Montreal Protocol;

(c) Rules and guidelines agreed by the Executive Committee, up to and including its fifty-fourth meeting, for determining eligibility for funding of investment projects (including those in the production sector), non-investment projects and sectoral or national phase-out plans;

(d) Approved country programmes;

(e) Financial commitments in 2009–2011 relating to national or sectoral phase-out plans agreed by the Executive Committee;

(f) The provision of funds for accelerating phase-out and maintaining momentum, taking into account the time lag in project implementation;

(g) Experience to date, including limitations and successes of the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances achieved with the resources already allocated, as well as the performance of the Multilateral Fund and its implementing agencies;

(h) 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;

- (i) Administrative costs of the implementing agencies and the cost of financing the secretariat services of the Multilateral Fund, including the holding of meetings;
2. That, in undertaking this task, the Panel should consult widely with all relevant persons and institutions and other relevant sources of information deemed useful;
3. To request the Panel to provide additional information on the levels of funding required for replenishment in each of the years 2012, 2013 and 2014 and to study the financial and other implications of a possible longer replenishment period, in particular whether such a measure would provide for more stable levels of contributions;
4. That the Panel shall strive to complete its work in time to enable its report to be distributed to all Parties two months before the twenty-eighth Meeting of the Open-ended Working Group;
5. To request the Panel to take into account the conclusions resulting from the study conducted by the Executive Committee pursuant to paragraph 2 of decision XVIII/9 in the event that proposals for control measures related to the subject of that study are submitted to the Ozone Secretariat.”

3. Decision taken at the 2nd Meeting of the Parties – Decision II/8 (1990)

Indicative list of categories of incremental costs

“1. The evaluation of requests for financing incremental costs of a given project shall take into account the following general principles:

(a) The most cost-effective and efficient option should be chosen, taking into account the national industrial strategy of the recipient party. It should be considered carefully to what extent the infrastructure at present used for production of the controlled substances could be put to alternative uses, thus resulting in decreased capital abandonment, and how to avoid deindustrialization and loss of export revenues;

(b) Consideration of project proposals for funding should involve the careful scrutiny of cost items listed in an effort to ensure that there is no double-counting;

(c) Savings or benefits that will be gained at both the strategic and project levels during the transition process should be taken into account on a case-by-case basis, according to criteria decided by the Parties and as elaborated in the guidelines of the Executive Committee;

(d) The funding of incremental costs is intended as an incentive for early adoption of ozone protecting technologies. In this respect the Executive Committee shall agree which time scales for payment of incremental costs are appropriate in each sector.

2. Incremental costs that once agreed are to be met by the financial mechanism include those listed below. If incremental costs other than those mentioned below are identified and quantified, a decision as to whether they are to be met by the financial mechanism shall be taken by the Executive Committee consistent with any criteria decided by the Parties and elaborated in the guidelines of the Executive Committee. The incremental recurring costs apply only for a transition period to be defined. The following list is indicated:

(a) Supply of substitutes

(i) Cost of conversion of existing production facilities:

- cost of patents and designs and incremental cost of royalties;
- capital cost of conversion;
- cost of retraining of personnel, as well as the cost of research to adapt technology to local circumstances;

(ii) Costs arising from premature retirement or enforced idleness, taking into account any guidance of the Executive Committee on appropriate cut-off dates:

- of productive capacity previously used to produce substances controlled by existing and/or amended or adjusted Protocol provisions; and
- where such capacity is not replaced by converted or new capacity to produce alternatives;

- (iii) Cost of establishing new production facilities for substitutes of capacity equivalent to capacity lost when plants are converted or scrapped, including:
 - cost of patents and designs and incremental cost of royalties;
 - capital cost;
 - cost of training, as well as the cost of research to adapt technology to local circumstances;
 - (iv) Net operational cost, including the cost of raw materials;
 - (v) Cost of import of substitutes;
- (b) *Use in manufacturing as an intermediate good*
- (i) Cost of conversion of existing equipment and product manufacturing facilities;
 - (ii) Cost of patents and designs and incremental cost of royalties;
 - (iii) Capital cost;
 - (iv) Cost of retraining;
 - (v) Cost of research and development;
 - (vi) Operational cost, including the cost of raw materials except where otherwise provided for;
- (c) End use
- (i) Cost of premature modification or replacement of user equipment;
 - (ii) Cost of collection, management, recycling, and, if cost effective, destruction of ozone-depleting substances;
- (iii) Cost of providing technical assistance to reduce consumption and unintended emission of ozone-depleting substances.”

4. Decision taken at the 17th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1995)

Export to non-Article 5 countries

"In projects which benefit enterprises that export part of their production to non-Article 5 countries, the following rules shall apply:

1. Where exports to non-Article 5 countries correspond to or are less than 10 per cent of total production, the total incremental costs shall be covered.
2. Where exports to non-Article 5 countries exceed 10 per cent of production but do not exceed 70 per cent, there shall be a reduction equivalent to the percentage of total production represented by such exports less 10 per cent.
3. Where exports to non-Article 5 countries exceed 70 per cent of production, the project shall not be eligible.
4. The average over the three years prior to submission of the project shall be used to determine production and exports to non-Article 5 countries.
5. Projects where the exports to non-Article 5 countries are in the form of agricultural or fisheries products shall be eligible for total incremental costs."

(UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/15/45 (paras. 146, 147).

5. Decision taken at the 18th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1995)

Transnational corporations

“The Fund should not finance phase-out activities relating to enterprises that were wholly owned subsidiaries of transnational corporations or enterprises permitted to operate in "free zones" and whose output was for export only. Partial funding should be considered on a case-by-case basis to finance the local share ownership of any given enterprise partly owned by a transnational corporation. In such a case, funding could be provided as a percentage of project incremental costs proportionate to the local share ownership of the enterprise with the transnational corporation responsible for the rest. Subject to the approval of the Executive Committee, the same criteria should apply to bilateral assistance for activities involving subsidiaries of transnational corporations.”

(UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/30, para. 88).

(Supporting document: UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/30 Annex VI).

6. Decision taken at the 3rd Meeting of the Executive Committee (1991)

Guidelines on Country programmes

1. “The Executive Committee shall invite each Party operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 and wishing to receive support from the Multilateral Fund to develop a country programme¹ and projects in accordance with paragraph 10(g) of the Terms of Reference of the Executive Committee.
2. The country programme is expected to contain inter alia:
 - (a) a review of recent production, imports, applications and use of controlled substances by the main producers, users, and consumers. Where information is available it would be useful to indicate links to multinational producers or users.
 - (b) a description of the institutional framework governing controlled substances - (Government agencies, collaborating NGO's, consumer groups, industry associations);
 - (c) a description of policy framework, regulatory and incentive systems;
 - (d) a description of government and industry activities in response to the Protocol;
 - (e) a statement of strategy for implementation of the Protocol, indicating the respective roles of Government, supporting multilateral and bilateral agencies;
 - (f) an action plan encompassing investment and technical assistance projects, pre-investment studies, and any additional policy analysis required;
 - (g) a timetable for each activity, and for action plan review;
 - (h) a budget and financing programme for the above activities.
3. In developing its country programme and/or individual projects, a Party may request technical assistance, other services and support from the implementing agencies within their respective areas of expertise and within the context of work programmes approved by the Executive Committee.
4. A Party operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 shall submit its country programme to the Executive Committee for its consideration and approval in accordance with paragraph 10(g) of Appendix II of Annex IV to the Report of the Second Meeting of the Parties.
5. A country programme approved by the Executive Committee shall serve as a basis for project preparation and further co-operation between the Party and the implementing agencies. However, individual projects prepared prior to the completion of a country programme shall also qualify for funding of consistent with project eligibility criteria (see section III) approved by the Executive Committee.”

(UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/3/18/Rev.1 Annex III (section II.1.2).

¹ A number of countries have already initiated or completed national or country studies which contain some of the elements of a country programme. Updated country studies containing the elements listed in paragraph 2a-h shall constitute a country programme.

7. Decision taken at the 38th meeting of the Executive Committee - Guidelines (2002)

Guidelines for the preparation, implementation and management of performance based sector and national ODS phase-out plans: Follow up to decision 37/67

“Introduction

6. Performance-based funding agreements for ODS phase-out were introduced into the Fund operation in 1997 and are being increasingly adopted by some Article 5 countries as a preferred modality for managing their sectoral and/or national ODS phase-out programmes. Since the advantage of the performance-based phase-out plans is the matching of the funding commitment by the Executive Committee with the commitment of countries concerned to comply with the Montreal Protocol obligations, it is essential that the performance targets in such plans conform with the phase-out schedules of the various controlled substances.

7. The plans which have been prepared and implemented to date show a great degree of similarity and convergence, although in some aspects variance exists both in format and substance among these plans. At a time when such plans are becoming the predominant funding modality of the Fund, the current effort in preparing these Guidelines provides the opportunity to formalize experiences accumulated in applying the funding modality, and achieve consistency on those aspects that have not been dealt with uniformly.

8. However, it is also realized that situations in countries vary and needs are different. It would be impractical for the Guidelines to attempt to encompass every situation. Instead, an open approach is followed in developing these Guidelines whereby the purpose is to provide general principles and procedures that should be followed in developing and implementing such performance-based ODS phase-out plans. At the same time, there should be enough room left to allow users of these Guidelines to expand and adapt to suit their specific needs. This is especially true in the specific examples used in the Guidelines and the proposed Format for Annual Implementation Programmes, which are mostly illustrative in nature.

9. The Guidelines contain four parts: Part I – Purpose, Applicability, Definitions, Composition and Deadline for Submission; Part II – Contents of a performance-based ODS phase-out proposal; Part III – Contents of the agreement for a performance-based phase-out plan; and Part IV – Implementation of the performance-based ODS phase-out plan.

Part I – Purpose, Applicability, Definitions, Composition and Deadline for Submission

Purpose

5. The purpose of the Guidelines for the Preparation, Implementation and Management of Performance-Based ODS Phase-Out Plans (hereinafter referred to as “the Guidelines”) is to provide standard procedures for the preparation, implementation and management of performance-based ODS phase-out plans. Users of these Guidelines could expand and adapt the guidelines to suit their specific needs.

Applicability

6. The Guidelines should apply to all the plans that the Executive Committee will enter into that entail a financial commitment by the Executive Committee, *which will approve specific amounts agreed*

to in principle and *to be* disbursed over a number of years according to performance targets as agreed and specified in such plans. The performance targets established in such plans should, at a minimum, conform with the phase-out schedules of the Montreal Protocol applicable to the countries concerned in relation to all of the controlled substances covered in the plans, ***except to the extent that the performance targets conform to the response by the Meeting of the Parties to Decision 37/20(a) of the Executive Committee.*** These include ODS phase-out plans at a sector level and at a national level. National phase-out plans could include the remaining consumption of a controlled substance, the controlled substances of an Annex/Group under the Montreal Protocol, or all the controlled substances in a country.

7. The Guidelines should not, in general, apply to projects or programmes that aim at completing the phase out at a sub-sector level such as rigid foam, flexible foam, polystyrene/polyethylene of the foam sector, or domestic refrigeration, commercial refrigeration, so-called manufacturing refrigeration and mobile air-conditioning of the refrigeration sector, unless the remaining consumption is high enough to warrant a sub-sector phase-out plan. Otherwise such sub-sector projects should be included either in the context of a sector plan, or a phase out plan covering Annex A/Group I substances, or be treated as group and/or terminal umbrella projects.

Definitions

8. The terms used for the purpose of the Guidelines are defined as follows:

- *A substance*, is defined as an ozone-depleting substance controlled by the Montreal Protocol.
- *Annex/Group*, is defined as those Annexes and Groups related to ozone-depleting substances referred to in the Montreal Protocol. These Annexes/Groups include:
 - Annex A Group I of the Montreal Protocol includes CFC-11, CFC-12, CFC-113 CFC 114 and CFC-115;
 - Annex A Group II of the Montreal Protocol includes Halon 1211, Halon 1301, and Halon2402;
 - ***Annex C Group III: Bromochloromethane***
 - Annex B Group I (CFC-13), Group II (CTC) and Group III (TCA); and
 - Annex E: methyl bromide.
- *A sector*, is defined as the industrial sector producing or using one or more ODSs. These sectors include:
 - ODS production;
 - Aerosol;
 - Foams;
 - Refrigeration;
 - Solvents;

- MDIs;
 - Sterilants;
 - Fire-fighting;
 - All controlled uses of methyl bromide; and
 - Process agents.
- *A sector ODS phase-out plan* aims at eliminating the eligible consumption or production of a controlled substance of an industrial sector; in the case of methyl bromide, of a controlled application.
 - *A national ODS phase-out plan* aims at eliminating the total eligible consumption of one or more than one controlled substances in a country, such as Annex A Group I (CFCs), Annex A Group II (halons), or Annex E substances (all the controlled applications of methyl bromide).

Composition

9. A performance-based ODS phase-out plan should consist of two parts: a performance-based ODS phase-out proposal, and an agreement which would formalize legally the commitments of the Executive Committee and the country concerned over the duration of the plan. Before funding can be approved, the plan must be supplemented by the first annual implementation programme, which will form the basis for approval of the initial tranche.

Deadline for Submission

10. A national/sector phase-out plan, complete with a draft agreement and a proposed first annual implementation programme, should be submitted, unless otherwise agreed with the Secretariat, 14 weeks prior to an Executive Committee meeting to allow for a review by the Secretariat.

Part II - Contents of a performance-based ODS phase-out proposal

General Information

11. The phase-out proposal should include general information, such as name of country; type of proposal (sector/national phase-out plan); number of controlled substances covered by the proposal; sector(s) covered and duration of the proposal.

Impact of the proposal

12. The proposal should state the impact in terms of the amount of ODP tonnes of each controlled substance to be eliminated and the impact on national consumption and its relation to compliance. For Annex A Group I CFCs, the proposal should provide data on the starting point established by Decision 35/57; consumption funded since the starting point; remaining eligible consumption unfunded as of

submission of the proposal; and phase-out from the proposal as a percentage of the remaining unfunded consumption in the case of a sector plan.

13. For the other controlled substances, the proposal should provide data on eligible consumption reported from the two most recent years prior to the submission of the proposal; consumption funded but not implemented as of submission of the proposal; eligible consumption unfunded as of submission of the proposal after netting out the consumption funded but not implemented; and phase-out from the proposal as a percentage of the unfunded consumption. Particular attention should be paid to establishing the proportion of consumption that is not eligible for funding because it arose from production capacity installed after 25 July 1995.

14. There should be an assessment of the consumption reduction schedule proposed in relation to the Montreal Protocol control schedule of the controlled substance concerned. The reduction schedule proposed should, at a minimum, conform to the Montreal Protocol control schedule, *except to the extent that the performance targets conform to the response by the Meeting of the Parties to Decision 37/20(a) of the Executive Committee.*

Data collection and validation

15. The proposal should provide sector distribution of the remaining eligible consumption of each of the controlled substances covered, in terms of the remaining consumption of the sector; consumption funded but not implemented; and the consumption unfunded as of the time of submitting the proposal after netting out the consumption funded but not implemented.

16. There should be a description of the procedure followed in collecting and validating the data, including the name of the institutions involved, the sources of data and the methodology used. If a sampling methodology is *necessary*, there should be a discussion of the representativeness of the sampling. There should be adequate divergence of sources of data to ensure data credibility and reliability. This should follow the chain of ODS supply from the time when the substance is ordered and imported into the country to distributors and manufacturers. This could include but not be limited to sources such as customs, use data from industries, enterprise surveys, data from compressor manufacturers and others.

Strategy and plan of implementation

17. The proposal should describe the strategy that will be followed to achieve the annual reductions proposed, in particular, the management of the supply and demand of ODS in the country to achieve the objectives of the proposal. This should include a discussion of policy instruments to reduce the supply of ODS, such as import quotas, price controls and the control of illegal trade in ODS. This should also include the steps to be taken to gradually curtail ODS demand (e.g. measures like completing the conversions of manufacturing industries while simultaneously planning to address demand in the refrigeration servicing sector).

18. The strategy should include a time frame of implementation based on the actual conditions in the country. This would entail an assessment of how much of the current consumption could be avoided with little investment but with targeted awareness campaigns and evaluations carried out on the results of such campaigns in terms of actual reduction achieved.

19. There should be an implementation programme sector-by-sector on how the ODS demand reduction will be achieved year by year. This includes a description of the contribution of activities by industry and government. This should include annual data on reductions to be achieved; reduction from

on-going projects; reduction from new conversions in the manufacturing industries; reduction from servicing; and contributions from government policy control.

20. For refrigeration servicing, the proposal should describe the strategy to reduce the dependence on CFCs. This strategy could include measures such as legal and economic incentives and disincentives targeting suppliers, service technicians and equipment owners; training of service technicians; public awareness activities; customs control on new CFC-based equipment and vehicles; bans on the introduction of after market CFC-based MAC systems; the retirement of existing CFC-based equipment and vehicles; and the gradual increase in the supply of recycled CFCs .

Incremental costs

21. The proposal should provide the basis and justifications for the calculation of incremental costs.

22. For industry conversions, data should be provided to the extent possible on the number of enterprises, sectors/sub-sectors involved, enterprise ODS consumption and baseline equipment, date of installation of production capacity, production levels, the average cost-effectiveness of the projects funded in the sector/sub-sector in the relevant country and level of exports to non-Article 5 countries. Using this data, incremental costs should be calculated at the sub-sector level. Where large enterprises are identified with potential individual phase-out costs of over US \$1 million, sub-projects should be appended to the plan establishing the incremental cost in the usual manner.

23. For refrigeration servicing, data provided should include estimated number of viable workshops in the country, their typical baseline equipment, estimated number of technicians currently working in refrigeration servicing, estimated average consumption of CFCs per workshop per year, number of recovering and recycling equipment needed and justification, including an estimate of the amount of ODS to be recovered annually, and other details.

24. *For non-investment activities, the charge against the aggregate baseline ODP level as per Decision 35/57 will not apply since these activities will not be treated as individual separate activities but components of a sector or national phase-out programme. However, the decision should apply to separate non-investment activities submitted outside such performance-based plans.*

25. For management costs, data should be provided on the justification for funding for project management in addition to the funding provided under institutional strengthening project, the role and responsibility of the project management to be funded.

Management

26. There should be a description of the management structure for the implementation of the phase-out proposal. This should include a clear indication of the roles to be assumed by Government bodies, industry bodies, academic institutions and consultants. Accountability of the management is of paramount importance. Thus a designation of a government entity to which the management should be held accountable should be indicated.

27. There should also be a discussion of the implementing agency to be involved in the management and implementation of the phase-out proposal. If there is more than one implementing agency involved, there should be a designation of the lead implementing agency and cooperating agencies, with a clearly defined role and responsibility for each of the implementing agencies involved.

Monitoring and Evaluation

28. There should be a clear description of the financial and substantive oversight to be exercised over the plan and should include the name of institutions involved, role and responsibility of each institution, type and frequency of reporting. There should be adequate provision to ensure independent confirmation of the achievement of the performance targets specified in the agreement, including a periodic evaluation to be included in the Monitoring and Evaluation Work Programme of the Fund. *Such evaluations could be undertaken by national auditing authorities that are not involved in the implementation and management of such plans, provided that their independence was guaranteed by the implementing agency concerned.*

Performance targets and disbursement schedule

29. A schedule of fund disbursement should provide the funding requirement in annual tranches to achieve the performance targets. Performance targets will include, inter alia, maximum ODS consumption levels, annual ODS reduction targets and the investment and non-investment activities proposed to be achieved in the year in question.

Part III - Contents of the agreement for a performance-based ODS phase-out plan

General Information

30. The agreement on the phase-out plan should include general information, such as name of country; type of the plan (sector or national phase-out plan); controlled substances covered by the agreement; duration of the agreement; and total funding level agreed in principle.

Impact of the agreement

31. The agreement should state the impact in terms of the amount of ODP tonnes of each controlled substance to be eliminated. For Annex A Group I CFCs, the agreement should provide data on the starting point established by Decision 35/57; consumption funded since the starting point; remaining eligible consumption unfunded as of submission of the agreement; and phase-out from the agreement as a percentage of the remaining unfunded consumption in the case of a sector plan.

32. For the other controlled substances, the agreement should provide data on eligible consumption reported from the two most recent years prior to the submission of the agreement; consumption funded but not implemented as of submission of the agreement; eligible consumption unfunded as of submission of the agreement after netting out the consumption funded but not implemented; and phase-out from the agreement as percentage of the unfunded consumption.

Performance targets, indicators of achievement and fund disbursement schedule

33. Performance *targets* should be set in annual reduction levels of the controlled substance concerned, starting from the year that the agreement is approved. The performance targets should at a minimum meet the control schedules of the Montreal Protocol for each of the controlled substances

concerned, *except to the extent that the performance targets conform to the response by the Meeting of the Parties to Decision 37/20(a) of the Executive Committee.*

34. *Indicators* should be provided for each annual target to validate and corroborate the achievement of the targets. To the extent possible, these indicators should be verifiable and quantifiable. For the purpose of illustration, they could include the import and consumption data (supply and demand) of the controlled substance, the completion of investment projects and associated phase-out, the number of CFC recovery and recycling stations in operation, the enactment and enforcement of a government policy such as import control of CFCs at a certain date, and other quantifiable indicators.

35. A schedule of *fund disbursement* should show fund requirements in annual tranches to achieve the performance targets

36. The three components can be presented in a tabular form as follows:

| Year | Performance target (ODP tonnes) | Consumption allowed under Montreal Protocol controlled schedule (ODP tonnes) | Indicator(s) of achievement | Disbursement (in US\$) |
|-------------|--|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | |

Conditions for disbursement

37. There should be a clear enunciation of the conditions that have to be met by the government of the country concerned before the annual tranche of funding could be released. This should include, among other things, an independent confirmation of the achievement of the agreed target in the phase-out funding period, the submission of an annual implementation programme for the upcoming funding period, and confirmation of the achievement of the activities included in the previous annual implementation programme.

Delineation of annual funding cycle

38. There should be a delineation of the annual funding cycle in the agreement which should include the time of the year that the funding request would be submitted to the Executive Committee, timing of submission of a report on the independent verification of the implementation of the target in the relevant previous funding period and the timing for submitting the annual implementation programme for the new funding period. Noting the time needed to audit phase-out performance, the plan should indicate clearly which previous funding period will be the basis for the verification audit.

Flexibility for using approved funding

39. The agreement may include a clause about the flexibility that should be allowed for the country concerned to reallocate the approved funds, or part of the funds according to the evolving circumstances

in the country to achieve the agreed targets. *Reallocations which are considered as major changes should be accounted for in the verification report and reviewed by the Executive Committee.*

Monitoring and evaluation

40. There should be a clear description of the financial and substantive oversight to be exercised over the plan and should include the name of the institutions involved, the role and responsibility of each institution, the type and frequency of reporting. There should be adequate provision to ensure independent confirmation of the achievement of the performance targets specified in the agreement, including *where appropriate* a periodic evaluation to be mounted by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer of the Secretariat.

Provisions for failing to honour commitments

41. There should be provision for failure to honour the commitment entered into under the agreement. Such provisions should cover situations in which the Executive Committee could not provide the level of funding agreed in the agreement when the country concerned had achieved the required ODS reduction. The provisions should also cover situations in which the country concerned could not meet the agreed ODS reduction target when the Executive Committee had fulfilled its obligation by making the agreed funds available.

Management responsibilities

42. The country concerned should assume overall responsibility for the implementation and management of the agreement to ensure the achievement of its goals. It should, however, choose an implementing agency to assist it in implementing the agreement. In cases where the government decides to enlist the services of more than one implementing agency (bilateral agencies included), the government should indicate the lead agency and the cooperating executing agency(ies).

43. The agreement should include a description of the role and responsibility of the country concerned, the lead implementing agency and each of the cooperating executing agencies.

Arrangement for administrative fees

44. The agreement should specify the arrangement for the payment of administrative fees for the implementing agency(ies) in accordance with the policy of the Executive Committee on administrative costs.

Part IV - Implementation of the performance-based ODS phase-out plan

45. The implementation of the performance-based ODS phase-out plans should be effected through the preparation, submission and approval of annual implementation programmes

Preparation and submission of annual implementation programmes and funding requests

46. Annual implementation programmes and funding requests should be submitted by the lead implementing agency on behalf of the country concerned to the Executive Committee for approval *eight weeks prior to the meeting of the Executive Committee*. As the verification of the achievement of the target in the preceding year is the condition for release of funding for the year of the plan, the annual implementation programme should be submitted together with the performance verification report. If this is not possible due to the time required to complete the verification after the conclusion of the implementation programme for the preceding year, an interim implementation review should be submitted together with the annual implementation programme.

Contents of the annual implementation programme

47. What is proposed below are the major items that ought to be included in the annual implementation programme, however, the details under each item as shown here are for illustrative purposes only and should be adapted according to the specific needs of each phase-out plan.

- ODS phase-out target: should be the same as agreed upon in the agreement. Indicators should be provided and one of them can be data on the supply, demand and stockpiling of the ODS in the preceding year and the year of the programme.
- Industry action: should include planned phase-out in the manufacturing industry and refrigeration servicing. For manufacturing, the plan should list by sector/sub-sector, the number of industry conversions to be completed and ODS phase-out to be realized. For refrigeration servicing, the plan should indicate the actions to be taken, such as ODS recovery and recycling and anticipated impact of such actions, which can be expressed in the amount of ODS to be recycled.
- Technical assistance: should include the planned enabling activities, their objectives, the target group to be reached and their impact.
- Government action: should include the planned measures to be taken and the schedule of implementation. These could be the enactment and enforcement of government policies on the supply of and demand for ODS, and public awareness campaigns.
- Annual budget: should list the planned expenditures to be incurred for the various activities to be implemented during the year.
- Administrative fees for implementing agencies: should include the name of the agency, planned expenditure of the agency in the year of the plan, rate of administrative fees agreed, and the total administrative fees to be paid.

48. For illustrative purposes, the items discussed above are presented in a tabular form in Annex I.

Annex I

FORMAT FOR ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMMES

This format is proposed for use by the Article 5 country to prepare the annual implementation programme for the implementation of performance-based ODS phase-out plans; however, it should be modified to suit the specific needs of each plan.

1. Data

| | |
|--|--|
| Country | |
| Year of plan | |
| # of years completed | |
| # of years remaining under the plan | |
| Target ODS consumption of the preceding year | |
| Target ODS consumption of the year of plan | |
| Level of funding requested | |
| Lead implementing agency | |
| Co-operating agency(ies) | |

2. Targets

| Target: | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Indicators | | Preceding Year | Year of Plan | Reduction |
| Supply of ODS | Import | | | |
| | Production* | | | |
| | Total (1) | | | |
| Demand of ODS | Manufacturing | | | |
| | Servicing | | | |
| | Stockpiling | | | |
| | Total (2) | | | |

* For ODS-producing countries

3. **Industry Action**

| Sector | Consumption Preceding Year (1) | Consumption Year of Plan (2) | Reduction within Year of Plan (1)-(2) | Number of Projects Completed | Number of Servicing Related Activities | ODS Phase-Out (in ODP tonnes) |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Manufacturing | | | | | | |
| Aerosol | | | | | | |
| Foam | | | | | | |
| Refrigeration | | | | | | |
| Solvents | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | |
| Servicing | | | | | | |
| Refrigeration | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | | |

4. **Technical Assistance**

Proposed Activity: _____

Objective: _____

Target Group: _____

Impact: _____

5. **Government Action**

| Policy/Activity Planned | Schedule of Implementation |
|--|----------------------------|
| Type of Policy Control on ODS Import: servicing, etc | |
| Public Awareness | |
| Others | |

6. **Annual Budget**

| Activity | Planned Expenditures (US \$) |
|--------------|------------------------------|
| | |
| | |
| TOTAL | |

7. **Administrative Fees**

8. Decision taken at the 16th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1995)

Cost effectiveness thresholds

“The Executive Committee:

- a) Decided that the first option proposed by the Sub-Committee on Project Review, as outlined in paragraph 25 above, should be implemented on a trial basis for projects submitted to the Seventeenth Meeting of the Executive Committee and that it should be reviewed at the Eighteenth Meeting;
- b) Decided that ODS consumption should be calculated on the basis of either the year, or an average of the three years, immediately preceding project preparation;
- c) Adopted the following sector and sub-sector cost-effectiveness threshold values to be applied to projects submitted to the Seventeenth Meeting;

| <u>Sector</u> | <u>US \$/kg ODP</u> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| AEROSOL | |
| Hydrocarbon | 4.40 |
| FOAM | |
| General | 9.53 |
| Flexible polyurethane | 6.23 |
| Integral skin | 16.86 |
| Polystyrene/polyethylene | 8.22 |
| Rigid polyurethane | 7.83 |
| HALON | |
| General | 1.48 |
| REFRIGERATION | |
| Commercial | 15.21 |
| Domestic | 13.76 |
| SOLVENT | |
| CFC-113 | 19.73 |
| TCA | 38.50” |

(UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/16/20 (paras. 32c, 32d).

9. Decision taken at the 17th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1995)

Treatment of hydrocarbon technologies

“The Executive Committee, noting its decision at its Fifteenth Meeting to presume against the use of HCFCs in investment projects, recognizing the higher cost of hydrocarbon technologies, primarily due to safety factors, and desiring to ensure an equality between technology options consistent with that decision decided:

- (a) That for the purposes of calculating the cost-effectiveness value of projects utilizing such technologies, the numerator should be discounted by up to 35 per cent. It is expected that these figures will be adjusted in the light of experience and a study on safety matters to be conducted by the Secretariat;
- (b) To request the Secretariat to analyse projects in the pipeline for the commercial refrigeration sector and the rigid polyurethane sector where hydrocarbon technologies are used, and to inform the Executive Committee of the results at its Eighteenth Meeting.”

(Decision 17/14)

9. Decision taken at the 17th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1995)

Treatment of hydrocarbon technologies

49. “The Executive Committee, noting its decision at its Fifteenth Meeting to presume against the use of HCFCs in investment projects, recognizing the higher cost of hydrocarbon technologies, primarily due to safety factors, and desiring to ensure an equality between technology options consistent with that decision decided:

- (a) That for the purposes of calculating the cost-effectiveness value of projects utilizing such technologies, the numerator should be discounted by up to 35 per cent. It is expected that these figures will be adjusted in the light of experience and a study on safety matters to be conducted by the Secretariat;
- (b) To request the Secretariat to analyse projects in the pipeline for the commercial refrigeration sector and the rigid polyurethane sector where hydrocarbon technologies are used, and to inform the Executive Committee of the results at its Eighteenth Meeting.”

(Decision 17/14)

10. Decision taken at the 20th Meeting of the Executive Committee

Safety-related costs in projects using hydrocarbon technology

“The Secretariat introduced its report on safety-related costs in projects using hydrocarbon technology, which had been prepared in accordance with Executive Committee decision 17/14 (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/20/65).

The Executive Committee took note of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/20/65 and the recommendation by the Sub-Committee on Project Review (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/20/5, para. 54) and decided:

- (c) To approve the recommendations in the Secretariat’s document on safety-related costs in projects using hydrocarbon technologies, namely:
 - (i) With regard to domestic refrigeration projects:
 - a. There was an increase in both the capital and total cost per unit for all-hydrocarbon technologies compared to HCFC/HFC-based technologies. The increase in the total project cost (capital plus operating costs) ranged between 15.6 per cent to 55.1 per cent for different categories of projects;
 - b. Discounting the numerator by 35 per cent was sufficient to maintain parity between HCFC-141b/HFC-134a and cyclopentane/HFC-134a technology options in the domestic refrigeration sector;
 - c. The number of projects approved for cyclopentane/isobutane technology was not sufficient to enable reliable conclusions to be drawn;
 - (ii) With regard to the commercial refrigeration projects, there was no need for the introduction of a discounting factor to account for the additional safety costs needed for hydrocarbon technology, because on average, projects using hydrocarbon technologies were within one per cent of the cost-effectiveness threshold for the sector and therefore would not be disadvantaged for consideration for funding;
 - (iii) With regard to rigid polyurethane foam projects, there was no need for the introduction of a discounting factor to account for the additional safety costs for hydrocarbon technology, because the above statistical analysis showed that on average, projects using hydrocarbon technology were already below the cost-effectiveness threshold for the sector, and thus would not be disadvantaged for consideration for funding;
- (b) That the Secretariat should, however, consider further information on conversion in the commercial refrigeration sector and report back to the Executive Committee at its Twenty-second Meeting.”

(Decision 20/45)

11. Decision taken at the 16th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1995)

Low volume consuming countries

“US \$6,630,000 exclusively for allocation to projects from low-ODS-consuming countries. This amount would be in addition to any funds received as a result of approval of projects from low-ODS-consuming countries that qualified under the cost-effectiveness thresholds listed above; (part of decision on cost-effectiveness at the 16th Meeting).”

12. Decision taken at the 25th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1998)

SMEs

“Accordingly, the Executive Committee decided to include an allocation of US \$10 million from the resource allocation for 1999 for a funding window designed to facilitate pilot conversions of significant groups of small firms that met the following criteria:

- (a) Given the fact that SME projects for low-volume consuming countries are currently fully eligible, this window should apply only to group projects from countries with annual ODS consumption of 360 ODP tonnes or more;
- (b) Eligible group projects for this initial pilot programme should be in the aerosol or foam sectors only, and should include firms with annual ODS consumption not exceeding the following:

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| <u>Aerosols:</u> | | 20 ODP tonnes/yr. |
| <u>Foams:</u> | Flexible | 25 ODP tonnes/yr. |
| | Extruded polyethylene/polystyrene | 25 ODP tonnes/yr. |
| | Flexible integral skin | 10 ODP tonnes/yr. |
| | Rigid polyurethane foams | 10 ODP tonnes/yr. |

- (c) Group projects should be at a level of US \$1 million or less, and should have an overall cost-effectiveness of no more than 150 per cent of the level of the current cost-effectiveness thresholds for the relevant eligible subsectors in (b) above. Such group projects should use the most cost-effective technologies reasonably available, and should consider the possible use of centralized/group use of equipment and industrial rationalization;
- (d) The group project should be put forward with a government plan, including policies and regulations designed to ensure that the specific level of agreed reduction to be achieved was sustained;
- (e) No single country may apply for more than US \$1 million from this pilot funding window although projects from one country may cover more than one sector.”

(Decision 25/56)

13. Decision taken at the 20th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1996)

The application of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) in projects funded by the Multilateral Fund

“The Executive Committee, having considered the Secretariat’s report on the application of hydrochlorofluorocarbons in projects funded by the Multilateral Fund (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/20/69) and the recommendation of the Sub-Committee on Project Review (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/20/5, para. 59), decided:

- (a) To take note with appreciation of the Secretariat’s report;
- (b) To request the implementing agencies to ensure that adequate information on all alternative technologies was provided to enterprises converting from CFCs;
- (c) To reaffirm paragraph (b) of its decision 19/2 which stated that, in cases where conversion to HCFCs was recommended, the implementing agencies should be requested to provide a full explanation of the reasons why such conversion was recommended, together with supporting documentation that the criteria laid down by the Executive Committee for transitional substances had been met, and should make it clear that the enterprises concerned had agreed to bear the cost of subsequent conversion to non-HCFC substances.”

(Decision 20/48)

14. Decision taken at the 26th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1998)

The application of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) in projects funded by the Multilateral Fund

“The Executive Committee also noted the concerns expressed by some members of the Sub-Committee on Project Review and decided:

- (a) That the full information provided in the project document should be included in the project evaluation sheet;
- (b) That where, upon review by the Fund Secretariat, a project proposal requesting HCFC technology was considered to provide inadequate information justifying the choice of that technology, the project should be submitted for individual consideration by the Sub-Committee on Project Review.”

(Decision 26/26)

15. Decision taken at the 27th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1999)

The application of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) in projects funded by the Multilateral Fund

Projects involving HCFCs

“Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Project Review on projects involving HCFCs (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/27/13, paras. 9-12), the Executive Committee expressed its appreciation for the increased information/justification provided for the selection of HCFCs and noted that that was the level of information originally expected, and that at least that level was expected in the future; stressed to the Implementing Agencies that it considered this to be more than a paper exercise, and urged the Agencies to take seriously the obligations related to providing information on alternatives available; and decided, in recognition of Article 2F of the Montreal Protocol, to request that Implementing Agencies provide, for all future projects or groups of projects for HCFCs from any country, a letter from the Government concerned. In the letter, the country should:

- (a) Verify that it had reviewed the specific situations involved with the project(s) as well as its HCFC commitments under Article 2F;
- (b) State if it had nonetheless determined that, at the present time, the projects needed to use HCFCs for an interim period;
- (c) State that it understood that no funding would be available for the future conversion from HCFCs for these companies.”

(Decision 27/13)