



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**



Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/20/57
24 September 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Executive Committee of
the Multilateral Fund for the
Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

Twentieth Meeting
Montreal, 16-18 October 1996

**DISCREPANCY BETWEEN THE DATA REPORTED BY A PARTY TO THE OZONE
SECRETARIAT AND THE DATA PRESENTED BY THE PARTY TO THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE MULTILATERAL FUND**

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Data Reporting under the Montreal Protocol

1. Data reporting is one of the basic responsibilities of all Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. Parties are required to report annually their data on production and consumption of the controlled substances to the Ozone Secretariat. They are also required to report certain baseline data on production, imports and exports within three months of becoming a Party to the Protocol. Currently, Parties operating under Article 5 of the Protocol are obliged to report production and consumption of all the categories of controlled substances to the Ozone Secretariat. However, the classification of developing countries who are Parties to the Protocol is based on per capita consumption of Annex A and of Annex B substances.

2. Data must be forwarded to the Ozone Secretariat not later than nine months after the end of the year to which they relate, i.e., not later than September of the following year.

Data Presented to the Executive Committee

3. At its 10th Meeting, the Executive Committee requested Article 5 Parties having approved country programmes to present annually information on progress made in the implementation of the country programmes. Subsequently, at the 13th Meeting, the format and the modalities for presenting the required information were approved. The information covers the progress of implementation of the country programme for the period 1 January to 31 December and should be forwarded to the Fund Secretariat not later than three months following the end of the year to which the information relates.

4. The calculation of consumption of controlled substances in all the country programmes so far approved, has been based on Annexes A and B substances, which were the only controlled substances for Article 5 countries. Consequently, the format for presenting the information to the Executive Committee requires statistical data on consumption of Annexes A and B substances only. Data on Annex C substances may also be provided, although this is an optional requirement. Data on consumption at the time of approval of the country programme and current data are also required to be provided. The data at the time of approval of the country programme, in many cases, reflect the consumption of the latest year prior to the preparation of the country programme for which data are available.

5. Data at the time of the approval of the country programme are based on results of survey or data collection activities which provide the necessary statistical data for the country programme and the strategies outlined in it. The current consumption is, however, expected to be based on updates conducted by the national ozone office as follow-ups to the original survey.

6. The first report on progress of implementation of country programmes was presented to the Executive Committee by the Fund Secretariat at the 18th Meeting as an information paper. The report was subsequently considered by the Committee at its 19th Meeting.

DISCREPANCIES IN ODS CONSUMPTION DATA REPORTED TO THE OZONE SECRETARIAT AND DATA PRESENTED TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

7. The lack of reporting of data and/or reporting of inaccurate data by Article 5 Parties have been a constant issue addressed by the Implementation Committee at its meetings. Comments on investment project proposals and/or country programmes submitted to the Executive Committee for approval have at times drawn attention to apparent discrepancies in sectoral consumption data of the same controlled substance for the same year or period reported for different purposes.

8. Consequently, the Seventh Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol accepted the recommendations of the Implementation Committee on this issue and decided that:

- (a) the (Ozone) Secretariat should be entitled to seek clarification on data reported under Article 7 if there is a discrepancy with the data in the country programme of the country concerned; and
- (b) that it should be established through these clarifications, which are the best available and most accurate data. Should the clarifications not result in an agreement, the data provided by the Party to the Secretariat should be used.

9. The Executive Committee, following the consideration of the report of the Fund Secretariat on the progress of implementation of country programmes, also decided:

- (a) that the data submitted to the Ozone Secretariat and those submitted to the Fund Secretariat should be reconciled; and
- (b) that discrepancies in data provided by Parties to the Ozone Secretariat and to the Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund should be submitted to the Executive Committee.

RECONCILIATION OF THE DATA SUBMITTED TO THE OZONE SECRETARIAT AND THOSE SUBMITTED TO THE FUND SECRETARIAT

10. The data reported to the Ozone Secretariat and those reported to the Fund Secretariat were compared and analyzed. The data reported to the Fund Secretariat were those contained in the report on the progress of implementation of country programmes which was considered at the 19th Meeting of the Executive Committee. Thirty two countries were covered in that report.

11. The following considerations were made during the reconciliation of the data:

- (a) account was taken of the differences in the reporting format of the data reported to the Ozone Secretariat and those reported to the Fund Secretariat;

- (b) the first report on the progress of implementation of country programmes made to the Executive Committee was for the year 1994, while the latest data reported to the Ozone Secretariat also covered the same year, hence the reconciliation was based on the 1994 data, except for one country whose information to the Fund Secretariat was based on 1993 data;
- (c) the data for the base year of the country programme (country programme baseline data) were compared with data reported to the Ozone Secretariat for the same year, if available; and
- (d) Where a country reported total consumption of ODS in the progress of implementation of country programmes, rather than consumption specified as representing Annex A and Annex B substances, the total consumption reported to the Ozone Secretariat was also considered for the reconciliation. However, where a country indicated consumption of only Annex A and Annex B substances, only the consumption reported to the Ozone Secretariat for those annexes were taken into account in the reconciliation.

12. The summary of the data reported to the Ozone Secretariat and those presented to the Executive Committee in country programmes and in information on progress of implementation of the country programmes is provided in Tables 1 and 2.

13. For purposes of coordination with the Ozone Secretariat regarding Decision VII/20 of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, the results of the reconciliation of the data were conveyed to the Ozone Secretariat.

CONCLUSIONS

Comparison of the Base Year Data (Table 1)

14. The thirty-two countries in the sample had their programmes approved between the period February 1992 and March 1994. Twenty-three of the countries used 1991 as the base year for calculating their ODS consumption while two countries each used 1989 and 1990 respectively, three used 1992 and one used 1993. Out of the thirty-two, eight have not as yet reported the base year data to the Ozone Secretariat, although these are available in the country programmes. These countries were: Algeria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Guatemala, India, Iran and Mauritius.

15. Twenty-four countries out of the thirty two in the sample reported their base year (country programme baseline) data to the Ozone Secretariat, three (Cameroun, Maldives and Zambia) reported data that were consistent with those contained in the country programme, one country (Colombia) reported data for Annex B Group II and Group III substances only (and was not included in the analysis) and the rest of the countries reported data with varying degrees of

discrepancies between those reported to the Ozone Secretariat and those in the country programmes. The discrepancies in the data ranged from a difference of three per cent to sixty-one per cent. Countries whose data to the Ozone Secretariat showed significant differences (over 10%) from the data in the country programme are listed below. The percentage figures indicate the extent of the difference between the two sets of data.

Chile	18%
Cote D'Ivoire	13%
China	52%
Ecuador	24%
Egypt	30%
Fiji	17%
Indonesia	30%
Malawi	48%
Malaysia	12%
Panama	61%
Philippines	24%
Senegal	593%
Uruguay	75%.

Comparison of Data Reported for 1994 (Table 2)

16. Twenty of the 32 countries reported their 1994 consumption data to the Ozone Secretariat and also presented their country programme performance report to the Executive Committee. Eight countries presented their country programme performance report to the Executive Committee but did not report their consumption of data for 1994 to the Ozone Secretariat. These were Algeria, Chile, Costa Rica, Cote D'Ivoire, Ecuador, Guatemala, Iran, Maldives, Sri Lanka and Zambia. Two countries - Fiji and Syria, reported their consumption data to the Ozone Secretariat but did not present their country programme performance report to the Executive Committee. Hence the analysis for discrepancies in the data reporting could be made on the data reported by the remaining 20 countries only.

17. Only two countries (Ghana and Mauritius) reported data to the Ozone Secretariat which were consistent with the data in their country programme performance reports. The rest of the countries reported data to the Ozone Secretariat which varied from the data reported to the Executive Committee. In four cases, Burkina Faso, India, Indonesia, Philippines and Thailand, the discrepancies were negligible relative to the ODS consumption.

18. The following list shows the countries whose reported consumption data to the Executive Committee were higher than those reported to the Ozone Secretariat. The figures in percentages indicate the level of difference.

Cameroun	10%
China	21%
Colombia	3%
Cuba	54%
India	Negligible
Indonesia	Negligible
Jordan	10%
Malawi	29%
Panama	6%
Turkey	7%.

19. The following list shows the countries whose reported consumption data to the Executive Committee were lower than those reported to the Ozone Secretariat. The percentage figures similarly, indicate the level of difference.

Burkina Faso	5%
Egypt	32%
Indonesia	Negligible
Malaysia	10%
Mexico	77%
Philippines	Negligible
Senegal	494%
Thailand	Negligible
Uruguay	39%.

20. In the case of Senegal, relatively large quantities of Annex B Group II substances have been reported annually to the Ozone Secretariat. But this consumption was neither reported in the country programme nor in the country programme performance report to the Executive Committee.

21. There is the need to enhance the comparison between the data presented to the Ozone Secretariat and those reported to the Executive Committee. At the same time the data presented to the Executive Committee should be able to serve the purpose of evaluating progress in the implementation of approved country programmes. Consequently, for the reporting period 1997, the Format for Presentation of Information on Progress of Implementation of Country Programmes could be revised to meet these needs.

22. There is also the need to draw the attention of the countries which have not reported their country programme baseline (base year) ODS consumption data to the Ozone Secretariat to this

omission and urge them to report. Reporting of these data could facilitate the monitoring of the ODS phase-out process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

23. The following recommendations arising out of the above conclusions are being made for the consideration of the Executive Committee.

- (a) To replace Items 6 and 7 of Section I of the format, namely:

Item 6: Total consumption of ODS at the time of approval of country programme (Tonnes ODP), and

Item 7: Current total consumption of ODS (Tonnes ODP) (199-), with a new Item 6, which is set out below:

6. Consumption of ODS in tonnes ODP. (Baseline ODS consumption represents consumption for the year on which the country programme's ODS consumption data is based).

Controlled Substance	Baseline Consumption (Tonnes ODP) (Year) ¹	Current Consumption (Tonnes ODP) (Year) ¹	ODS to be Phased out in Approved Projects (Tonnes ODP)	ODS Phased Out (Tonnes ODP)
Annex A Group I				
Annex A Group II				
Annex B Group I				
Annex B Group II				
Annex B Group III				
Annex C Group I				
Annex C Group II				
Annex E				
TOTAL:				

¹ Indicate year to which the data relate

- (b) To urge countries whose country programmes have been approved but which have not reported the country programmes' baseline data to the Ozone Secretariat to do so.

**Table 1. Consumption Data for Annexes A and B Controlled Substances
Reported for Base Year in Country Programmes and Data Reported to
the Ozone Secretariat for the Same Year**

	Country	Data Reported for the Base Year in Country Programme		Data Reported to the Ozone Sec. for Same Year	Difference in Data Reported	
		(Year)	(Tonnes ODP)	(Tonnes ODP)	(Tonnes ODP)	(%)
1	Algeria	1991	2221			
2	Burkina Faso	1991	33	29	4	14
3	Cameroon	1991	104	104	0	0
4	Chile	1989	1055	892	163	18
5	China	1991	55948	36868	19080	52
6	Colombia	1992	1947	44.5 ⁽¹⁾		
7	Costa Rica	1991	240			
8	Côte d'Ivoire	1991	247	278	31	13
9	Cuba	1991	331			
10	Ecuador	1989	742	598	144	24
11	Egypt	1991	2763	21125	638	30
12	Fiji	1991	47	55	8	17
13	Ghana	1991	101	105	4	4
14	Guatemala	1991	285			
15	India	1991	13111			
16	Indonesia	1992	6567	5057	1510	30
17	Iran	1991	2445			
18	Jordan	1991	779	755	24	3
19	Malawi	1993	130	88	42	48
20	Malaysia	1990	3745	4194	448	12
21	Maldives	1991	5	5	0	0
22	Mauritius	1991	69			
23	Mexico	1989	10184	9878	306	3
24	Panama	1991	233	377	144	61
25	Philippines	1991	2536	3317	781	24
26	Senegal	1991	102	707	605	593
27	Sri Lanka	1991	231	212	19	9
28	Syria	1991	1327	1388	61	5
29	Thailand	1991	8893	9128	235	3
30	Turkey	1990	3608			
31	Uruguay	1992	314	549	234.7	75
32	Zambia	1991	22	22	0	0

(1) Annex B controlled substances only.

Table 2. 1994 ODS Consumption Data Reported by
Article 5 Countries in Country Programme Performance Reports (to the Fund Secretariat)
and in Accordance with Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol (to Ozone Secretariat)
for Annexes A and B Substances (Except otherwise specified)

	Country	Data Reported to Ozone Secretariat (Article 7) (Tonnes ODP)	Data Reported to Fund Secretariat in C.P. Performance Reports (Tonnes ODP)	Difference in Data (Tonnes ODP)	Per Cent Difference (%)	Remarks
1	Algeria		2447			
2	Burkina Faso	38	36	2	5	
3	Cameroon	197	217	20	10	
4	Chile		991			
5	China (1)	92156	111919	19763	21	
6	Colombia	2161	2224	63	3	
7	Costa Rica					
8	Côte d'Ivoire					
9	Cuba (1)	182	281	99	54	
10	Ecuador		450			
11	Egypt	2636	2000	636	32	
12	Fiji	1				
13	Ghana	43	43	0	0	
14	Guatemala		228			
15	India (1)	16066	16148	82	Negligible	
16	Indonesia	2925	2934	9	Negligible	
17	Iran		3420			
18	Jordan	775	850	75	10	
19	Malawi	177	228	51	29	Ozone Secretariat data includes 142 tonnes methyl bromide, Annexes A and B - 33 tonnes
20	Malaysia (2)	4270	3896	374	10	Fund Secretariat data for Annex A only
21	Maldives		10			
22	Mauritius	31	31	0	0	
23	Mexico	10793	6081	4712	77	Total for annex A-E (Oz. Sec.); 11,107 tonnes ODP
24	Panama	254	269	15	6	
25	Philippines	4152	4122	30	Negligible	
26	Senegal	666	112	554	494	BII (Methyl Chloroform) 548.1 tonnes ODP (Oz. Sec.)
27	Sri Lanka		333			
28	Syria	2380				
29	Thailand	7524	7490	34	Negligible	
30	Turkey	3140	3355	215	7	
31	Uruguay	318	228	90	39	
32	Zambia		22			

(1) Figures represent consumption of all controlled substances

(2) Figures represent consumption of controlled substances in 1993.