



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**



Distr.
Limited

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/38
8 November 2000

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Thirty-second Meeting
Ouagadougou, 6-8 December 2000

**STRATEGIC PLANNING AND THE DRAFT THREE-YEAR BUSINESS PLAN FOR
THE MULTILATERAL FUND**

This document contains:

- Part I: Status of Article 5 Countries in Achieving Compliance with the Initial Control Measures of the Montreal Protocol, An Analysis by the Fund Secretariat
- Part II: Implementation of the Montreal Protocol through Government Policy Controls, A Status Report on Implementation by Article 5 Countries
- Part III: Draft Three-year Business Plan for the Multilateral Fund

PART I:

STATUS OF ARTICLE 5 COUNTRIES IN ACHIEVING COMPLIANCE WITH THE INITIAL CONTROL MEASURES OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL.

An Analysis by the Fund Secretariat

Introduction

1. Part I of this document contains the Status of Article 5 countries in achieving compliance with the initial control measures of the Montreal Protocol. It updates document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/31/INF.2 which was presented by the Secretariat to the Informal Meeting of the Executive Committee that preceded its 31st Meeting in July 2000 and to the 24th Meeting of the Implementation Committee.
2. The Executive Committee will continue its informal and formal discussion on strategic planning before and during its 32nd Meeting. In order to assist the discussion, the Secretariat has prepared this report on the Status of Article 5 countries in achieving compliance with the initial control measures of the Montreal Protocol.

METHODOLOGY

3. The methodology used consisted of:
 - (a) data collection and verification;
 - (b) data processing;
 - (c) data limitation; and,
 - (d) data analysis.

Data collection and verification

4. 68 Article 5 countries reported complete 1999 data to the Ozone Secretariat as contained in the document, "Reporting of Data" that will be presented to the 12th Meeting of the Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro/12/4) and the 25th Meeting of its Implementation Committee. An additional 11 countries have not reported 1999 data to the Ozone Secretariat but have reported their 1999 data to the Fund Secretariat within the context of the annual reports required by the Executive Committee on the implementation of the country programmes (Decision 17/34). Of the remaining 32 countries, the latest consumption data available was from 1998 for 27 countries, 1997 for 4 countries and 1996 for one country.

5. Data on the status of implementation of all activities and projects approved by the Executive Committee as of the end of 1999 were reported by the implementing and bilateral agencies in their annual progress reports.

6. Data on the level of phase out from projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting were obtained from project proposals.

7. Data on potential approvals during the year 2001 were obtained from the Draft Business Plan of the Multilateral Fund for the Year 2001.

Data processing

8. The Fund Secretariat introduced these data into its database.

9. The database entries were organised for each controlled substance or group of substances in a matrix where each row represents an Article 5 country whose reported and calculated data are analysed in the matrix columns.

10. Thus, each matrix includes 11 or 12 numbered columns (halon has 12): five of which represent fixed (reported) data including the baselines for compliance with the freeze and 50 per cent reduction in CFCs; latest consumption data; data on ODS to be phased out from approved but unimplemented projects, projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting, projects include in the 2001 draft business plans; and whether a country is implementing an RMP for CFCs, a halon banking project for halons (a 12th column for having received assistance for halon activities) and having received assistance for methyl bromide activities. The other 6 columns represent calculated data pertaining to the status of a country's compliance with the freeze and assessments of ODS phase-out needs to achieve compliance both with the freeze and the subsequent reduction target.

Data limitation

11. The data reported by Parties has the following limitations:

- a) the 12 month period for determining compliance with the CFC freeze does not represent a calendar year as the period begins from 1 July 1999 and ends by 30 June 2000, with official data for 2000 becoming known only in late 2001;
- b) the latest consumption either from 1998 or 1999 is reported according to the definition of the term consumption in the Montreal Protocol (consumption = production + imports – exports) which may include actual use and stockpiles. The latter is crucial when a country is not in compliance since the quantities stockpiled may amount to the difference between compliance and non-compliance.
- c) countries may change data reported for previous years which can impact the baseline for compliance and/or the latest consumption;

Data analysis

12. The analysis was not performed for 16 countries either due to insufficient data or because some countries have been urged not to seek assistance from the Multilateral Fund.

13. The analysis was not performed for the production sector because the Executive Committee has established a process for production sector projects. Of the seven Article 5 countries with CFC production facilities, the Governments of China and India have agreements in place for scheduled reductions; Argentina and Korea DPR have begun the process. The remaining countries with CFC production facilities include Mexico, Romania and Venezuela. For halon production, China has an agreement in place.

14. The analysis in Part I does not account for industrial and regulatory initiatives that could assist countries in meeting their obligations. However, Part II of this document deals exclusively with the implementation of the Montreal Protocol through government policy.

15. Analysis of the data was performed within the following boundary conditions:

- a) consumption in 2000 is assumed to be the same as that of 1999 (or 1998 if data was not reported for 1999, etc.);
- b) amount of ODS to be phased out from approved but not implemented projects and from projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting represent actual amounts to be phased out; and
- c) ODS consumption beyond 2000 is assumed not to exceed the latest reported consumption.

16. Within these boundary conditions, and on the basis of the information gathered, the Secretariat prepared three compliance profiles for each Article 5 country, one for CFCs, another for halons, and a third for methyl bromide. The profiles are included in Annexes I-III to Part I of this document.

- a) Freeze of CFCs:
 - (i) the amount of CFCs in ODP tonnes representing a country's baseline (column 1) was subtracted from its latest CFCs consumption (column 2). The result is listed for each country in column 3 of the matrix, where a zero value indicates that the country concerned is assumed to be in compliance and the non-zero values indicate the amount of phase out needed for the concerned country to be in compliance;
 - (ii) The ODP approved for phase-out but not yet implemented, which is listed in column 4 for the relevant countries and the amount in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting in column 5 was subtracted from column 3. The results are listed in column 6 where a zero value indicates that the

country will achieve compliance. The non-zero values represent the future annual amounts of CFCs needed to be permanently phased out either through new approvals by the Executive Committee, or by measures to be taken by the country concerned to reduce its consumption.

b) 50 per cent reduction in CFCs:

- (i) Latest consumption (column 2) was reduced by the amount of phase-out in projects approved, but not implemented (column 4) and the amount in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting (column 5), the results are recorded in column 9. (A negative value means that the ODP to be phased out from unimplemented (and submitted) projects will exceed the latest reported consumption by the negative amount indicated in column 9.)
- (ii) The amount in column 9 was compared with 50 per cent of the baseline (column 8) and the results were recorded in column 10. A negative value in column 10 indicates that no additional phase-out is needed to meet the 50 per cent reduction. The negative value denotes the amount by which the country will have surpassed its 50 per cent reduction target.
- (iii) As mentioned above, column 7 contains ODP phase-out that would result from the approval of projects included in the 2001 business plan. The phase-out from projects in the 2001 business plan may also have an impact on a country's ability to meet its 50 per cent reduction targets in 2005.
- (iv) Column 11 provides information on whether or not an RMP, has been approved for the country concerned by the Executive Committee. This may also have an impact on a country's ability to meet its obligations.

c) Halons:

17. A similar analysis was undertaken to determine the potential profiles of Article 5 countries with regard to the 2000 freeze and the 50 per cent reduction in 2005. Column 11 in the case of halons indicates if a halon banking activity has been approved. Column 12 indicates if halon activities have been approved for the country concerned.

d) Methyl bromide:

18. The same was done for methyl bromide with regard to the 2002 freeze and a 20 per cent reduction in 2005. Column 11 indicates whether methyl bromide activities have been approved for the country concerned.

ANALYSIS OF COMPLIANCE FOR CFCs (Annex I)

19. The findings and observations from the analysis of the freeze and 50 per cent targets for CFCs are presented in this section.

Findings

Meeting the CFC Freeze

20. The analysis revealed that countries could be broadly grouped into three categories.

(a) Countries assumed to be in compliance

21. The category represents 80 countries (compared to 64 countries in the July analysis) that could be considered to be in compliance now based on their latest reported consumption data. The countries' latest combined consumption of 90,039 ODP tonnes is some 35,474 ODP tonnes lower than their baseline level of 125,514 ODP tonnes. 53 of these countries are LVCs. All of these countries have received support from the Multilateral Fund. Whilst more countries appear to be in compliance than in the July analysis and latest consumption has decreased from 95,820 ODP tonnes, the baseline for measuring CFC compliance has increased from the July level of 120,071 ODP tonnes.

(b) Countries that could achieve compliance by the end of 2002

22. The category, which is represented by 14 countries including 8 LVCs, contains countries that could achieve compliance by 2002 if projects approved for them are implemented by that date. The projects amount to a future phase-out of 6,510 ODP tonnes.

(c) Countries that may not achieve compliance by the end of 2002

23. The 15 countries in this category include 12 LVCs. These countries may not achieve compliance by the end of 2002 based on their latest consumption data. The Executive Committee has approved RMPs for 9 of these countries. Additional action may be needed to phase-out a total of 550 ODP tonnes to bring these countries into compliance. Submission, approval and implementation of projects included in the 2001 draft business plans should bring two of these countries into compliance with the freeze in the future.

Meeting the 50 per cent reduction target in 2005

24. The analysis revealed that countries could be grouped into two categories.

(a) Countries that could achieve compliance before 2005

25. The category represents countries which could achieve compliance with the 50 per cent reduction before 2005 based on their latest reported consumption, and contingent on the implementation of the projects approved (and those submitted to the 32nd Meeting) for them.

This category consists of 52 countries including 30 LVCs. This is compared to 38 countries and 21 LVCs that was reported in the July analysis.

(b) Countries that may need additional action to achieve compliance by 2005

26. The category consists of 57 countries including 43 LVCs, which may need additional phase-out amounting to 11,469 ODP tonnes before 2005 in order to comply with the 50 per cent reduction target. Of the amount needed for phase-out, 9,510 ODP tonnes is consumed by 20 countries, which are slated in the 2001 business plans to receive projects that will phase out 6,877 ODP tonnes.

27. Of the 57 countries, the Executive Committee has approved RMPs for 28 LVCs and 3 for non-LVCs.

Observations

28. There appears to be a need for immediate actions in four countries that are at risk of not meeting their compliance with their CFC freeze obligations.

29. For another 14 countries, approved (and submitted) projects must be implemented sooner than planned to overcome the prospects of delayed compliance with their CFC freeze obligations.

30. Momentum should be maintained, phase-out from implemented projects must be sustained, vigorous implementation of RMPs and business plans, and actions on the parts of governments and the Multilateral Fund are needed for most countries to ensure their compliance with the 50 per cent reduction targets by the year 2005.

ANALYSIS OF COMPLIANCE FOR HALONS (Annex II)

31. This section presents the analysis for compliance with halon control measures except for China that is assumed to meet its obligations by existing agreement with the Executive Committee.

Additional data limitations

(a) 54 countries had a zero level of consumption for 1995 to 1999.

(b) 16 countries have not reported baseline or latest consumption data.

Findings

Meeting the Halon Freeze

32. Cognisant of the fact that the freeze is still 12 months away, the indications from the analysis suggest that:

(a) Countries would be in compliance now

33. For the 54 countries with halon consumption, 37 countries (compared to 33 in the July analysis) could be considered to be in compliance now based on their latest reported consumption data provided that this level of consumption will not increase. These countries' latest combined consumption of 1,487 ODP tonnes is some 1,685 ODP tonnes lower than their freeze baseline of 3,172 ODP tonnes. 22 of these countries are LVCs. 11 of the 37 countries have received support from the Multilateral Fund, 4 of which for halon banking. Whilst more countries appear to be in compliance than in the July analysis and latest consumption has decreased from 1,586 ODP tonnes, the baseline for measuring halon compliance has increased from the July level of 2,855 ODP tonnes.

(b) Countries that could achieve compliance by the end of 2002

34. 3 countries that could achieve compliance by the end of 2002 if projects approved for them are implemented by that date. The projects amount to a future phase-out of 1,568 ODP tonnes.

(c) Countries that may not achieve compliance by the end of 2002

35. 14 countries may not achieve compliance with the freeze target in 2002. These countries would need to phase-out a total of 2,113 ODP tonnes to achieve compliance in 2002. Three of those countries have already received support from the Fund for halon activities including one country that has received support for halon banking. The 2001 draft business plans include activities in the sector for one of the 14 countries.

Meeting the 50 per cent reduction target in 2005

36. Assuming that the latest reported consumption will not increase and that all approved (and submitted) projects are implemented before 2005, the analysis points to the following prospects for potential compliance with the 50 per cent reduction target:

(a) 35 countries could achieve compliance with the 50 per cent reduction before 2005 based on their latest reported consumption and contingent upon the implementation of approved (and submitted) projects. This group of countries includes 20 LVCs.

(b) 19 countries including 6 LVCs may need additional phase-out amounting to 3,678 ODP tonnes before 2005 in order to comply with the 50 per cent reduction targets.

Of this amount, 2,460 ODP tonnes should be phased out in Iran. The remaining 1,218 ODP tonnes represents the amount needed to be phased out in the other 18 countries to achieve compliance by 2005. Four of these 18 countries have received support for halon activities from the Multilateral Fund including halon banking in one of these countries. Submission, approval and implementation of projects included in the 2001 draft business plans could enable one of these 18 countries to achieve compliance with its 50 per cent reduction target.

Observations

37. There appears to be a need for immediate actions to enable 11 countries to achieve compliance by 2002 with their halon freeze obligations.

38. For another 3 countries, approved (and submitted) projects must be implemented sooner than planned to overcome the prospects of delayed compliance with their halon freeze obligations.

39. Momentum must be maintained, vigorous implementation of halon banking and business plans, and actions on the parts of governments and the Multilateral Fund are needed for most countries to ensure that they will be able to achieve compliance with the 50 per cent reduction targets by the year 2005.

ANALYSIS OF COMPLIANCE FOR METHYL BROMIDE (Annex III)

40. This section presents the analysis for compliance with methyl bromide control measures. It should be noted that all data reported and used in this analysis are those related to controlled use only.

Additional boundary conditions

- (a) Of the 71 Article 5 countries that have ratified the Copenhagen Amendment, only 58 countries have reported complete data to the Ozone Secretariat, which includes the baseline and 1999 data. Of these 58 countries, 14 reported zero for the baseline and latest consumption. As such only 44 countries are included in the analysis.
- (b) Phase-out projects have been approved in 11 Article 5 countries. This includes projects that will lead to a complete phase out of methyl bromide in five Article 5 countries. Four projects have been submitted to the 32nd Meeting for complete phase out of methyl bromide.

Findings

41. Countries were grouped into three categories for the purposes of this analysis: those that have ratified the Copenhagen Amendment and have provided baseline and latest consumption

data, those that have ratified the Copenhagen Amendment but have not provided sufficient data for analysis, and those that have not ratified the Copenhagen Amendment.

Meeting the Methyl Bromide Freeze

42. Cognisant of the fact that the freeze is in 2002, the indications from the analysis suggest that:

(a) Countries that have ratified the Copenhagen Amendment with data for analysis

43. Of the 44 countries that have ratified the Copenhagen Amendment, 19 countries could be considered to be in compliance now based on their latest reported consumption data provided that this level of consumption will not increase. 17 of the 19 countries that could be considered in compliance now have received assistance from the Multilateral Fund for methyl bromide activities.

44. 8 countries could achieve compliance by 2002 if projects approved for them are implemented by that date. The projects approved (and submitted) amount to a future phase-out of 900 ODP tonnes.

45. The other 17 countries may not achieve compliance with the freeze target in 2002. These countries would need to phase-out a total of 397 ODP tonnes to achieve the freeze in 2002. The Multilateral Fund has provided funding for methyl bromide projects and other activities in 10 of these countries and four, that have received assistance in the past, are slated in the 2001 draft business plans to receive projects that would enable them to achieve the freeze if these projects are approved and implemented in time.

(b) Countries that have ratified the Copenhagen Amendment without data needed for the analysis

46. 13 countries that have ratified the Copenhagen Amendment did not provide sufficient data for analysis; 4 of these 13 countries have received assistance from the Multilateral Fund.

(c) Countries that have not ratified the Copenhagen Amendment

47. Of the 54 Article 5 countries that have not ratified the Copenhagen Amendment, 23 countries reported data indicating that 15 of which could be considered to be in compliance now based on their latest reported consumption data provided that this level of consumption will not increase.

48. The Multilateral Fund has provided assistance to 9 of the 54 countries.

Meeting the 20 per cent reduction target in 2005

49. Assuming that the latest reported consumption will not increase and that all approved projects are implemented before 2005, the analysis points to the following prospects for potential compliance with the 20 per cent reduction target:

- (i) 23 of the 44 countries that provided data and have ratified the Copenhagen Amendment could achieve compliance with the 20 per cent reduction before 2005 based on their latest reported consumption and contingent upon the implementation of approved projects.
- (ii) The remaining 21 countries may need additional phase-out amounting to 720 ODP tonnes before 2005 in order to comply with the 20 per cent reduction targets. 14 of the 21 countries have received support for methyl bromide activities from the Multilateral Fund. Whilst 6 of the 21 countries have projects included in the 2001 draft business plans, the approval and timely implementation of these projects will be sufficient to enable 5 countries to achieve their 20 per cent reduction target.
- (iii) Of the 23 countries that have not ratified the Copenhagen Amendment, 12 countries could achieve their 20 per cent reduction before 2005 based on their latest reported consumption. 5 of these 12 countries have received assistance from the Multilateral Fund.

Observations

50. There appears to be a need for immediate actions to enable 7 countries to achieve compliance by 2002 with their halon freeze obligations.

51. For another 3 countries, approved (and submitted) projects must be implemented sooner than planned to overcome the prospects of delayed compliance with their methyl bromide freeze obligations.

52. Countries that have ratified the Copenhagen Amendment should provide data to the Ozone Secretariat.

53. Parties that have not ratified the Copenhagen Amendment should be encouraged to do so and report complete data to the Ozone Secretariat.

54. Since the freeze occurs in 2002 and considering that project implementation in the sector needs up to four years to be completed, urgent actions are needed by all concerned to ensure that as many countries as possible will be able to achieve (and remain in) compliance.

NOTE: A graphic presentation of the analysis for CFCs, halons, and methyl bromide has been done and will be posted on the Fund Secretariat's web site, only, as Annexes IV-VI.

CARBON TETRACHLORIDE (CTC) AND METHYL CHLOROFORM (TCA)

55. An analysis similar to that for CFCs, halons and methyl bromide was not possible to perform for CTC and TCA for the following reasons:

- (a) The baseline for compliance with the control measures applicable to CTC and TCA (average 1998-2000) will only be established sometime in 2001;
- (b) CTC consumption data were reported to the Ozone Secretariat by 25 Article 5 countries (excluding 45 countries with no consumption) for 1999 and 8 Article 5 countries (excluding 21 countries with no consumption) for 1998. An additional 11 countries have not reported 1999 data to the Ozone Secretariat but have reported their 1999 data on the implementation of Country Programme to the Fund Secretariat. Four of the reporting countries have not ratified the London Amendment;
- (c) TCA consumption data were reported to the Ozone Secretariat by 20 Article 5 countries (excluding 50 countries with no consumption) for 1999 and 10 Article 5 countries (excluding 19 countries with no consumption) for 1998. An additional 11 countries have not reported 1999 data to the Ozone Secretariat but have reported their 1999 data on the implementation of Country Programme to the Fund Secretariat. Three of the reporting countries have not ratified the London Amendment; and
- (d) Reported CTC consumption is not differentiated into uses such as solvents, process agents and feedstock (for example, China reported CTC consumption in 1998 amounting to more than 85,000 ODP tonnes, but indicated a consumption of 110 ODP tonnes in its report to the Fund Secretariat).

56. As of the end of 2000, the Executive Committee approved projects for the phase-out of 831 ODP tonnes of CTC and 585 ODP tonnes of TCA out of reported consumption of about 12,194 ODP tonnes of CTC and about 1,547 ODP tonnes of TCA.

57. Although there is no freeze of CTC for Article 5 countries that ratified the London Amendment, these countries are required to reduce their consumption by 85 per cent on 1 January 2005.

58. The World Bank plans to include CTC and TCA production closure projects in its 2001 business plans with a project for CTC in 2001 and one CTC and one TCA production closure in 2002. The 2001 draft business plans also include the CTC projects in Pakistan, Korea, DPR, and India.

59. The consumption of TCA is required to be frozen on 1 January 2003 at the average of 1998-2000, and to be reduced by 30 per cent from this baseline on 1 January 2005 for all Article 5 countries.

60. Article 5 countries should be encouraged to:

- (a) report complete data earlier rather than later in 2001 on their CTC and TCA consumption to enable the determination of the compliance baselines for the two substances;
- (b) differentiate their CTC consumption into solvent, process agent and feedstock; and,
- (c) take early action to control their consumption of CTC and TCA including the identification of potential investment projects to be included in the 2002 business plans of the implementing and bilateral agencies;
- (d) ratify the London Amendment by the countries that have not done so.

ANNEX I

CFC ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	CFC baseline (1995-1997)	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% CFC reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% CFC reduction	RMP approved (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)	
Countries assumed to be in compliance with the freeze														
Algeria	Non-LVC	1999	A7	2,119.50	1,502.20	0	454.5	202.3	0		1,059.75	845.40	-214.35	No
Antigua and Barbuda	LVC	1999	A7	10.7	-2	0	1		0		5.35	-3.00	-8.35	Yes
Argentina	Non-LVC	1999	A7	4,855.50	4,316.30	0	1,549.00	96.42	0	163	2,427.75	2,670.88	243.13	No
Bahrain	LVC	1999	CP	132.7	129	0	17		0	15	66.35	112.00	45.65	Yes
Barbados	LVC	1999	A7	21.5	16.5	0	0		0.00		10.75	16.50	5.75	No
Bostwana	LVC	1997	A7	6.8	6.8	0.00	1.5		0		3.40	5.30	1.90	Yes
Brunei Darussalem	LVC	1999	A7	78.2	36.7	0	0		0.00		39.10	36.70	-2.40	No
Burkina Faso	LVC	1999	A7	36.3	30.6	0	0	3	0		18.15	27.60	9.45	Yes
Central African Republic	LVC	1999	A7	11.3	1.4	0	5.8		0		5.65	-4.40	-10.05	No
Chile	Non-LVC	1999	CP	828.7	657.5	0	670		0	22	414.35	-12.50	-426.85	Yes
China	Non-LVC	1999	CP	57,818.70	45,592	0	16,380.20	3,301.38	0	3,788	28,909.35	25,910.42	302.45	No
Colombia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	2,208.20	985.5	0	306.6	127.2	0	130	1,104.10	551.70	-552.40	No
Comoros	LVC	1999	A7	2.5	2.5	0.00	0		0.00		1.25	2.50	1.25	No
Congo	LVC	1999	A7	11.90	9.3	0	19.2		0	5	5.95	-9.90	-15.85	No
Costa Rica	LVC	1999	A7	250.2	152.3	0	70.3		0		125.10	82.00	-43.10	No
Cote D'Ivoire	LVC	1999	A7	294.2	166.2	0	24.8		0		147.10	141.40	-5.70	Yes
Croatia	LVC	1999	CP	219.3	141.51	0	25.6		0		109.65	115.91	6.26	Yes
Cuba	Non-LVC	1999	A7	625.1	571.4	0	11.2		0	25	312.55	560.20	247.65	Yes
Cyprus	LVC	1998	A7	149.5	81	0	0		0.00		74.75	81.00	6.25	No
Dominica	LVC	1999	A7	1.5	1.1	0	0		0.00		0.75	1.10	0.35	Yes
Ecuador	LVC	1999	A7	301.4	153	0	76.1		0		150.70	76.90	-73.80	No
Egypt	Non-LVC	1999	A7	1,668.00	1,373.60	0	676.4		0		834.00	697.20	-136.80	Yes
El Salvador	LVC	1999	A7	306.6	109.5	0	58.7		0		153.30	50.80	-102.50	Yes
Fiji	LVC	1998	A7	33.4	13.1	0	5.2		0		16.70	7.90	-8.80	Yes

ANNEX I

CFC ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	CFC baseline (1995-1997)	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% CFC reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% CFC reduction	RMP approved (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)	
Gabon	LVC	1999	A7	10.30	8.30	0	12.20		0	5.00	5.15	-3.90	-9.05	Yes
Gambia	LVC	1999	A7	23.8	6.9	0	0		0.00		11.90	6.90	-5.00	Yes
Georgia	LVC	1999	CP	22.5	21.5	0	3.7		0	7.5	11.25	17.80	6.55	Yes
Grenada	LVC	1998	A7	6	3.8	0	1.2		0		3.00	2.60	-0.40	Yes
Guatemala	LVC	1999	A7	224.60	191.10	0	0.00		0.00		112.30	191.10	78.80	Yes
Guinea	LVC	1999	A7	42.4	39.9	0	0		0.00		21.20	39.90	18.70	Yes
Guyana	LVC	1999	A7	53.20	39.90	0	13.70		0		26.60	26.20	-0.40	Yes
India	Non-LVC	1998	A7	6,681.00	5,264.60	0	3,462.60	183.81	0	545	3,340.50	1,618.19	-1,722.31	No
Indonesia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	8,332.70	5,865.80	0	3,479.20		0	80	4,166.35	2,386.60	-1,779.75	No
Jordan	Non-LVC	1999	A7	673.3	398	0	429.6	12	0		336.65	-43.60	-380.25	Yes
Kiribati	LVC	1998	A7	0.7	0.5	0	0		0.00		0.35	0.50	0.15	No
Korea DPR	Non-LVC	1999	A7	441.7	106	0	0		0.00		220.85	106.00	-114.85	No
Kuwait	Non-LVC	1999	A7	480.4	450	0	0		0.00		240.20	450.00	209.80	No
Lebanon	Non-LVC	1999	CP	725.5	463.57	0	372.4		0	10	362.75	91.17	-271.58	No
Lesotho	LVC	1998	A7	5.1	3.4	0	0		0.00		2.55	3.40	0.85	Yes
Libya	Non-LVC	1997	A7	716.7	647.5	0	0	167	0	280	358.35	480.50	289.15	No
Macedonia	LVC	1999	A7	519.7	191.9	0	13.5	25	0		259.85	153.40	-106.45	Yes
Madagascar	LVC	1999	A7	47.9	26.3	0	0		0.00		23.95	26.30	2.35	Yes
Malawi	LVC	1999	A7	57.7	50.9	0	33		0		28.85	17.90	-10.95	Yes
Malaysia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	3,271.1	2,010.1	0	830.3	133.12	0		1,635.55	1,046.68	-588.87	No
Maldives	LVC	1998	A7	4.6	0.9	0	0		0.00		2.30	0.90	-1.40	No
Mauritania	LVC	1999	A7	15.7	13.4	0	2		0		7.85	11.40	3.55	No
Mauritius	LVC	1999	A7	29.1	18.6	0	24		0		14.55	-5.40	-19.95	Yes
Mexico	Non-LVC	1999	A7	4,624.9	2,837.9	0	635.9	988	0	240	2,312.45	1,214.00	-1,098.45	No
Moldova	LVC	1999	A7	73.3	11.1	0	21.9		0		36.65	-10.80	-47.45	Yes
Myanmar	LVC	1999	A7	54.3	30.7	0	0		0.00		27.15	30.70	3.55	No

ANNEX I														
CFC ANALYSIS														
Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	CFC baseline (1995-1997)	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% CFC reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% CFC reduction	RMP approved (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)	
Namibia	LVC	1999	CP	21.9	16.76	0	5.4		0		10.95	11.36	0.41	Yes
Nicaragua	LVC	1999	CP	82.8	52.6	0	12.8		0		41.40	39.80	-1.60	Yes
Pakistan	Non-LVC	1998	A7	1,679.4	1,196.0	0	1,261.20	78.68	0		839.70	-143.88	-983.58	No
Panama	LVC	1999	A7	384.2	301.1	0	42		0		192.10	259.10	67.00	Yes
Philippines	Non-LVC	1999	CP	3,055.90	2,087.60	0	94.7		0		1,527.95	1,992.90	464.95	No
Romania	Non-LVC	1999	A7	675.8	338.2	0	192.4		0		337.9	145.80	-192.1	Yes
Saint Kitts and Nevis	LVC	1997	A7	3.7	3.6	0	2		0		1.85	1.60	-0.25	Yes
Saint Lucia	LVC	1998	A7	8.3	6.3	0	3		0		4.15	3.30	-0.85	Yes
Senegal	LVC	1999	A7	155.8	121.1	0	0		0.00		77.90	121.10	43.20	No
Seychelles	LVC	1999	A7	2.8	1.1	0	0		0.00		1.40	1.10	-0.30	Yes
Slovenia	LVC	1999	A7	118.4	0.1	0	0		0.00		59.20	0.10	-59.10	No
Solomon Islands	LVC	1998	A7	2.1	0.8	0	0		0.00		1.05	0.80	-0.25	No
South Africa	Non-LVC	1999	A7	592.6	117.3	0	0		0.00		296.30	117.30	-179.00	No
Sri Lanka	LVC	1999	A7	400.4	216.4	0	5	5	0		200.20	206.40	6.20	No
Sudan	LVC	1999	A7	456.8	294.5	0	97.6		0		228.40	196.90	-31.50	Yes
Swaziland	LVC	1999	A7	24.6	2.1	0	4		0		12.30	-1.90	-14.20	Yes
Syria	Non-LVC	1999	CP	2,224.60	1,280.70	0	910.3	103.43	0	37.5	1,112.30	266.97	-845.33	Yes
Tanzania	LVC	1999	A7	253.9	88.9	0	160.2		0		126.95	-71.26	-198.21	Yes
Thailand	Non-LVC	1999	A7	6,082.10	3,610.60	0	1,564.70	22.70	0		3,041.05	2,023.20	-1,017.85	No
Trinidad and Tobago	LVC	1999	A7	120	81.7	0	46.5		0		60.00	35.18	-24.82	Yes
Tunisia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	870.1	566	0	358.7	56.6	0	53	435.05	150.70	-284.35	No
Turkey	Non-LVC	1999	A7	3,805.70	1,791.10	0	928.2	1958.45	0	330	1,902.85	-1,095.55	-2,998.40	No
Tuvalu	LVC	1999	A7	0.3	0.2	0	0		0.00		0.15	0.20	0.05	No
Uganda	LVC	1999	A7	12.8	12.2	0	0		0.00		6.40	12.20	5.80	Yes
Uruguay	LVC	1999	A7	199.1	111.4	0	11.3		0		99.55	100.10	0.55	Yes
Venezuela	Non-LVC	1999	A7	3,321.60	1,922.10	0	496.5	60.1	0	20	1660.8	1,365.50	-295.3	No

ANNEX I

CFC ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	CFC baseline (1995-1997)	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% CFC reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% CFC reduction	RMP approved (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)	
Vietnam	Non-LVC	1999	A7	500	293.9	0	128.1		0	86.6	250.00	165.80	-84.20	No
Yugoslavia	Non-LVC	1998	A7	849.2	519.4	0	0		0.00		424.60	519.40	94.80	No
Zambia	LVC	1998	A7	27.4	26.7	0	0		0.00		13.70	26.70	13.00	Yes
Zimbabwe	LVC	1999	A7	451.4	229.1	0	6.9		0		225.70	222.20	-3.50	Yes
Countries that could achieved the freeze compliance by the end of 2002														
Bolivia	LVC	1999	A7	52.7	61.9	9.20	18.8		0	40	26.35	43.10	16.75	No
Brazil	Non-LVC	1999	A7	10,525.80	11,612.00	1,086.20	1,881.70	518.30	0	1155	5,262.90	9,212.00	3,949.10	No
Cameroon	Non-LVC	1999	A7	256.9	361.5	104.60	250		0		128.45	111.50	-16.95	No
Chad	LVC	1998	A7	34.6	38.1	3.50	8.8		0	5	17.30	29.30	12.00	Yes
Ghana	LVC	1999	A7	35.6	46.8	11.20	38	4	0		17.80	4.80	-13.00	No
Honduras	LVC	1999	A7	331.6	334.8	3.20	14.2		0		165.80	320.60	154.80	Yes
Iran	Non-LVC	1998	A7	4,635.00	5,571.00	936.00	1168.3	381.68	0	651	2,317.50	4,021.02	1,703.52	No
Kenya	LVC	1999	A7	239.5	241.1	1.60	8.5		0		119.75	232.60	112.85	Yes
Mali	LVC	1998	A7	108.1	113.1	5.00	19.5	6.3	0	7.5	54.05	87.30	33.25	Yes
Morocco	Non-LVC	1998	A7	802.3	923.6	121.30	669.9	17.3	0	12	401.15	236.40	-164.75	No
Nepal	LVC	1998	A7	27	32.9	5.90	6		0		13.50	26.90	13.40	Yes
Nigeria	Non-LVC	1998	A7	3,650.00	4,761.50	1,111.50	1094	185.52	0	579	1,825.00	3,481.98	1,656.98	No
Peru	LVC	1999	A7	289.5	295.6	6.10	39.8		0	14	144.75	255.80	111.05	Yes
Yemen	Non-LVC	1998	A7	349.1	453.3	104.20	0	179.3	0	37	174.55	274.00	99.45	No
Countries may not achieved freeze compliance by the end of 2002														
Bahamas	LVC	1998	A7	38.7	54.6	15.90	12.6		3.30		19.35	42.00	22.65	Yes
Bangladesh	Non-LVC	1997	A7	580.4	832.2	251.80	136.2		115.60		290.20	696.00	405.80	Yes
Belize	LVC	1998	A7	13.6	25	11.40	1.7		9.70		6.80	23.30	16.50	Yes
Benin	LVC	1999	A7	60	123	63.00	0	27.3	35.70		30.00	95.70	65.70	No

ANNEX I														
CFC ANALYSIS														
Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	CFC baseline (1995-1997)	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% CFC reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% CFC reduction	RMP approved (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)	
Burundi	LVC	1998	A7	59	64.5	5.50	5.4		0.10	30	29.50	59.10	29.60	Yes
Dominican Republic	Non-LVC	1999	CP	539.8	752.1	212.30	116.5		95.80	30	269.90	635.60	365.70	Yes
Ethiopia	LVC	1998	A7	33.8	38.2	4.40	0		4.40		16.90	38.20	21.30	Yes
Jamaica	LVC	1999	A7	93.2	153.6	60.40	9.6		50.80	10	46.6	144.00	97.40	Yes
Mongolia	LVC	1999	A7	10.6	20.6	10.00	0		10.00	10	5.30	20.60	15.30	No
Niger	LVC	1999	A7	32	58.3	26.30	5.8		20.50	7.5	16	52.50	36.50	Yes
Papua New Guinea	LVC	1998	A7	36.2	45.2	9.00	0		9.00		18.10	45.20	27.10	No
Paraguay	Non-LVC	1999	A7	146.9	345.3	198.40	0	23.049	175.35	22	73.45	322.25	248.80	No
Qatar	LVC	1998	A7	101.4	120.8	19.40	0		19.40		50.70	120.80	70.10	No
Saint Vincent	LVC	1998	A7	1.8	2.3	0.50	0		0.50		0.90	2.30	1.40	Yes
Samoa	LVC	1999	A7	4.5	4.8	0.30	0		0.30		2.25	4.80	2.55	No
Countries with No Data Reported														
Albania	NDR			NDR	NDR									No
Angola	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Bosnia and Herzegovina	LVC	1998	A7	NDR	45.1		0		0.00	44.5		45.10		No
Congo, DR	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00	40.13				No
Djibouti	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Haiti	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Lao's People Democratic Republic	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Liberia	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Marshall Islands	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Micronesia	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Mozambique	LVC	1996	A7	NDR	21.7				0.00			21.70		Yes
Oman	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No

ANNEX I														
CFC ANALYSIS														
Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	CFC baseline (1995-1997)	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% CFC reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% CFC reduction	RMP approved (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)	
Suriname	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Togo	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Tonga	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Vanuatu	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No

ANNEX II

HALON ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Country		Year	Source	Halon baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% halon reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% halon reduction	Halon banking approved (Yes/No)	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)		
Countries assumed to be in compliance with the freeze															
Algeria	Non-LVC	1999	A7	237.3	195	0	0		0.00		118.65	195	76.35	No	Yes
Antigua and Barbuda	LVC	1999	A7	0.3	0	0	0		0.00		0.15	0	-0.15	No	No
Argentina	Non-LVC	1999	A7	401.1	0	0	200		0		200.55	-200	-400.55	Yes	Yes
Bahrain	LVC	1999	CP	39.8	17.5	0	0		0.00		19.9	17.5	-2.4	No	No
Benin	LVC	1999	A7	3.9	0	0	0		0.00		1.95	0	-1.95	No	No
Brazil	Non-LVC	1999	A7	21.3	3	0	0		0.00		10.65	3	-7.65	Yes	Yes
Burkina Faso	LVC	1999	A7	5.3	0	0	0		0.00		2.65	0	-2.65	No	No
Chile	Non-LVC	1999	CP	8.5	0	0	0		0.00		4.25	0	-4.25	No	No
Colombia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	187.7	0	0	0		0.00		93.85	0	-93.85	No	No
Congo	LVC	1999	A7	5	5	0.0	0		0.00		2.5	5	2.5	No	No
Croatia	LVC	1999	CP	17.3	3	0	0		0.00		8.65	3	-5.65	No	No
Ecuador	LVC	1999	A7	5.5	0	0	0		0.00		2.75	0	-2.75	No	Yes
El Salvador	LVC	1999	A7	0.7	0	0	0		0.00		0.35	0	-0.35	No	No
Ethiopia	LVC	1998	A7	1.1	0	0	0		0.00		0.55	0	-0.55	No	No
Guatemala	LVC	1999	A7	0.2	0	0	0		0.00		0.1	0	-0.1	No	No
Guinea	LVC	1999	A7	8.6	0.1	0	0		0.00		4.3	0.1	-4.2	No	No
India	Non-LVC	1998	A7	448.4	202	0	1,306.10	1,027.60	0		224.2	-2131.7	-2355.9	No	Yes
Indonesia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	354	0	0	972		0		177	-972	-1149	Yes	Yes
Jamaica	LVC	1999	A7	1	0	0	0		0.00		0.5	0	-0.5	No	No
Kenya	LVC	1999	A7	5.3	0	0	0		0.00		2.65	0	-2.65	No	No
Kuwait	Non-LVC	1999	A7	3	0	0	0		0.00		1.5	0	-1.5	No	No
Lesotho	LVC	1998	A7	0.2	0	0	0		0.00		0.1	0	-0.1	No	No

ANNEX II

HALON ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Country		Year	Source	Halon baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% halon reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% halon reduction	Halon banking approved (Yes/No)	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)		
Libya	Non-LVC	1997	A7	633.1	586.5	0	0		0.00		316.55	586.5	269.95	No	No
Macedonia	LVC	1999	A7	32.1	0	0	0		0.00		16.05	0	-16.05	No	No
Malaysia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	8	0	0	0		0.00		4	0	-4	No	Yes
Moldova	LVC	1999	A7	0.4	0	0	0		0.00		0.2	0	-0.2	No	No
Morocco	Non-LVC	1998	A7	7	0	0	0		0.00		3.5	0	-3.5	No	Yes
Namibia	LVC	1999	CP	8.3	7.67	0	0		0.00		4.15	7.67	3.52	No	No
Nepal	LVC	1998	A7	2	0	0	0		0.00		1	0	-1	No	No
Philippines	Non-LVC	1999	CP	103.9	46.8	0	77		0		51.95	-30.2	-82.15	No	Yes
Qatar	LVC	1998	A7	10.6	3	0	0		0.00		5.3	3	-2.3	No	No
Romania	Non-LVC	1999	A7	3.5	0	0	0		0.00		1.75	0	-1.75	No	No
Sudan	LVC	1999	A7	2	0	0	0		0.00		1	0	-1	No	No
Syria	Non-LVC	1999	CP	416.9	412.6	0	0		0.00		208.45	412.6	204.15	Yes	Yes
Trinidad and Tobago	LVC	1999	A7	46.6	5	0	0		0.00		23.3	5	-18.3	No	No
Turkey	Non-LVC	1999	A7	141	0	0	0		0.00	800	70.5	0	-70.5	No	Yes
Zimbabwe	LVC	1999	A7	1.5	0	0	0		0.00		0.75	0	-0.75	No	No
Countries that could achieved the freeze compliance by the end of 2002															
Egypt	Non-LVC	1999	A7	705	810	105.0	0	754	0		352.5	56	-296.5	No	Yes
Jordan	Non-LVC	1999	A7	210	255	45.0	0	421.8	0		105	-166.8	-271.8	Yes	Yes
Thailand	Non-LVC	1999	A7	271.7	500	228.3	0	392.60	0		135.85	107.401	-28.449	Yes	Yes
Countries may not achieved freeze compliance by the end of 2002															
Botswana	LVC	1997	A7	5.2	9	3.8	0		3.80		2.6	9	6.4	No	No
Cameroon	Non-LVC	1999	A7	2.4	8.1	5.7	0		5.70		1.2	8.1	6.9	No	No

ANNEX II

HALON ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Country		Year	Source	Halon baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% halon reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% halon reduction	Halon banking approved (Yes/No)	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)		
Cyprus	LVC	1998	A7	12.8	48.6	35.8	0		35.80		6.4	48.6	42.2	No	No
Dominican Republic	Non-LVC	1999	CP	4.2	6	1.8	0		1.80		2.1	6	3.9	No	No
Guyana	LVC	1999	A7	0.1	0.2	0.1	0		0.10		0.05	0.2	0.15	No	No
Iran	Non-LVC	1998	A7	1,420	3,170	1,750.0	0		1,750.00		710	3170	2460	Yes	Yes
Mexico	Non-LVC	1999	A7	124.6	141	16.4	0		16.40	213	62.3	141	78.7	No	Yes
Nigeria	Non-LVC	1998	A7	285.3	472	186.7	0		186.70		142.65	472	329.35	No	No
Pakistan	Non-LVC	1998	A7	14.2	15	0.8	0		0.80		7.1	15	7.9	No	No
Tanzania	LVC	1999	A7	0.3	10.7	10.4	0		10.40		0.15	10.7	10.55	No	No
Tunisia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	104.3	150	45.7	0		45.70		52.15	150	97.85	No	No
Vietnam	Non-LVC	1999	A7	37.1	76	38.9	0		38.90		18.55	76	57.45	No	Yes
Yemen	Non-LVC	1998	A7	2.8	4.2	1.4	0		1.40		1.4	4.2	2.8	No	No
Yugoslavia	Non-LVC	1998	A7	3.8	19.5	15.7	0		15.70		1.9	19.5	17.6	No	No
Countries with No Consumption															
Bahamas	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Bangladesh	Non-LVC	1997	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Barbados	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Belize	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Bolivia	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Brunei Darussalem	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Burundi	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Central African Republic	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Chad	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Comoros	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No

ANNEX II

HALON ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Country		Year	Source	Halon baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% halon reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% halon reduction	Halon banking approved (Yes/No)	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)		
Costa Rica	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Cote D'Ivoire	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Cuba	Non-LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Dominica	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Fiji	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Gabon	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Gambia	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Georgia	LVC	1999	CP	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Ghana	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Grenada	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Honduras	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Kiribati	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Korea, DPR	Non-LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Lebanon	Non-LVC	1999	CP	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Malawi	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Madagascar	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Maldives	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Mali	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Mauritania	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Mauritius	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Mongolia	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Myanmar	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Nicaragua	LVC	1999	CP	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Niger	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No

ANNEX II

HALON ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Country		Year	Source	Halon baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% halon reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% halon reduction	Halon banking approved (Yes/No)	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)		
Panama	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	Yes
Papua New Guinea	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Paraguay	Non-LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Peru	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Saint Kitts and Nevis	LVC	1997	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Saint Lucia	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Saint Vincent	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Samoa	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Senegal	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Seychelles	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Slovenia	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Solomon Islands	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
South Africa	Non-LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Sri Lanka	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Swaziland	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Tuvalu	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Uganda	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Uruguay	LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Venezuela	Non-LVC	1999	A7	0	0				0.00			0		Yes	Yes
Zambia	LVC	1998	A7	0	0				0.00			0		No	No
Countries with No Data Reported															
Albania	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Angola	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No

ANNEX II

HALON ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Country		Year	Source	Halon baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	50% halon reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 50% halon reduction	Halon banking approved (Yes/No)	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.50	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9) - (8)		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	LVC	1998	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0		No	No
Congo, DR	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Djibouti	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Haiti	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Lao People's Democratic Republic	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Liberia	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Marshall Islands	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Micronesia	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Mozambique	LVC	1996	A7	NDR	1.4				0.00			1.4		No	No
Oman	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Suriname	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Togo	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Tonga	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No
Vanuatu	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No	No

* China excluded from the analysis because the Committee has approved a phase-out plan for this substance.

ANNEX III

METHYL BROMIDE ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	Methyl bromide baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	Allowable consumption in 2005 after 20% reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 20% methyl bromide reduction	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.80	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9)-(8)	
COUNTRIES THAT HAVE RATIFIED THE COPENHAGEN AMENDMENT														
Countries assumed to be in compliance with the freeze														
Brazil	Non-LVC	1999	A7	711.6	275.5	0	84.4		0		569.28	191.10	-378.18	Yes
Chile	Non-LVC	1999	CP	212.5	131.14	0	0	76.2	0	40	170	54.94	-115.06	Yes
Colombia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	110.1	0	0	0		0.00		88.08	0.00	-88.08	Yes
Indonesia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	135.6	0	0	0		0.00		108.48	0.00	-108.48	Yes
Jordan	Non-LVC	1999	A7	176.25	88.8	0	180		0		141	-91.20	-232.2	Yes
Kenya	LVC	1999	A7	217.5	60	0	0		0.00		174	60.00	-114	Yes
Lebanon	Non-LVC	1999	CP	152.38	139.31	0	0		0.00	82	121.904	139.31	17.41	Yes
Malaysia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	14.6	0	0	0		0.00		11.68	0.00	-11.68	Yes
Mexico	Non-LVC	1999	A7	1,130.80	839.40	0	0		0.00		904.64	839.40	-65.24	Yes
Pakistan	Non-LVC	1998	A7	13.95	0	0	0		0.00		11.16	0.00	-11.16	Yes
Panama	LVC	1999	A7	0.09	0	0	0		0.00		0.072	0.00	-0.072	No
Senegal	LVC	1999	A7	53.16	0.7	0	0.7		0		42.528	0.00	-42.528	Yes
Slovenia	LVC	1999	A7	0.15	0	0	0		0.00		0.12	0.00	-0.12	No
Syria	Non-LVC	1999	CP	188.5	89.67	0	0	175	0		150.8	-85.33	-236.13	Yes
Tunisia	Non-LVC	1999	A7	8.25	7.8	0	0		0.00	3.6	6.6	7.80	1.2	Yes
Turkey	Non-LVC	1999	A7	479.7	342.6	0	80		0	266	383.76	262.60	-121.16	Yes
Venezuela	Non-LVC	1999	A7	10.28	0	0	0		0.00		8.224	0.00	-8.224	Yes
Vietnam	Non-LVC	1999	A7	136.5	57	0	0		0.00		109.2	57.00	-52.2	Yes
Zimbabwe	LVC	1999	A7	556.95	490.3	0	0		0.00		445.56	490.30	44.74	Yes
Countries that could achieved the freeze compliance by the end of 2002														

ANNEX III

METHYL BROMIDE ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	Methyl bromide baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	Allowable consumption in 2005 after 20% reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 20% methyl bromide reduction	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.80	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9)-(8)	
Argentina	Non-LVC	1999	A7	411.3	468	56.70	331		0	70	329.04	137.00	-192.04	Yes
Cuba	Non-LVC	1999	A7	50.47	62.1	11.63	48		0		40.376	14.10	-26.276	Yes
Iran	Non-LVC	1998	A7	35.25	42	6.75	12.4		0		28.2	29.60	1.4	Yes
Macedonia	LVC	1999	A7	12.2	27.2	15.00	0	48.4	0		9.76	-21.20	-30.96	Yes
Malawi	LVC	1999	A7	112.7	129	16.30	0	132	0	33	90.16	-3.00	-93.16	Yes
Morocco	Non-LVC	1998	A7	695.9	959.4	263.50	61	259	0	390	556.72	639.40	82.68	Yes
Peru	LVC	1999	A7	1.28	3.1	1.82	4		0		1.024	-0.90	-1.924	Yes
Sri Lanka	LVC	1999	A7	4.08	6.5	2.42	3.9		0		3.264	2.60	-0.664	Yes
Countries may not achieved freeze compliance by the end of 2002														
Algeria	Non-LVC	1999	A7	4.7	6	1.30	0		1.30		3.76	6.00	2.24	Yes
Bahamas	LVC	1998	A7	0.15	0.6	0.45	0		0.45		0.12	0.60	0.48	No
Barbados	LVC	1999	A7	0.08	3.3	3.22	0		3.22		0.064	3.30	3.236	No
Benin	LVC	1999	A7	0	0.7	0.70	0		0.70		0	0.70	0.7	No
Cameroon	Non-LVC	1999	A7	18.1	25.5	7.40	0		7.40		14.48	25.50	11.02	Yes
Costa Rica	LVC	1999	A7	434.25	567.6	133.35	0		133.35		347.4	567.60	220.2	Yes
Croatia	LVC	1999	CP	15.69	16.11	0.42	0		0.42	18	12.552	16.11	3.558	Yes
Ecuador	LVC	1999	A7	66.23	122.4	56.17	0		56.17	60	52.984	122.40	69.416	Yes
Egypt	Non-LVC	1999	A7	238.1	409.2	171.10	0		171.10		190.48	409.20	218.72	Yes
Guyana	LVC	1999	A7	1.39	1.5	0.11	0		0.11		1.112	1.50	0.388	No
Jamaica	LVC	1999	A7	4.9	7.1	2.20	0		2.20		3.92	7.10	3.18	Yes
Mauritius	LVC	1999	A7	0.09	0.4	0.31	0		0.31		0.072	0.40	0.328	No
Nicaragua	LVC	1999	CP	0.42	2.09	1.67	0		1.67		0.336	2.09	1.754	No
Thailand	Non-LVC	1999	A7	164.9	172.2	7.30	0		7.30		131.92	172.20	40.28	Yes
Trinidad and Tobago	LVC	1999	A7	1.7	2.1	0.40	0		0.40		1.36	2.10	0.74	No

ANNEX III

METHYL BROMIDE ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	Methyl bromide baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	Allowable consumption in 2005 after 20% reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 20% methyl bromide reduction	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.80	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9)-(8)	
Uganda	LVC	1999	A7	1.87	2.4	0.53	0		0.53	4	1.496	2.40	0.904	Yes
Uruguay	LVC	1999	A7	11.2	21.7	10.50	0		10.50	40	8.96	21.70	12.74	Yes
Countries with No Consumption														
Antigua and Barbuda	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Belize	LVC	1998	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Bolivia	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00	1	0	0.00	0	Yes
Burkina Faso	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Grenada	LVC	1998	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Kuwait	Non-LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Mongolia	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Niger	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Qatar	LVC	1998	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Saint Lucia	LVC	1998	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Saint Vincent	LVC	1998	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Seychelles	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Solomon Islands	LVC	1998	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Tuvalu	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0	No
Countries with No Data Reported														
Botswana	LVC	1997	A7	NDR	0.4				0.00			0.40		Yes
Congo, DR	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Djibouti	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Fiji	LVC	1998	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		No
Georgia	LVC	1999	CP	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		Yes

ANNEX III

METHYL BROMIDE ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	Methyl bromide baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	Allowable consumption in 2005 after 20% reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 20% methyl bromide reduction	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.80	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9)-(8)	
Korea, D. R.	Non-LVC	1999	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		Yes
Liberia	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Marshall Islands	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Mozambique	LVC	1996	A7	NDR	2.7				0.00			2.70		Yes
Oman	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Saint Kitts and Nevis	LVC	1997	A7	NDR	0.3				0.00			0.30		No
Togo	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Vanuatu	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
COUNTRIES THAT HAVE NOT RATIFIED THE COPENHAGEN AMENDMENT														
Countries assumed to be in compliance with the freeze														
Cote D'Ivoire	LVC	1999	A7	8.14	0	0	0		0.00		6.512	0.00	-6.51	Yes
Dominican Republic	Non-LVC	1999	CP	104.23	77.4	0	0		0.00		83.384	77.40	-5.98	Yes
El Salvador	LVC	1999	A7	1.39	0	0	0		0.00		1.112	0.00	-1.11	No
India	Non-LVC	1998	A7	-2.82	-3.8	0	0		0.00		-2.256	-3.80	-1.54	No
Lesotho	LVC	1998	A7	0.13	0	0	0		0.00		0.104	0.00	-0.10	No
Moldova	LVC	1999	A7	6.97	0	0	0		0.00		5.576	0.00	-5.58	Yes
Myanmar	LVC	1999	A7	3.38	0	0	0		0.00		2.704	0.00	-2.70	No
Papua New Guinea	LVC	1998	A7	0.33	0	0	0		0.00		0.264	0.00	-0.26	No
Paraguay	Non-LVC	1999	A7	0.85	0.4	0	0		0.00		0.68	0.40	-0.28	No
Philippines	Non-LVC	1999	CP	8.01	0	0	0		0.00		6.408	0.00	-6.41	Yes
Romania	Non-LVC	1999	A7	111.49	33.6	0	0		0.00		89.192	33.60	-55.59	Yes
Yemen	Non-LVC	1998	A7	1.05	0.6	0	0		0.00		0.84	0.60	-0.24	No

ANNEX III

METHYL BROMIDE ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	Methyl bromide baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	Allowable consumption in 2005 after 20% reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 20% methyl bromide reduction	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.80	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9)-(8)	
Congo	LVC	1999	A7	0.89	0.8	0	0		0.00		0.712	0.80	0.09	No
South Africa	Non-LVC	1999	A7	602.70	588.10	0	0		0.00		482.16	588.10	105.94	No
Sudan	LVC	1999	A7	3	3	0.00	0		0.00		2.4	3.00	0.60	No
Countries may not achieved freeze compliance by the end of 2002														
China	Non-LVC	1999	CP	1,102.05	2,018.40	916.35	0	90	826.35		881.64	1,928.40	1,046.76	Yes
Ethiopia	LVC	1998	A7	15.6	21.6	6.00	0		6.00		12.48	21.60	9.12	Yes
Ghana	LVC	1999	A7	0	4.5	4.50	0		4.50	5	0	4.50	4.50	No
Guatemala	LVC	1999	A7	400.7	514.6	113.90	0		113.90		320.56	514.60	194.04	Yes
Honduras	LVC	1999	A7	259.43	292.1	32.67	0		32.67		207.54	292.10	84.56	No
Madagascar	LVC	1999	A7	2.6	3.4	0.80	0		0.80		2.08	3.40	1.32	No
Swaziland	LVC	1999	A7	0.56	0.6	0.04	0		0.04		0.448	0.60	0.15	No
Zambia	LVC	1998	A7	29.34	29.5	0.16	0		0.16		23.472	29.50	6.03	Yes
Countries with No Consumption														
Bahrain	LVC	1999	CP	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No
Brunei Darussalam	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No
Burundi	LVC	1998	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No
Chad	LVC	1998	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No
Comoros	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No
Dominica	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No
Gambia	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No
Kiribati	LVC	1998	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No
Mauritania	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No
Nepal	LVC	1998	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No

ANNEX III

METHYL BROMIDE ANALYSIS

Column Number	Status	Latest Consumption		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Country		Year	Source	Methyl bromide baseline	Latest consumption	Amount needed to meet the freeze	Phase-out approved but not yet implemented (as of August 2000)	Phase-out in projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting	Future phase-out needed to meet the freeze	ODS phase-out in draft 2001 business plan	Allowable consumption in 2005 after 20% reduction	Balance from approved and submitted projects	Additional phase-out needed to meet 20% methyl bromide reduction	Received assistance from Fund (Yes/No)
						(2) - (1)			(3)-(4)-(5)		(1)*.80	(2)-(4)-(5)	(9)-(8)	
Samoa	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No
Tanzania	LVC	1999	A7	0	0	0.00	0		0.00		0	0.00	0.00	No
Countries with No Data Reported														
Albania	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Angola	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Bangladesh	Non-LVC	1997	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		No
Bosnia and Herzegovina	LVC	1998	A7	NDR	4.2				0.00			4.20		No
Central African Republic	LVC	1999	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0.00	0.00	No
Cyprus	LVC	1998	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		No
Gabon	LVC	1999	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		No
Guinea	LVC	1999	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		No
Haiti	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Lao People's Democratic Republic	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Libya	Non-LVC	1997	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		No
Maldives	LVC	1998	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		No
Mali	LVC	1998	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		No
Micronesia	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Namibia	LVC	1999	CP	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		No
Nigeria	Non-LVC	1998	A7	NDR	2				0.00			2.00		No
Suriname	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Tonga	NDR			NDR	NDR				0.00					No
Yugoslavia	Non-LVC	1998	A7	NDR	0				0.00			0.00		No

Annex IV-VI

GRAPHIC PRESENTATION OF RESULTS OF ANALYSIS: CFCs

(This annex is found on the Fund Secretariat's web site (www.unmfs.org)).

PART II:

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL THROUGH GOVERNMENT POLICY MEASURES

A Status Report on the Implementation by Article 5 Countries

Introduction

1. The Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund, as part of its contributions to the 24th meeting of the Implementation Committee in July 2000 presented document UNEP/OzL.ExCom/31/inf.2 under item 5 of the meeting agenda “Evaluation of compliance prospects of developing countries”. The document was prepared to assist the Executive Committee at its informal meeting preceding its 31st Meeting with the discussion on the strategic planning of the Multilateral Fund. It was based on an analysis of data submitted by Article 5 countries in fulfillment of Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, reports on the progress in the implementation of country programmes and progress reports submitted annually by the implementing agencies. The document did not address the impact of policy measures enacted by Article 5 countries on the status of compliance with the early control measures of the Protocol. The Implementation Committee thus requested that the Fund Secretariat present to its next meeting an analysis of policies adopted by Article 5 countries.

2. Subsequently the Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund has revised the document it had submitted to the 31st Meeting of the Executive Committee and the 24th Meeting of the Implementation Committee based on data submitted since July 2000. The revised document also includes a section on policies enacted by Article 5 countries.

Objectives of the Analysis

3. (a) Examine the impact of Fund assistance and the potential of a country to implement compliance with the Montreal Protocol.
- (b) Examine the impact of the enactment of policy controls and the potential of a country to implement compliance with the Montreal Protocol.
- (c) Examine the combined effect of Fund assistance and policy controls on the implementation of compliance with the Montreal Protocol.

Source of Data

Report on the Implementation of the Country Programme

4. Article 5 countries are requested to report annually to the Executive Committee on the progress in the implementation of their country programmes. However, the compliance with this reporting requirement is not consistent. Therefore, in order to have a reasonably large number of countries included in this analysis, reports received by the Secretariat over a period of three years 1997-99 were examined. Out of the 95 countries, which are covered in the analysis provided in Part I of this document (UNEP/OzLPro/ExCom/32/38), 69 reports furnish the data needed for the analysis, and the other 26 countries either never reported on the implementation of country programmes during the 3 year period or the reports did not fulfil the reporting requirement and did not contain the data needed for the analysis.

5. The Report on the Implementation of the Country Programme consists of two sections: Section One contains data forms for import, export, consumption by sector and production of all the controlled substances. Apart from listing by substance, data is also requested by industry sectors.

6. Section Two is on Administrative and Support Actions under which countries provide updated information on the progress in implementing government policy controls; establishing institutions for management of ODS phase out; establishing procedures for certification of refrigeration service technicians; establishing channels for public information on ODS controls; and monitoring activities.

7. Under government policy controls, the status of implementation of four policy controls is monitored by requesting updates on these actions as compared to those proposed in the country programmes.

Reports on Implementation of Institutional Strengthening Project

8. Institutional Strengthening projects are renewed every two years subject to a consideration by the Executive Committee of reports on the implementation of the previous phase, and as a result, the rate of compliance on reporting is better. Therefore a review of the reports received by the Secretariat is also done to supplement the data available from the country programme implementation reports, as pertinent.

Results of the Analysis from Part I of the Document

9. Results from the analysis on the potential of countries in implementing the CFC freeze and other initial compliance targets in Part I is used as part of the data for the analysis.

Indicators

10. For this analysis, these indicators are used:
- (a) Potential of implementing compliance with the Montreal Protocol is indicated by the ability of meeting the CFC freeze obligation in 1999/2000 and the CFC 50% reduction obligation in 2005.
 - (b) The assistance of the Multilateral Fund is indicated by the amount of ODS phase-out (expressed in ODP tonnes) funded till July 2000.
 - (c) The implementation of policy controls by a country is indicated by the status of implementation of four policy measures. These four measures are also used in the report on the implementation of country programmes to monitor progress in implementing policy controls by governments:
 - (i) General/special permit on the import (production and export) or sale of bulk of ODS;
 - (ii) General/special permit on the import (production and export) or sale of products and equipment containing ODS;
 - (iii) Banning import or sale of bulk quantities of ODS;
 - (iv) Banning import or sale of ODS-containing products and equipment.

Methodology

11. *In examining the impact of Fund assistance and the potential of a country to implement the compliance*, countries are categorized into five groups according to the amount of ODS phase-out funded and the data on the potential of implementing compliance by the country is provided alongside. The underlining assumption is that the greater the amount of ODS phase out funded, the greater is the potential of the country to implement the compliance. These five groups are:

- Group I: with approvals above 3,000 tonnes/ODP
- Group II: with approvals between 500 – 3,000 tonnes/ODP
- Group III: with approvals between 200 – 500 tonnes/ODP
- Group IV: with approvals between 20 – 200 tonnes/ODP
- Group V: with approvals between 0 – 20 tonnes/ODP

The result is recorded in Table 1 in Annex I

12. *In examining the impact of the enactment of policy measures and the potential of a country to implement compliance*, the analysis groups countries into three categories according to the status of implementation by each country of the policy measures and this data is placed alongside the potential of the country in implementing

compliance. The underlining assumption is that enactment of the policy measures will enhance the potential of the country to implement the compliance. The three groups are:

- Group I: countries which reported having implemented at least one of the four policy measures in any one of the three years between 1997 and 1999
- Group II: countries which reported not having implemented any of the policy measures in any of the three years between 1997 and 1999
- Group III: countries which either did not submit any report in any of the years between 1997 and 1999 or did not submit report on implementation of the policy measures.

The result is recorded in Table 2 in Annex I.

13. *In examining the combined effect of Fund assistance and policy controls on the potential of a country to implement the compliance*, a linkage is sought between the amount of ODS phase-out funded and the status of implementing compliance of those countries which have implemented at least one policy measure. The underlying assumption is the greater the assistance from the Fund, the greater the potential of these countries which have enacted policy controls to be in compliance. Therefore, the analysis sorts those countries which have implemented at least one policy measure according to the five groups used in Table 1 of Annex I. And the result is recorded in Table 3 in Annex I.

14. Summaries of the statistics in the three tables in Annex I are provided in Annex II to facilitate analysis and understanding.

Limitations of the Analysis

15. In undertaking the analysis, the Secretariat is aware of the following limitations.

Data availability

16. There are only a few countries which have reported data every year over the three year period covered in the analysis. Therefore, the analysis has to rely on data some time from only one of the 3 years available from the country, without knowing whether there has been changes since the time when the data was provided, and as a result, the data used in the analysis may not reflect the most recent situation in the country.

17. A considerable number of countries either never submitted any reports on the implementation of the country programme between 1997 and 1999 or did not report on the implementation of policy controls as required, which significantly limits the coverage of the analysis.

The assessment of the impact of each variable on compliance

18. The implementation of compliance could be the result of a number of variables, including the assistance of the Multilateral Fund, the policy controls, the public environmental awareness, the market forces and others. By focusing on the two variables i.e. the Fund assistance and the policy controls, the Secretariat is fully aware of the other contributing factors. It is also aware that the attempt to assess separately the impact of one variable could be a limited representation of the real world where all the variables interact among each other.

Observations

Correlation between the Assistance of the Multilateral Fund and the Potential of Implementing Compliance

CFC freeze

19. In Table 1 of Annex II, there is an observable correlation between the amount of Fund assistance and the potential of a country to implement compliance with Montreal Protocol. Groups which have received a higher amount of Fund assistance show a higher rate of compliance.

50% reduction in CFC

20. The same correlation is also observable with the 50% reduction compliance target, although Group I in this case does not show exactly the same consistency. Otherwise, the positive correlation indicates that higher Fund assistance is complemented by higher compliance rate for this target.

21. The marked decrease in the rate of potential compliance across all groups with the implementation 50% reduction of CFCs is expected given that projects which will impact on this target are in the early stage of development and implementation and will show the effect in the next few years.

Correlation between the Enactment of Policy Controls and the Potential of Implementing Compliance

22. In Table 2 of Annex II, a clear correlation could be observed between the implementation of policy controls and the potential of implementing compliance. Both in the case of CFC freeze and the 50% reduction in CFCs, countries which have implemented at least one policy control perform better than the group of countries which have implemented no policy controls and the group of countries which have not reported data.

23. Similarly, the expected decrease in compliance rate is witnessed for the 50% CFCs reduction, across all groups.

Combined Effect of Fund Assistance and Policy Controls on the Potential of Implementing Compliance

24. Table 3 in Annex II shows the combined effect of Fund assistance and policy controls on the potential of countries to implement compliance. The analysis indicates:

CFC Freeze

25. For the implementation of the CFC freeze compliance, Table 3 shows a positive correlation between the Fund assistance and the compliance of those countries which have implemented at least one policy control. The higher the amount of ODS approvals funded, the greater will be the chance of the country to achieve compliance.

50% reduction in CFCs

26. For the 50% CFCs reduction target, Table 3 of Annex II shows no clear correlation between the level of Fund assistance and the potential of implementing compliance for countries which have implemented at least one policy measure.

Conclusions

27. The analysis of the Secretariat, bearing in mind its limitations, concludes the following:

- (i) The Multilateral Fund has demonstrated its effectiveness over the past 10 years in assisting Article 5 countries in implementing the initial targets for the compliance with the Montreal Protocol. However there is considerable challenges ahead, first there are still 15 countries which do not show a good potential of achieving their CFC freeze target. Secondly implementing the 50% CFC reduction by 2005 calls for continued support by the Multilateral Fund and efforts of the Article 5 countries to make that goal achievable.
- (ii) The enactment of policy measures by Article 5 country governments has played a significant role in the ability of the countries in implementing their compliance with the initial targets of the Montreal Protocol. It is expected to witness an enhanced role of these measures in the compliance period, with the emphasis moving to the phase out by small-users and the servicing sector.

Annex I

Table 1

Fund Assistance and Potential of Implementing Compliance

Name of Countries	ODS phaseout approved (in ODP tonnes)*	Potential of compliance with CFC freeze**	Potential of compliance with CFC 50% reduction**
Group I with approvals above 3,000 tonnes/ODP			
China	67822.10	Yes	No
India	8064.22	Yes	Yes
Indonesia	6715.17	Yes	Yes
Brazil	5700.86	Yes	No
Malaysia	4859.55	Yes	Yes
Thailand	4116.97	Yes	Yes
Iran	3808.99	Yes	No
Argentina	3083.11	Yes	No
Mexico	3036.86	Yes	Yes
Turkey	3034.12	Yes	Yes
Group II with approvals between 500 - 3,000 tonnes/ODP			
Egypt	2448.18	Yes	Yes
Syria	2087.35	Yes	Yes
Philippines	1662.10	Yes	No
Nigeria	1543.03	Yes	No
Algeria	1460.20	Yes	Yes
Pakistan	1282.60	Yes	Yes
Romania	1231.70	Yes	Yes
Jordan	1200.75	Yes	Yes
Venezuela	1095.01	Yes	Yes
Tunisia	961.50	Yes	Yes
Colombia	955.84	Yes	Yes
Lebanon	946.55	Yes	Yes
Morocco	809.25	Yes	Yes
Chile	799.56	Yes	Yes
Korea DPR	568.80	Yes	Yes
Group III with approvals between 200 - 500 tonnes/ODP			
Macedonia	465.14	Yes	Yes
Cameroon	427.00	Yes	Yes
Ecuador	417.11	Yes	Yes
Sudan	399.84	Yes	Yes

Fund Assistance and Potential of Implementing Compliance

Name of Countries	ODS phaseout approved (in ODP tonnes)*	Potential of compliance with CFC freeze**	Potential of compliance with CFC 50% reduction**
Ghana	366.00	Yes	Yes
Tanzania	310.19	Yes	Yes
Vietnam	275.06	Yes	Yes
Peru	273.39	Yes	No
Zimbabwe	214.60	Yes	Yes
Kenya	213.26	Yes	No
Group IV with approvals between 20 - 200 tonnes/ODP			
Dominican Republic	189.00	No	No
Cote d'Ivoire	164.70	Yes	Yes
Uruguay	163.35	Yes	No
Guatemala	159.30	Yes	No
Bangladesh	136.20	No	No
Cuba	108.20	Yes	No
Jamaica	108.20	No	No
Costa Rica	97.38	Yes	Yes
Panama	85.00	Yes	No
Sri Lanka	60.55	Yes	No
El Salvador	58.67	Yes	Yes
Paraguay	55.50	No	No
Yugoslavia	54.60	Yes	No
Mauritius	53.70	Yes	Yes
Croatia	50.60	Yes	No
Trinidad & Tobago	46.49	Yes	Yes
Malawi	40.20	Yes	Yes
Burkina Faso	38.48	Yes	No
Bahrain	37.53	Yes	No
Senegal	36.84	Yes	No
Nicaragua	22.35	Yes	Yes
Group V with approvals between 0 - 20 tonnes/ODP			
Mali	19.50	Yes	No
Congo PRC	19.20	Yes	Yes
Bolivia	18.83	Yes	No
Gambia	18.75	Yes	Yes
Honduras	14.20	Yes	No
Barbados	14.00	Yes	No
Guyana	13.70	Yes	Yes

Fund Assistance and Potential of Implementing Compliance

Name of Countries	ODS phaseout approved (in ODP tonnes)*	Potential of compliance with CFC freeze**	Potential of compliance with CFC 50% reduction**
Guinea	12.90	Yes	No
Benin	12.89	No	No
Bahamas	12.64	No	No
Gabon	12.20	Yes	Yes
Chad	8.80	Yes	No
Zambia	7.20	Yes	No
Central African Republic	5.83	Yes	Yes
Niger	5.80	No	No
Burundi	5.40	No	No
Namibia	5.40	Yes	No
Fiji	5.20	Yes	Yes
Swaziland	4.00	Yes	Yes
Georgia	3.70	Yes	No
Uganda	3.60	Yes	No
Lesotho	3.58	Yes	No
St Lucia	3.00	Yes	Yes
Mauritania	2.00	Yes	No
St Kitts & Nevis	2.00	Yes	Yes
Belize	1.70	No	No
Botswana	1.50	Yes	No
Grenada	1.20	Yes	Yes
Antigua & Barbuda	1.00	Yes	Yes
Comoros	0.00	Yes	No
Dominica	0.00	Yes	No
Ethiopia	0.00	No	No
Mongolia	0.00	No	No
Papua New Guinea	0.00	No	No
Qatar	0.00	No	No
Seychelles	0.00	Yes	Yes
St Vincent & Grenadines	0.00	No	No
Western Samoa	0.00	No	No
Yemen	0.00	Yes	No

*Total ODP phaseout approved up till July 2000 from the Fund Secretariat's database

**Source of data: Part I of UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/38

Annex I

Table 2

Policy Controls and Potential of Implementing Compliance

Name of Countries	General/special permit on import or sale of ODS				General/special permit on import or sale of ODS containing equipment				Banning import or sale of bulk ODS				Banning import or sale of ODS containing equipment				Potential of compliance with CFC freeze*	Potential of compliance with CFC 50% reduction*	
	Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation					
		99	98	97		99	98	97		99	98	97		99	98	97			
Countries which have implemented at least one policy measure																			
Algeria	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	No	No	N/A	No	No	No	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	
Argentina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Bahrain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Brazil	Yes	Yes	Data	N/A	Yes	Yes	Data	N/A	No	Yes	Data	N/A	No	Yes	Data	N/A	Yes	Yes	No
Burkina Faso	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Cameroon	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	No	Yes	Data	No	No	No	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chile	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	No	Data	No	No	No	Data	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
China	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	No	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	No
Colombia	Yes	Yes	Data	No	No	Yes	Data	No	Yes	No	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Congo PRC	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes
Costa Rica	Yes	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Cuba	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	No
Dominican Republic	No	Yes	Data	N/A	Yes	Yes	Data	N/A	No	No	Data	N/A	Yes	Yes	Data	N/A	No	Yes	No
Egypt	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	No	Data	Data	No	No	Data	Data	No	No	Data	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fiji	Yes	N/A	Yes	Data	Yes	N/A	Yes	Data	Yes	N/A	Yes	Data	Yes	N/A	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gambia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ghana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	No	No	No	Data	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes
Guatemala	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	No	No	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	No
Guyana	Yes	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes
India	No	N/A	Yes	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes
Indonesia	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes

Policy Controls and Potential of Implementing Compliance

Name of Countries	General/special permit on import or sale of ODS				General/special permit on import or sale of ODS containing equipment				Banning import or sale of bulk ODS				Banning import or sale of ODS containing equipment				Potential of compliance with CFC freeze*	Potential of compliance with CFC 50% reduction*
	Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation				
		99	98	97		99	98	97		99	98	97		99	98	97		
Iran	No	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	No
Jamaica	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Jordan	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	No	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes
Korea DPR	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	No	No	No	Data	No	No	No	Data	Yes	Yes
Lebanon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Macedonia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	No	No	No	Data	No	No	No	Data	Yes	Yes
Malawi	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	No	No	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Malaysia	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	No	No	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mauritius	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mexico	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nicaragua	No	Yes	Data	N/A	No	No	Data	N/A	No	No	Data	N/A	No	No	Data	N/A	Yes	Yes
Niger	Yes	Yes	N/A	Data	No	No	N/A	Data	Yes	Yes	N/A	Data	No	No	N/A	Data	No	No
Pakistan	No	N/A	Yes	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	Yes	Yes
Panama	Yes	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	No
Philippines	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	No
Romania	Yes	N/A	Yes	Data	Yes	N/A	Yes	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	Yes	N/A	No	Data	Yes	Yes
Sri Lanka	Yes	Data	N/A	Yes	Yes	Data	N/A	Yes	Yes	Data	N/A	No	Yes	Data	N/A	No	Yes	No
Sudan	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	No	No	Yes	Data	No	No	Yes	Data	No	No	Yes	Yes
Syria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes
Thailand	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	No	Data	No	No	Yes	Data	No	No	No	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tunisia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Turkey	No	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	Yes
Uganda	No	Data	Yes	Yes	No	Data	Yes	Yes	No	Data	No	No	No	Data	No	No	Yes	No
Uruguay	No	No	Data	No	No	No	Data	No	No	Yes	Data	Yes	No	No	Data	No	Yes	No
Venezuela	No	Yes	Data	Yes	No	Yes	Data	No	No	Yes	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vietnam	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	Yes	No	Data	No	No	No	Data	No	Yes	Yes	Data	Yes	Yes

Policy Controls and Potential of Implementing Compliance

Name of Countries	General/special permit on import or sale of ODS				General/special permit on import or sale of ODS containing equipment				Banning import or sale of bulk ODS				Banning import or sale of ODS containing equipment				Potential of compliance with CFC freeze*	Potential of compliance with CFC 50% reduction*
	Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation				
		99	98	97		99	98	97		99	98	97		99	98	97		
Yemen	Yes	N/A	No	No	No	N/A	No	No	Yes	N/A	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Zambia	Yes	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	Yes	Data	Data	Yes	No
Zimbabwe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Countries which have not implemented any of the policy measure																		
Bangladesh	Yes	N/A	Data	No	Yes	N/A	Data	No	No	N/A	Data	No	Yes	N/A	Data	No	No	No
Benin	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	No	No
Central African Republic	Yes	Data	No	No	Yes	Data	No	No	Yes	Data	No	No	Yes	Data	No	No	Yes	Yes
Cote d'Ivoire	No	N/A	No	Data	Yes	N/A	No	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	Yes	Yes
El Salvador	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Ethiopia	No	N/A	Data	No	No	N/A	Data	No	N/A	N/A	Data	No	Yes	N/A	Data	No	No	No
Guinea	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	No
Mali	Yes	N/A	No	Data	Yes	N/A	No	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	Yes	N/A	No	Data	Yes	No
Mauritania	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
Morocco	Yes	Data	N/A	No	Data	Data	N/A	No	No	Data	N/A	No	No	Data	N/A	No	Yes	Yes
Namibia	No	Data	Data	No	No	Data	Data	No	No	Data	Data	No	No	Data	Data	No	Yes	No
Paraguay	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	No	No	Data	Yes	No	No	Data	No	No
Peru	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Senegal	Yes	N/A	No	Data	Yes	N/A	No	Data	Yes	N/A	No	Data	Yes	N/A	No	Data	Yes	No
Seychelles	No	N/A	No	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	No	N/A	No	Data	Yes	Yes
Swaziland	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Yes	Yes
Tanzania	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Data	Data	No	Yes	Yes
Trinidad & Tobago	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Countries which only submit the data part of the report and not the administrative and supportive actions																		
Antigua & Barbuda	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Yes	Yes
Barbados	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	Yes	No

Policy Controls and Potential of Implementing Compliance

Name of Countries	General/special permit on import or sale of ODS				General/special permit on import or sale of ODS containing equipment				Banning import or sale of bulk ODS				Banning import or sale of ODS containing equipment				Potential of compliance with CFC freeze*	Potential of compliance with CFC 50% reduction*	
	Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation					
		99	98	97		99	98	97		99	98	97		99	98	97			
Bolivia	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Yes	No	
Comoros	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Yes	No	
Dominica	Data	N/A	N/A	Data	Data	N/A	N/A	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	Data	Yes	No	
Gabon	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Data	Data	Data	N/A	Yes	Yes	
Georgia	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Yes	No	
Honduras	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Data	Yes	No	
Nigeria	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	Data	N/A	Yes	No	
Countries which did not submit any reports during 1997-1999																			
Bahamas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No
Belize	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No
Botswana	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	No	
Burundi	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No	
Chad	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	No	
Ecuador	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	
Grenada	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	
Kenya	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	No	
Lesotho	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	No	
Mongolia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No	
Papua New Guinea	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No	
Qatar	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No	
St Kitts & Nevis	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	
St Lucia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	

Policy Controls and Potential of Implementing Compliance

Name of Countries	General/special permit on import or sale of ODS				General/special permit on import or sale of ODS containing equipment				Banning import or sale of bulk ODS				Banning import or sale of ODS containing equipment				Potential of compliance with CFC freeze*	Potential of compliance with CFC 50% reduction*
	Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation			Proposed in CP	Implementation				
		99	98	97		99	98	97		99	98	97		99	98	97		
St Vincent & Grenadines	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No
Western Samoa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No
Yugoslavia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	No

*Source of data: Part I of UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/38

Yes: indicates that the country concerned has implemented the policy measure

No: indicates that the country concerned has not implemented the policy measure

Data: indicates that the country submits a report which contains only ODS consumption data but no data on administrative and supportive actions

N/A: indicates that the country did not submit any report during 1997-1999

Annex I

Table 3

A Combined Analysis of Policy Control and Fund Assistance on Potential of Implementing Compliance

Name of Countries	ODS phaseout approved (in ODP tonnes)*	Potential of compliance with CFC freeze**	Potential of compliance with CFC 50% reduction**
Countries which have implemented at least one policy measure			
Group I with approvals above 3,000 tonnes and above			
China	67822.10	Yes	No
India	8064.22	Yes	Yes
Indonesia	6715.17	Yes	Yes
Brazil	5700.86	Yes	No
Malaysia	4859.55	Yes	Yes
Thailand	4116.97	Yes	Yes
Iran	3808.99	Yes	No
Argentina	3083.11	Yes	No
Mexico	3036.86	Yes	Yes
Turkey	3034.12	Yes	Yes
Group II with approvals between 500 - 3,000 tonnes			
Egypt	2448.18	Yes	Yes
Syria	2087.35	Yes	Yes
Philippines	1662.10	Yes	No
Algeria	1460.20	Yes	Yes
Pakistan	1282.60	Yes	Yes
Romania	1231.70	Yes	Yes
Jordan	1200.75	Yes	Yes
Venezuela	1095.01	Yes	Yes
Tunisia	961.50	Yes	Yes
Colombia	955.84	Yes	Yes
Lebanon	946.55	Yes	Yes
Chile	799.56	Yes	Yes
Korea DPR	568.80	Yes	Yes
Group III with approvals between 200 - 500 tonnes			
Macedonia	465.14	Yes	Yes
Cameroon	427.00	Yes	Yes
Sudan	399.84	Yes	Yes
Ghana	366.00	Yes	Yes

A Combined Analysis of Policy Control and Fund Assistance on Potential of Implementing Compliance

Name of Countries	ODS phaseout approved (in ODP tonnes)*	Potential of compliance with CFC freeze**	Potential of compliance with CFC 50% reduction**
Vietnam	275.06	Yes	Yes
Zimbabwe	214.60	Yes	Yes
Group IV with approvals between 20 - 200 tonnes			
Dominican Republic	189.00	No	No
Uruguay	163.35	Yes	No
Guatemala	159.30	Yes	No
Cuba	108.20	Yes	No
Jamaica	108.20	No	No
Costa Rica	97.38	Yes	Yes
Panama	85.00	Yes	No
Sri Lanka	60.55	Yes	No
Mauritius	53.70	Yes	Yes
Croatia	50.60	Yes	No
Malawi	40.20	Yes	Yes
Burkina Faso	38.48	Yes	No
Bahrain	37.53	Yes	No
Nicaragua	22.35	Yes	Yes
Group V with approvals between 0 - 20 Tonnes			
Congo PRC	19.20	Yes	Yes
Gambia	18.75	Yes	Yes
Guyana	13.70	Yes	Yes
Zambia	7.20	Yes	No
Niger	5.80	No	No
Fiji	5.20	Yes	Yes
Uganda	3.60	Yes	No
Yemen	0.00	Yes	No

*Total ODP phaseout approved up till July 2000 from the Fund Secretariat's database

**Source of data: Part I of UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/38

Annex II: Summary Tables

Table 1

Fund Assistance and Potential of Implementing Compliance

Groups	No.of countries	CFC freeze				CFC 50% reduction			
		YES	%	NO	%	YES	%	NO	%
Group I - approvals above 3,000 tonnes/ODP	10	10	100.00%	0	0.00%	6	60.00%	4	40.00%
Group II - approvals between 3,000-500 tonnes/ODP	15	15	100.00%	0	0.00%	13	86.67%	2	13.33%
Group III - approvals between 500-200 tonnes/ODP	10	10	100.00%	0	0.00%	8	80.00%	2	20.00%
Group IV - approvals between 200-20 tonnes/ODP	21	17	80.95%	4	19.05%	7	33.33%	14	66.67%
Group V - approvals between 20-0 tonnes/ODP	39	28	71.79%	11	28.21%	12	30.77%	27	69.23%
Total	95	80	84.21%	15	15.79%	46	48.42%	49	51.58%

Annex II: Summary Tables

Table 2

Policy Controls and Potential of Implementing Compliance

Groups	No. of countries	CFC freeze				CFC 50% reduction			
		YES	%	NO	%	YES	%	NO	%
Countries with at least one policy control implemented	51	48	94.12%	3	5.88%	32	62.75%	19	37.25%
Countries with no policy control implemented	18	14	77.78%	4	22.22%	8	44.44%	10	55.56%
Countries with no data reported	26	18	69.23%	8	30.77%	6	23.08%	20	76.92%
Total	95	80	84.21%	15	15.79%	46	48.42%	49	51.58%

Annex II: Summary Tables

Table 3**A Combined Analysis of Fund Assistance and Policy Control on the Potential of Implementing Compliance**

Groups	No. of countries	CFC freeze				CFC 50% reduction			
		YES	%	NO	%	YES	%	NO	%
Group I- approvals above 3,000 tonnes/ODP	10	10	100.00%	0	0.00%	6	60.00%	4	40.00%
GroupII- approvals between 3,000-500 tonnes/ODP	13	13	100.00%	0	0.00%	12	92.31%	1	7.69%
GroupIII- approvals between 500-200 tonnes/ODP	6	6	100.00%	0	2.38%	6	100.00%	0	0.00%
GroupIV- approvals between 200-20 tonnes/ODP	14	12	85.71%	2	14.29%	4	28.57%	10	71.43%
GroupV- approvals between 20-0 tonnes/ODP	8	7	87.50%	1	12.50%	4	50.00%	4	50.00%
Total	51	48	94.12%	3	5.88%	32	62.75%	19	37.25%

PART III:

DRAFT THREE-YEAR BUSINESS PLAN FOR THE MULTILATERAL FUND

Introduction

1. Decision 29/13 authorised the Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund to prepare the draft three-year business plan for the 2000-2002 triennium for its consideration at its 30th Meeting. The Secretariat submitted a document on strategic planning and the three-year business plan to the 30th Meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/35). The Executive Committee decided, at its 30th and 31st Meetings, to continue its discussion on strategic planning.
2. The implementing agencies requested countries to identify their compliance needs for the years 2001 and 2002. The agencies prepared their draft 2001 business plans on the basis of such needs, among others, and indicated wherever possible what was expected to be included in the 2002 business plans.
3. This draft three-year business plan is submitted to the 32nd Meeting when the remaining projects for the first year of the triennium and the draft business plans for the year 2001 have been submitted to the Executive Committee for its consideration. The Executive Committee has already agreed to forward commitments for the year 2002 for the annual payments of multiyear projects that have been approved in principle.

ODS Phaseout

4. Table 1 presents the level of phase out by chemical from approved projects, projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting, projects contained in the draft 2001 business plans, and the annual release of forward commitments, and other planned projects to be submitted in 2002.

Table 1

**PHASE OUT FROM APPROVED, SUBMITTED, AND PLANNED PROJECTS
(In ODP tonnes)**

Chemical	Year 2000 (a)	Year 2001 (b)	Year 2002 (b)	
			Forward Commitments	Other Planned Activities
CFC	10,664	8,537	508	7,367
Halon	2,596	3,902	1,941	0
Carbon Tetrachloride	748	1,585	0	2,352
Methyl Chloroform	89	0	0	0
Methyl Bromide	947	1,013	0	893
Consumption Total	15,044	15,037	2,449	10,612
CFC	1,882	5,682	5,183	N/A
Halon	1,989	3,489	2,292	0
Carbon Tetrachloride	0	0	0	12,200
Methyl Chloroform	0	0	0	1,400
Production Total	3,871	9,171	7,475	13,600

- (a) Includes projects submitted to the 32nd Meeting and projects approved in 2000 excluding those investment projects approved as part of the 1997-1999 triennium at the 30th Meeting
- (b) Based on information in the draft business plans for the year 2001.

5. The phase out needs of Article 5 countries to achieve compliance with the freeze and the 2005 reductions are reported in Part I of this document. Part I indicates the countries that are at risk of not achieving their freeze and 2005 reductions. It also indicates that for some of these countries, projects included in the draft business plans for the year 2001 should enable them to achieve compliance with the initial reductions.

6. For the remaining countries still considered at risk, Table 2 presents the amount of phase-out needed to bring these countries into compliance and the amount of phase out form projects anticipated to be submitted in the year 2002 resulting from project preparation to be approved in 2001.

Table 2

**CONSUMPTION PHASE OUT REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE THE FREEZE AND
2005 REDUCTIONS FOR COUNTRIES AT RISK
(In ODP tonnes)**

Chemical	Phase Out Needed to Achieve Freeze and 2005 Reductions	Phase Out from Projects Planned to be Submitted in 2002	Difference
CFC	8,564	7,367	1,197
Halon	5,691	1,941	3,750
Methyl Bromide	3,317	893	2,424
Total	17,572	10,201	7,371

7. As shown in Table 2, an additional phase out of 7,371 ODP tonnes is needed for these countries, mainly in the halon and methyl bromide sectors.

Potential level of resources

8. The level of resources that could be used for financial planning in 2002 is estimated, as shown in Table 3, at a minimum of US \$162 million. Additional funds may become available for the 2002 budget from, *inter alia*, unused bilateral contributions, cancelled projects, returned balances from completed projects, adjustments to approvals in previous triennia, etc. The table indicates that at least US \$24.4 million is expected in programmable resources that could be used to assist those countries at risk and all other activities in 2002.

Table 3

**BUDGET AND PLANNED FUNDING FOR THE YEAR 2002
(In US \$)**

Item	2002
Expected level of resource	162,000,000
Expected level of expenditures	
Investment	
Forward Commitments	(31,230,000)
Other Planned Activities	(64,960,480)
Non-investment allocation	(15,100,000)
Bilateral allocation	(20,000,000)
Secretariat and Executive Committee	(3,400,000)
61. Additional programmable resources	24,436,520

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Executive Committee may wish to note the three-year business plan in the context of its ongoing discussions on strategic planning.