



Distr.: General
12 July 2018

Original: English



United Nations Environment Programme

Implementation Committee under the
Non-Compliance Procedure for the
Montreal Protocol
Sixtieth meeting
Vienna, 8 July 2018

Report of the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol on the work of its sixtieth meeting

I. Opening of the meeting

1. The sixtieth meeting of the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol was held at the Vienna International Centre, Vienna, on 8 July 2018.
2. The President of the Committee, Ms. Miruza Mohamed (Maldives), opened the meeting at 10 a.m.
3. Ms. Tina Birmpili, Executive Secretary, Ozone Secretariat, welcomed the members of the Committee and the representatives of the Multilateral Fund secretariat and its implementing agencies. She observed that the agenda of the meeting contained only a relatively small number of items, which was a sign of the good progress parties were making in adhering to their commitments and obligations under the Montreal Protocol. The rates both of data reporting and of compliance were high, though many parties had only very recently reported their 2017 production and consumption data for ozone-depleting substances. For those parties implementing plans of action contained in their respective non-compliance decisions, the rate of compliance was also high; the Committee would be considering four such cases during the meeting. She concluded by drawing the attention of the Committee to the meeting documents prepared by the Secretariat, and to an information note on country programme data and prospects for compliance prepared by the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund, and wished the Committee a successful meeting.

II. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

A. Attendance

4. Representatives of the following Committee members attended the meeting: Australia, Chile, Georgia, Jordan, Maldives, Paraguay, Poland, South Africa and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The representative of the Congo was not present.
5. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund and representatives of the implementing agencies of the Multilateral Fund – the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the World Bank.
6. A list of participants is set out in the annex to the present report.

B. Adoption of the agenda

7. The Committee adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/60/R.1):

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
3. Presentation by the Secretariat on data and information under Articles 7 and 9 of the Montreal Protocol and on related issues.
4. Presentation by the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on relevant decisions of the Executive Committee of the Fund and on activities carried out by the implementing agencies to facilitate compliance by parties.
5. Follow-up on previous decisions of the parties and recommendations of the Implementation Committee on non-compliance-related issues: existing plans of action to return to compliance:
 - (a) Democratic People's Republic of Korea (decision XXVI/15);
 - (b) Libya (decision XXVII/11);
 - (c) Kazakhstan (decision XXIX/14);
 - (d) Ukraine (decision XXIV/18).
6. Consideration of other possible non-compliance issues arising out of the data report.
7. Other matters.
8. Adoption of the recommendations and report of the meeting.
9. Closure of the meeting.

C. Organization of work

8. The Committee agreed to follow its usual procedures, but to omit item 6, as no compliance issues had yet arisen from the data submitted by parties. Responding to a question from a member of the Committee, the representative of the Secretariat said that not all the data had yet been processed, as a considerable number of reports had been submitted only recently, but that the first step in cases of possible non-compliance was in any case always to seek clarification from the party concerned before such issues could be brought to the Committee's attention. Any compliance issues remaining after that process would be drawn to the attention of the Committee at its next (sixty-first) meeting.

III. Presentation by the Secretariat on data and information under Articles 7 and 9 of the Montreal Protocol and on related issues

9. The representative of the Secretariat gave a presentation summarizing the report of the Secretariat on the information provided by parties in accordance with Articles 7 and 9 of the Montreal Protocol (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/60/R.2).

10. On reporting of information pursuant to Article 9, no new submissions had been received since the last update to the Committee at its fifty-seventh meeting, in October 2016, where it had been reported that Lithuania had submitted a report covering the period 2014–2015.

11. On reporting of data under Article 7 for 2017, 130 out of 197 parties – 104 Article 5 parties and 26 non-Article 5 parties – had reported by 7 July 2018, with a large number of parties having submitted their data only in the last few weeks.

12. For that reason, he was unable to say yet whether there were any cases of possible non-compliance; any that arose from analysis of the data would be reported to the Committee at its next meeting. For the one possible case of non-compliance by a non-Article 5 party that had been mentioned at the Committee's fifty-ninth meeting, the party concerned had provided clarification of its apparent excess production for 2016 and the issue had been resolved.

13. The only party operating with an essential-use exemption – China – had submitted its report accounting for its use of carbon tetrachloride under the exemptions granted for 2017. Similarly, all five

parties operating under critical-use exemptions for methyl bromide for 2017 – Argentina, Australia, Canada, China and South Africa – had submitted reports accounting for their use.

14. On reporting of exports and destinations of exports of ozone-depleting substances, exporting parties had reported on the destinations of almost all their exports, by weight, for the four years 2013–2016, with the proportion of weight reported on averaging almost 99 per cent. The total quantity exported had fallen since 2013, in line with the Article 5 phase-out schedules for hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs). In accordance with the request contained in decision XVII/16, the Secretariat had communicated to 138 parties the exports reported as destined for them.

15. The overall rate of reporting, for the same period, of the sources of imports had been somewhat lower, reaching 64 per cent, by weight, in 2016, though that proportion had increased since 2013. The total weight of imports had fallen, as would be expected. Out of 43 parties reported as being the source countries of imports, 8 parties had requested to be informed about such reporting concerning them, and the Secretariat had duly informed them of the imports reported as originating from them, in accordance with the provisions of decision XXIV/12.

16. Four parties were supposed to report on their use of ozone-depleting substances as process agents. So far only the European Union had done so for 2017.

17. The number of parties that left blank cells in their Article 7 data reporting forms, rather than inserting numbers, including zeroes where appropriate, had continued to fall; just 23 had done so for their 2016 data, and all of those had responded to the Secretariat's request for clarification. That represented a marked improvement since 2012.

18. The quantity of phased-out substances that continued to be produced had increased somewhat in 2016, after having remained roughly stable since 2010. Almost all (95–98 per cent) of that production was for feedstock; quantities destroyed (2–3 per cent) represented the next highest proportion, most of it unintentionally generated by-products. Overall, the total used for feedstock (about 1.2 million tonnes annually) and the relative ratios of the substances had not changed in any significant way over the last several years. Most of the feedstock uses involved HCFCs, followed by carbon tetrachloride; the remainder mostly involved CFCs and methyl chloroform.

19. Consumption of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes had risen slightly in Article 5 parties in 2016 after remaining roughly stable since 2005. Consumption in non-Article 5 parties had fallen significantly since 2005, though with considerable variation from year to year. Over the period 2015–2016 the total annual average consumption had been about 8,000 tonnes.

20. The number of parties that had reported the destruction of ozone-depleting substances had continued to rise, reaching more than 25 in 2016. The total weight of substances destroyed had fallen by about half, however, since its peak in 2007.

21. A member of the Committee asked what the Secretariat did to encourage the reporting of data on the sources of imports, given that in 2016, fully 103 out of 161 importing countries had not provided any information on the sources of their imports. The representative of the Secretariat pointed out that the reporting was not obligatory, but that the Secretariat always wrote back to parties having submitted Article 7 data without such information, inviting them to report the information. However, it did not pursue the matter further if they did not. The member suggested that the topic be discussed again at the Committee's next meeting, with a view to agreeing on a possible recommendation encouraging all parties to report such data.

22. The Committee member also suggested that the topic of blank cells in data reports by parties could be raised again at the Committee's next meeting. Although it was encouraging to see the steady fall in the number of parties leaving blank cells, there were still several of them, which created unnecessary work for the Secretariat; the Committee could perhaps consider a recommendation encouraging parties not to leave blank cells in their data reports. The representative of the Secretariat acknowledged the additional work involved in resolving such issues and noted that the matter had been raised at the Committee's previous two meetings, culminating in decision XXIX/18, in which the parties had been urged to comply with the requirement in question.

23. Responding to a question about an apparent discrepancy between the report of the Secretariat and that of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on reporting of process agent uses, the representative of the Secretariat clarified that all parties had reported as required by decision X/14 on their consumption data for process agents to the Secretariat. The missing information that the Panel had mentioned in its report referred to information from one party on the range of process agents it still used, as requested in paragraph 2 of decision XXIX/7.

24. Responding to a question on parties' submission of national management strategies for their use of methyl bromide for critical-use exemptions, as recorded in decision Ex.I/4, the representative of the Secretariat clarified that according to the Secretariat's understanding, the decision only requested the information to be submitted once, before 1 February 2006; accordingly, the Secretariat did not insist on Article 5 parties making such submissions. Nevertheless, such strategies had been received so far from two Article 5 parties, China and Mexico.
25. Responding to a question about the rise in production of phased-out substances in 2016, and while requesting members to protect the confidentiality of information received in confidence, as per the non-compliance procedure, the representative of the Secretariat informed the Committee that most of the increase was attributable to production in two parties, and that the main substances were CFC-113 and CFC-114, which had been produced mainly for use as feedstock.
26. Finally, and in response to a request for more information, the representative of the Secretariat indicated that the Secretariat's report to the next meeting of the Implementation Committee could contain information on trends in the timeliness of data reporting.
27. The Committee took note of the information presented.

IV. Presentation by the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on relevant decisions of the Executive Committee of the Fund and on activities carried out by implementing agencies to facilitate compliance by parties

28. The representative of the Multilateral Fund secretariat reported on relevant decisions of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund and on activities carried out by implementing agencies, summarizing information provided in the annex to the note by the Secretariat on country programme data and prospects for compliance (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/60/INF/R.3). He noted that the Executive Committee had held only one meeting – its eighty-first – since the last meeting of the Implementation Committee, and expressed his appreciation for the attendance of the President of the Implementation Committee at that meeting.
29. He noted that the Fund secretariat always checked the country programme data submitted to it against the production and consumption data reported to the Ozone Secretariat under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, and any discrepancies were communicated to the relevant implementing agency for further action. Two such discrepancies had come to light in recent reports: for Morocco for 2015 and for the Syrian Arab Republic for 2016. The former was being clarified with UNEP, but the latter could not be resolved, as Syria's institutional strengthening project had been frozen for a number of years due to the political and security situation in the country.
30. Pursuant to decision 81/4 of the Executive Committee, the Fund secretariat was in the process of preparing a draft country programme data reporting format incorporating Annex F substances (hydrofluorocarbons – HFCs), taking into account the revised Article 7 data reporting forms scheduled to be considered for possible approval by the Thirtieth Meeting of the Parties in November 2018.
31. The most recent country programme data showed a steady reduction in the production and consumption of the three main HCFCs in use in Article 5 parties (HCFC-22, HCFC-141b and HCFC-142b), as would be expected. HCFC phase-out management plans for consumption had been approved for all countries except the Syrian Arab Republic, while an HCFC phase-out management plan for production had been approved for China (representing about 95 per cent of global production); additional funding had been approved at the eighty-first meeting of the Executive Committee. The starting points for the reduction in HCFC consumption in Burundi and Ghana had been over-estimated; Burundi's had been revised downwards, and Ghana's would be similarly revised when that country next applied for assistance.
32. Most of the HCFC-based foam manufacturing, a large portion of HCFC-based air-conditioning manufacturing, and most of the HCFCs used in aerosol and solvent applications were already in the process of conversion, mostly to low-global-warming-potential alternatives. All parties were also addressing the refrigeration servicing sector. Several had issued regulations banning imports of specific HCFCs once conversion had been completed, or banning imports of HCFC-based equipment. The cumulative amount of HCFCs to be phased out once the approved phase-out management plans had been completed was over 19,740 ODP-tonnes (over 60 per cent of the starting point), including 99 per cent of HCFC-141b, 64 per cent of HCFC-142b and 39 per cent of HCFC-22.

33. As for matters related to the Kigali Amendment, the Executive Committee had been developing guidelines for funding the phase-down of HFC production and consumption since the Amendment had been adopted; it would submit an update on progress to the Thirtieth Meeting of the Parties.

34. Criteria for the Executive Committee's consideration of assistance for enabling activities included the ratification of the Kigali Amendment, or the receipt of a letter indicating the Government's intention to ratify it as early as possible, and the existence of an operational import and export licensing scheme for HFCs. The initial activities eligible for assistance were those identified in paragraph 20 of decision XXVIII/2, including support for institutional arrangements, licensing systems, HFC data reporting and demonstration of non-investment activities. Those enabling activities should be completed within 18 months, though that period could, if necessary, be extended by up to 12 months. A final report would be produced highlighting lessons learned from those activities. So far the Executive Committee had approved \$17.2 million for enabling activities in 119 Article 5 parties (including six Article 5 group 2 parties).

35. The Executive Committee had also agreed to consider providing assistance to HFC-related projects in the manufacturing sector, in order to gain experience with the incremental costs associated with phasing down HFCs. Again, this would require the applicant country to have ratified the Kigali Amendment, or to have indicated that it would do so as early as possible. The quantity of HFCs phased down as a result of the project would be deducted from the country's starting point for future projects. The projects were intended to be carried out by individual enterprises deciding to convert to mature technologies; to be broadly replicable to the country, region or sector; to take into account geographic distribution; and to be fully implemented in no more than two years from the time of approval. To date the Executive Committee had approved \$12.4 million for such HFC investment activities, in six Article 5 countries.

36. As at 24 May 2018, 16 (out of 17) non-Article 5 parties had paid their additional voluntary contributions for HFC-related activities, for a total value of \$23.4 million. Of that amount, \$23.1 million had been disbursed; the balance would be allocated at the eighty-second meeting of the Executive Committee to fund enabling activities and/or additional HFC-related projects.

37. In addition to those activities, the Fund secretariat had been requested to prepare a document on all aspects of the refrigeration servicing sector supporting HFC phase-down. A preliminary information document had been produced containing key considerations that could assist the Executive Committee in developing a methodology for establishing the starting point for sustained aggregate reductions in HFC consumption and production. Work was also ongoing on issues related to funding the cost-effective management of stockpiles of used or unwanted controlled substances, including through destruction, in the light of the paper on the disposal of ozone-depleting substances being prepared by the Fund secretariat.

38. A document on the evaluation of cost-effective and environmentally sustainable options for the destruction of HFC-23 by-product from HCFC-22 production had been considered at the Executive Committee's eighty-first meeting. A report from an independent consultant on options and costs related to the control of HFC-23 by-product emissions in Argentina would be produced for the Executive Committee's next meeting. Finally, a document would be prepared for that meeting on cost-effective options for controlling HFC-23 by-product emissions, including the costs of closure of HCFC-22 production swing plants, together with options for monitoring.

39. One member of the Committee asked whether the information that the Fund secretariat received on licensing systems included details on whether the systems covered mixtures of ozone-depleting substances, and reclaimed and recycled substances, as this was important in controlling illegal trade. The representative of the Fund secretariat informed the Committee that a letter confirming that a licensing system was in place was a condition of eligibility for assistance, and that every Article 5 party receiving assistance had submitted such a letter. In addition, the Fund secretariat received verification reports on the operation of each licensing system.

40. Responding to questions on the data reported under country programmes, he confirmed that the figure for the consumption of methyl bromide reported in Suriname in 2017 had been incorrect. Figures for the consumption of HCFC-225 should have read "HCFC-225ca". Figures for the consumption of HCFC-141 could be correct; although the main isomer of that substance in use was HCFC-141b, some parties did have consumption of HCFC-141. Discrepancies between country programme data and Article 7 data did occasionally appear – for example, when some of the production was for stockpiling – but the Fund secretariat always investigated such discrepancies. Finally, he undertook to look further into the matter of why data for Indian production of methyl bromide had not been included in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/60/INF/R.3.

41. The Committee took note of the information presented.

V. Follow-up on previous decisions of the parties and recommendations of the Implementation Committee on issues related to non-compliance: existing plans of action to return to compliance

42. The representative of the Secretariat drew the attention of the Committee to the background information contained in documents UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/60/R.3 and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/60/INF/R.2.

A. Democratic People's Republic of Korea (decision XXVI/15)

43. The representative of the Secretariat recalled that under its plan of action to return to compliance with its obligations under the Montreal Protocol, as agreed in decision XXVI/15, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had undertaken to limit, in 2017, its production of HCFCs to 24.84 ODP-tonnes and its consumption of HCFCs to 70.16 ODP-tonnes. It had reported data for 2017 showing production of 24.81 ODP-tonnes and consumption of 69.19 ODP-tonnes.

44. The party had also committed itself, under decision XXVI/15, to monitoring its system for licensing imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances. It had reported that its licensing and quota system had been established in 2000 for the phase-out of CFCs, and had been extended in 2007 to cover HCFCs. The system included what the party described as "thorough monitoring and strict verification" undertaken by the Ministry of Land and Environmental Protection and the National Ozone Unit. The Ministry received quarterly reports from the customs authority and the Ministry for External Economic Affairs, and the data were verified on a quarterly basis by officials from the Provincial Environmental Monitoring Station by consulting documents at Customs House. The National Ozone Unit, accompanied by officials from the Provincial Environmental Monitoring Station, also conducted verification at border areas. Annual reports were made by the Ministry to the Cabinet and by the National Ozone Unit to the National Coordinating Committee for the Environment. The party had also reported that a meeting of all national stakeholders had been held at which it had been decided to set quotas to meet the limits included in the plan of action, thus ensuring compliance with the plan, in conjunction with the procedures in place for monitoring and verification.

45. The Committee therefore agreed:

(a) To note with appreciation that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had submitted its Article 7 data for 2017, which indicated that it was in compliance with its commitments for consumption and production of HCFCs for 2017 as set out in decision XXVI/15 and with its obligations under the control measures of the Montreal Protocol;

(b) To also note with appreciation that the party had provided information concerning its monitoring of the system for licensing imports and exports, pursuant to its commitment contained in paragraph 4 (c) of decision XXVI/15.

B. Libya (decision XXVII/11)

46. The representative of the Secretariat recalled that under its plan of action to return to compliance with its obligations under the Montreal Protocol, as agreed in decision XXVII/11, Libya had undertaken to limit its consumption of HCFCs to 118.4 ODP-tonnes in 2017. It had reported data showing consumption of 117.68 ODP-tonnes in 2017.

47. The party had also committed itself to monitoring the enforcement of its system for licensing imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances, to imposing a ban on the procurement of air-conditioning equipment containing HCFCs, and to considering a ban on the import of such equipment.

48. The party had reported that the situation had improved over the past year, although administrative and technical challenges remained. The National Ozone Unit, in collaboration with the customs authorities and the Ministry of Finance, carefully monitored the import and export activities of importers and end users, and the National Ozone Unit cleared requests for import licences. The list of certified importers was reviewed regularly and updated at the start of each fiscal year. The annual quota was set in line with the limits in Libya's plan of action. The Government was considering imposing a ban on the procurement of air-conditioning equipment containing HCFCs, and on imports of such equipment, before 2020, but the decision would depend on the market and the availability of

alternatives. At the same time, Libya had clearly indicated that it wished to prevent the dumping of HCFC-containing equipment in its territory.

49. Expressing appreciation for Libya's efforts, in particular given the challenging security and political situation in the country, the Committee therefore agreed:

(a) To note with appreciation that Libya had submitted its Article 7 data for 2017, which indicated that the party was in compliance with its commitment to limiting its consumption of HCFCs to no more than 118.4 ODP-tonnes for 2017, as set out in decision XXVII/11;

(b) To also note with appreciation that the party had provided information concerning the monitoring of the enforcement of its system for licensing imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances, and concerning its consideration of a ban on the procurement and import of air-conditioning equipment containing HCFCs;

(c) To encourage Libya to continue its efforts to impose a ban on the procurement of air-conditioning equipment containing HCFCs and to consider a ban on imports of such equipment, and to provide an update to the Secretariat, preferably before 31 March 2019, for consideration by the Implementation Committee at its sixty-second meeting.

Recommendation 60/1

C. Kazakhstan (decision XXIX/14)

50. The representative of the Secretariat recalled that the Twenty-Ninth Meeting of the Parties had agreed to a revision of Kazakhstan's original plan of action, which had been set out in decision XXVI/13, following discussions between the Implementation Committee and representatives of Kazakhstan. The party had explained that the Government had been improving its regulations to limit HCFC use and imports but had experienced challenges, including the lack of technical support since 2008; the poor quality of customs equipment; the lack of capacity among the companies concerned; insufficient public awareness of the dangers of the consumption of ozone-depleting substances; and uncontrolled imports from other members of the Eurasian Economic Union.

51. Under its revised plan of action to return to compliance with its obligations under the Montreal Protocol, set out in decision XXIX/14, Kazakhstan had undertaken to limit its consumption of HCFCs to 7.5 ODP-tonnes in 2017. It had recently reported data showing consumption of 6.82 ODP-tonnes in 2017.

52. Although decision XXIX/14 had not contained any commitments to specific further actions, the party had also reported that a project document was being prepared for submission to the Global Environment Facility in December 2018. The party was also planning to amend its Environmental Code with respect to regulating the import and export of ozone-depleting substances among member countries of the Eurasian Economic Union (with the amendments to be submitted to Parliament in 2019), and to develop standards for identifying, evaluating, regulating and processing ozone-depleting substances.

53. Responding to a request for further information, the representative of UNDP informed the Committee that Kazakhstan was the only country with an economy in transition that had not received assistance for its HCFC phase-out. However, in 2017 a project concept for Kazakhstan had been approved by the Global Environment Facility Council, and a detailed proposal was being developed for submission by March/April 2019 at the latest, and hopefully by December 2018. The project would take at least four years to implement fully, beginning with the re-establishment of the institutional capacity necessary to control the consumption of HCFCs.

54. The Committee agreed to note with appreciation that Kazakhstan had submitted its Article 7 data for 2017, which indicated that it was in compliance with its commitment to limiting its consumption of HCFCs to no more than 7.5 ODP-tonnes for 2017, as set out in decision XXIX/14.

D. Ukraine (decision XXIV/18)

55. The representative of the Secretariat recalled that Ukraine, under its plan of action to return to compliance with its obligations under the Montreal Protocol, as agreed in decision XXIV/18, had undertaken to limit its consumption of HCFCs to 16.42 ODP-tonnes in 2017. It had not yet reported data for 2017 and therefore its compliance could not yet be assessed.

56. The party had also committed itself to implementing a licensing and quota system for imports of ozone-depleting substances, introducing a gradual ban on the imports of equipment containing or relying on ozone-depleting substances and monitoring the operation of the ban, and passing new legislation to more closely regulate ozone-depleting substances.

57. In 2017, in its recommendation 58/2, the Committee had noted with appreciation Ukraine's submission of information on its progress towards completing the enactment of those legislative and regulatory measures, and had requested an update, by 31 March 2018, for consideration at the present meeting.

58. The party had submitted an updated progress report (included in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ImpCom/60/INF/R.2) indicating that draft legislation had been submitted to the Cabinet, which had decided to revise it to include measures to control fluorinated greenhouse gases in addition to ozone-depleting substances. The revised draft legislation had now been agreed with interested executive bodies, reviewed by the Ministry of Justice and submitted to the Cabinet; it was expected to be considered by Parliament in September/October 2018.

59. Expressing appreciation for Ukraine's efforts in that respect, the Committee indicated that it would appreciate more information on the timing of the stages the revised legislation would need to pass through before it entered into force.

60. The Committee therefore agreed:

(a) To note with appreciation the submission by Ukraine of further information relating to the progress made towards completing its legislative and regulatory process for controlling imports and exports of ozone-depleting substances for consideration by the Committee;

(b) To request Ukraine to provide an update to the Secretariat, by 15 September 2018, on the timing of each stage of the process leading to the entry into force of the legislation, for consideration by the Committee at its sixty-first meeting;

(c) To request Ukraine to report to the Secretariat its data on ozone-depleting substances for 2017, in accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 7 of the Protocol, preferably no later than 15 September 2018, to enable the Committee to assess at its sixty-first meeting the status of compliance by Ukraine with its commitments as set out in decision XXIV/18.

Recommendation 60/2

VI. Consideration of other possible non-compliance issues arising out of the data report

61. No discussion took place under the item as no compliance issues had yet arisen from the data submitted by parties.

VII. Other matters

62. No other matters were discussed.

VIII. Adoption of the recommendations and report of the meeting

63. The Committee approved the recommendations set out in the present report and agreed to entrust the finalization and approval of the meeting report to the President and the Vice-President, the latter of whom served as Rapporteur for the meeting, working in consultation with the Secretariat.

IX. Closure of the meeting

64. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the President declared the meeting closed at 12.40 p.m. on Saturday, 8 July 2018.

Annex***List of participants****Members of the Implementation Committee****Maldives**

Ms. Miruza Mohamed (President)
 Director
 Ministry of Environment and Energy
 Green Building, Handhuvaree Hingun,
 Maafannu
 Male, 20392
 Republic of Maldives
 Tel: +960 301 8366
 Fax: +960 301 8301
 Email:
 miruza.mohamed@environment.gov.mv

Australia

Ms. Lesley Dowling (Vice-President
 & Rapporteur)
 Assistant Secretary
 International Climate Change and
 Energy Innovation Division
 Department of the Environment and
 Energy
 GPO Box 787
 Canberra ACT - 2601
 Australia
 Tel: +61 2 61597266
 Cell: +61 434568724
 Email:
 lesley.dowling@environment.gov.au

Ms. Annie Gabriel
 Assistant Director
 International Ozone Protection and
 Synthetic Greenhouse Gas Section
 Department of the Environment and
 Energy
 GPO Box 787
 Canberra ACT – 2601
 Australia
 Tel: +61 2 6274 2023
 Email:
 annie.gabriel@environment.gov.au

Chile

Mr. Osvaldo-Patricio Álvarez-Pérez
 First Secretary
 Head, Department of Hazardous
 Chemicals and Waste Cluster
 Teatinos 180, piso 13
 Santiago
 Chile
 Tel: +562 2827 5096
 Cell: +569 4590 4150 or +1713 775 0386
 Email: oalvarez@minrel.gob.cl,
 osvaldoalvarezperez@hotmail.om

Mrs. Claudia Paratori (Alternate)
 Coordinator, Ozone Programme
 Office of Climate Change
 Ministry of Environment
 San Martin 73
 Santiago
 Chile
 Tel: +56 2 2573 5660
 Email: cparatori@mma.gob.cl

Georgia

Mr. Noe Megrelishvili
 National Ozone Focal Point & Chief
 Specialist
 Ambient Air Division
 Integrated Management Department
 Ministry of Environment and Natural
 Resources Protection
 6 Gulua Str.
 Tbilisi 0114
 Georgia
 Tel: +995 32 272 7228
 Cell: +995 5951 19735
 Email: n.megrelishvili@moe.gov.ge

Jordan

Eng. Emad Fattouh
 Ozone Officer
 Ozone Unit
 Ministry of Environment
 P.O. Box 1408
 11941 Amman
 Jordan
 Tel: +962 795558538
 Email: emaddn@yahoo.com

* The annex is presented without formal editing.

Paraguay

Ing. Ulises Lovera
 Punto Focal
 Dirección General del Aire
 Secretaría del Ambiente (SEAN)
 Avendia Madame Lynch No. 3500
 Asunción
 Paraguay
 Tel: +595 212 879 000 Ext.294
 Cell: +595 971702494
 Email: ulovera@seam.gov.py,
 uliseslovera@hotmail.com

Poland

Ms. Agnieszka Tomaszewska, Ph.D.
 Counsellor to the Minister
 Head of Environmental Management
 Systems and Protection of the
 Ozone Layer Team
 Department of Climate and Air Protection
 Ministry of Environment
 52-54 Wawelska Street
 Warsaw – 00-922
 Poland
 Tel: +4822 3692 498
 Cell: +48 723 189 231
 Email:
 agnieszka.tomaszewska@mos.gov.pl

Mr. Janusz Kozakiewicz, Ph.D.
 Head of Ozone Layer and Climate
 Protection Unit
 Industrial Chemistry Research Institute
 8, Rydygiera Street
 Warsaw - 01-793
 Poland
 Tel: +4822 5682 845
 Cell: +48 5004 33297
 Email: kozak@ichp.pl

South Africa

Mr. Obed Baloyi
 Chief Director, Chemicals Management
 Ministry of Environmental Affairs
 Private Bag X313, Gauteng
 Pretoria 0001
 South Africa
 Tel: +27 12 399 9843
 Email: OBaloyi@environment.gov.za

Mr. Lubabalo Maweni
 Deputy Director
 National Ozone Unit
 Ozone Layer Protection, Chemical
 Management
 Ministry of Environmental Affairs
 Private Bag X313, Gauteng
 Pretoria 0001
 South Africa
 Tel: +27 12 399 9847
 Cell: +27 74 849 5895
 Email: LMaweni@environment.gov.za;
 Lmaweni7@gmail.com

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Ms. Anita Kanji
 Policy Advisor
 Department for Food, Environment and
 Rural Affairs
 Horizon House
 Bristol, BS1 5AH
 United Kingdom
 Tel: +44 (0) 20 8225 7538
 Cell: +44 (0) 79497 99833
 Email: Anita.Kanji@Defra.gsi.gov.uk

Ms. Eva Huchne
 Legal Adviser
 Department for Food, Environment and
 Rural Affairs
 17 Smith Square, Nobel House 3E
 London-SW1P 3JR
 United Kingdom
 Tel: +44(0) 20 8026 4712
 Cell: +44(0) 7770 830040
 Email: Eva.Huchne@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Secretariats and implementing agencies

Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

Mr. Eduardo Ganem
Chief Officer
Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol
1000 de la Gauchetiere Street West
Suite 4100
Montreal, Quebec H3B 4W5,
Canada
Tel: +1 514 282 7860
Fax: +1 514 282 0068
E-mail: eganem@unmfs.org

Mr. Balaji Natarajan
Senior Project Management Officer
Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol
1000 de la Gauchetiere Street West
Suite 4100
Montreal, Quebec H3B 4W5
Canada
Tel: +1 514 282 1122
Fax: +1 514 282 0068
E-mail: balaji@unmfs.org

United Nations Environment Programme

Ms. Shamila Nair-Bedouelle
Head
UN Environment, Law Division,
OzonAction Branch
Paris 75015
France
Tel: +33 1 4437 1459
Email: shamila.nair-bedouelle@un.org

Mr. Halvart Koeppen
Programme Officer
UN Environment, Law Division,
OzonAction Branch
Paris 75015
France
Tel: +33 1 4437 1432
Email : halvart.koppen@un.org

United Nations Development Programme

Mr. Maksim Surkov
Programme Specialist
(Europe/CIS, Arab States and Africa)
Montreal Protocol and Chemicals Unit
Sustainable Development Cluster
Bureau for Policy and Programme Support
UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub for Europe and the CIS
Key Plaza, Abide-Hurriyet Cad.
Istiklal Sk.No.11, Sisli 34381Istanbul
Turkey
Tel: +90 850 288 2613
Email: maksim.surkov@undp.org

United Nations Industrial Development Organization

Mr. Yury Sorokin
Industrial Development Officer
UNIDO/Montreal Protocol Branch
Vienna International Centre
Wagramerstrasse 5
P.O. Box 300
A-1400, Vienna
Austria
Tel: +43 1 26026 5085
Cell: +43 6642 309911

World Bank

Mr. Thanavat Junchaya
Sr. Environmental Engineer
Climate Change Group
The World Bank
1818 H. Street Ave.
Washington, DC 20433,
United States of America
Tel: +1 202 473 3841
Email: tjunchaya@worldbank.org

Ozone Secretariat

Ms. Tina Birmpili
Executive Secretary
Ozone Secretariat
UN Environment
P.O. Box 30552 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 762 3885
Email: Tina.Birmpili@un.org

Ms. Megumi Seki
Deputy Executive Secretary
Ozone Secretariat
UN Environment
P.O. Box 30552 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 7623452
Email: Meg.Seki@un.org

Mr. Gilbert Bankobeza
Chief, Legal Affairs and Compliance
Ozone Secretariat
UN Environment
P.O. Box 30552 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 762 3854
Email: Gilbert.Bankobeza@un.org

Mr. Gerald Mutisya
Programme Officer
Ozone Secretariat
UN Environment
P.O. Box 30552 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 762 4057
Email: Gerald.Mutisya@un.org

Ms. Katherine Theotocatos
Programme Officer (Compliance)
Ozone Secretariat
UN Environment
P.O. Box 30552 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 762 5067
Email: Katherine.Theotocatos@un.org