



# **United Nations Environment Programme**

Distr.  
LIMITED



UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/13/43  
16 June 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

Thirteenth Meeting  
Montreal, 25-27 July 1994

## **DATA COLLECTION AND DATA REPORTING**

**(Draft)**

### **Background**

1. At the Twelfth Meeting of the Executive Committee, the amount of US \$150,000 was requested within the UNEP 1994 Work Programme for Regional Data Collection Systems Workshop in Africa. The Fund Secretariat however, advised that the activity was not eligible for funding from the Multilateral Fund sources since all Parties were bound by Article 7 of the Protocol to report data to the Secretariat of the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol and also since the Fund was assisting Article 5 countries through funding for country programme preparation, to collect comprehensive data which should enable Article 5 Parties to report data as required and make future updates. Furthermore, institutional strengthening assistance provided from the Fund also provided resources to enable Article 5 countries to collect and disseminate data.
2. After extensive discussion, the Executive Committee decided to defer the workshop pending submission by the Fund Secretariat to the Thirteenth Meeting of a paper dealing with the scope of activities under institutional strengthening projects and country programme preparation and how they related to data collection.
3. This paper is prepared in response to the request of the Executive Committee and also provides links between data collection and other activities under the auspices of the Montreal Protocol.

### Data Reporting under the Montreal Protocol

4. Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol requires *inter alia* that each Party provides to the Secretariat of the Protocol (Ozone Secretariat), within three months of becoming a Party, statistical data or the best possible estimate of its production, imports and exports of the controlled substances for various base years depending on the class of controlled substance. Each Party is also required to report annually statistical data on its production, imports and exports of the controlled substances to the Ozone Secretariat.

5. Following a report submitted by the Ozone Secretariat which indicated that some countries faced difficulties in reporting data as required by Article 7 of the Protocol, an *ad hoc* Group of Experts was established at the Second Meeting of the Parties in 1990 to consider the reasons leading to such difficulties and recommend possible solutions to the Parties concerned, and report on its progress to the Third Meeting of the Parties.

6. In noting the report of the Group of Experts, the Third Meeting of the Parties invited developing countries to inform the Secretariat of any difficulties they faced in reporting data for suitable measures to be taken. Subsequently the Ozone Secretariat in its report to the Fourth Meeting of the Implementation Committee indicated that five Article 5 Parties (Fiji, Maldives, Syria, Uganda and Zambia) had expressed particular difficulties in reporting data and that the Secretariat had referred all such cases to implementing agencies and the Multilateral Fund for necessary technical and financial assistance to enable those Parties to collect and report their data. Data have since been collected in all five countries, all of which except Uganda, which has just completed its country programme, have had their country programmes approved by the Executive Committee. The Meeting also requested the Technical and Economic Assessment Panel to compile a list of full and complete trade names, including any numerical designations of controlled substances, including mixtures containing controlled substances, and submit it to the Ozone Secretariat by the end of November 1991 for distribution to all the Parties by the end of March 1992.

7. Since data reporting relates to compliance with provisions of the Protocol, the issue has been given attention at all the meetings of the Implementation Committee during which the implementing agencies and the Fund Secretariat have reported on measures taken to facilitate data collection in Article 5 countries, to enable them to comply with Article 7 of the Protocol. The reports of all the implementing agencies, given at the meetings of the Implementation Committee, have indicated that efforts are being made by all the agencies to improve data collection in Article 5 countries through country programme preparation, institutional strengthening activities, sectoral project preparation activities, workshops and other technical assistance. These efforts could address most of the problems identified by the *Ad hoc* Group of Experts.

8. The report of the Ozone Secretariat to the Seventh Meeting of the Implementation Committee held on 16 November 1993, in effect, pointed to considerable improvement in data reporting by Article 5 countries due to country programme preparation. The report, however, lamented the long time lag between approval of country programmes and date of reporting by some countries. This situation may be due to internal institutional/political, bureaucratic and infrastructural problems as reported at the Seventh Meeting of the Implementation Committee by some of the countries whose data were still pending. The infrastructural problem is, however, being addressed through institutional strengthening in the Article 5 countries.

## **Data Requirements in Country Programmes**

9. The basic data required for the analysis of a country's phase-out programme according to the current guidelines for preparing country programmes are the current ODS consumption broken down by substance and by application. Based on these data, consumption for the planned phase out period and for a situation in the absence of the Montreal Protocol to the year 2010-2015 (unconstrained ODS demand) could be projected.

10. The format for presentation of data makes it necessary to provide a breakdown of the data by source, (i.e., production, export or import), by substance (i.e., as indicated in the annexes to the Protocol) and by user sector or subsector. A descriptive section provides some guide as to what needs to be done. The tables provided in the format however relate only to current consumption and not consumption for the base years as defined in the Protocol. The baseline consumption can be covered by either modifying the tables to include the consumption data for the base years or incorporating additional tables to take account of consumption for the base years.

11. Additional information requirements such as information on industry structure relating to importers (and exporters, where applicable) of ODS, ODS producing and user companies (including servicing workshops) and the pattern of ODS use further provides leads for identification or survey of sources of ODS consumption in the country. The identification (and updating) of these sources would facilitate the compilation of annual consumption data.

## **Impact of Country Programme Preparation on Data Collection and Reporting**

12. A review of the 33 country programmes so far approved shows a significant involvement of local personnel in data collection for the preparation of country programmes. Data collection is conducted in a number of ways, which may be:

- (a) by a team, a working group or a task force, set up under a government Ministry or Department purposely for the country programme preparation. Invariably this becomes the core of the unit or part of the system for monitoring the phase-out process.
- (b) by staff of the Ministry or Department responsible for the Montreal Protocol.
- (c) by an existing national institution e.g. Statistical Bureau, a department of a university.
- (d) by an individual acting as a consultant.

13. A report from UNEP Consultants who assisted in the preparation of some country programmes (Algeria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Fiji, Ghana, Maldives, Mauritius, Senegal, Sudan, Syria and Zambia) and the report submitted by UNEP to the Fourth Implementation Committee meeting emphasized the importance given to generating within Article 5 countries the ability to collect data. The activities conducted by UNEP during preparation of country programmes have included facilitation of establishment of monitoring arrangements and systems for improved record keeping in order to enable monitoring of the importation and use of controlled substances, so as to make possible:

- (a) observation and evaluation of the effectiveness of the country programme in reducing and phasing out the consumption of the controlled substances, and
- (b) compliance with Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol.

Thus, the reports indicate that as a result of data collection activities through the country programme preparation it has been possible for countries to draw up inventories of current uses of ODS and trends in consumption. In some cases the data, as required by Article 7 of the Protocol, have been collected and annexed to the country programmes. However, a recent report of the Ozone Secretariat shows that baseline data for Annex A substances are pending for six countries with approved country programmes (Algeria, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Mauritius, Senegal and Syria), while for Annex B substances, the data are pending for seven such countries (Algeria, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mauritius and Senegal).

14. In an effort to provide some on-site training in data collection during country programme preparation, Consultants have, as necessary, had meetings with the pertinent authorities and ODS users or had lectures addressing the reporting requirements under the Montreal Protocol and the importance or advantages of having the relevant data. In one instance, data collection sheets and reporting requirements had been elaborated in detail with the ministry staff as well as with the national team. UNDP and the World Bank are similarly assisting the medium and large ODS consuming countries whose country programmes they are responsible for.

15. At the Sixth Meeting of the Implementation Committee on 26 August 1993, when 21 country programmes had been approved and 23 others were under preparation improvement had been noticed in the data reporting from the Article 5 Parties. The impact of country programme preparation on data reporting could also be inferred from the status of the Article 5 countries as reported by the Ozone Secretariat in the monthly issues of the Status of Ratification of the Montreal Protocol. Two categories of Article 5 Parties are reported. These are:

- Those that are categorized as operating under Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Montreal Protocol
- Those that are categorized temporarily as Article 5 countries pending submission of complete split data.

The latter category of Parties are those that have not been able to submit complete data for one reason or the other. For instance, as at 31 August 1992, twenty-two of the forty-six (47 per cent) Article 5 Parties were temporarily categorized as operating under Article 5, paragraph 1. By 31 March 1994, twenty of these countries had been provided funding for preparation of their country programmes, out of which eleven had been completed and approved. At the same time nine countries out of the twenty had submitted complete data as a result of the surveys conducted for the country programmes. However, four of the countries (Costa Rica, Cuba, Mauritius and Syrian Arab Republic), who had their country programmes approved and therefore had composite data available, were still categorized as temporarily operating under Article 5. A fifth country (India), also temporarily categorized as such, indicated in its country programme that data survey was still on-going in one significant sector. The Syrian Arab Republic presented its data to the Seventh Meeting of the Implementation Committee on 6 November 93, while Costa Rica at the same meeting attributed its failure to report its data to delays in receiving funds to create the necessary infrastructure for submission of data and promised to submit the data in two months time since its country programme had been approved and the country would be able to complete the inventory of controlled substances. It also gave the assurance to submit data on an annual basis as required by the Protocol since the infrastructural funding issue had been resolved with the implementing agency.

16. As at 31 March 1994, thirty-six of the eighty-eight Article 5 Parties (40 percent) were temporarily categorized as operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5. In seventeen of these countries, country programme preparation was ongoing, while seven of the countries had their country programmes approved. Hence, it may be expected that data surveys/collection have been or would be facilitated by the implementing agencies in nearly 50 percent of the countries likely to have difficulties with data reporting.

### **Institutional Strengthening Projects and Data Reporting**

17. Institutional strengthening funds ranging from US \$41,250 to US \$450,000 have been provided to thirty seven Article 5 countries. The terms of reference of institutional strengthening projects include collecting and processing data and information "to fulfil the national information exchange obligations as a Party to the Protocol". Furthermore, the Executive Committee has requested Article 5 Parties and their collaborating implementing agencies to make provisions to address the needs of the countries with respect to the data submission requirements of Article 7 of the Protocol when preparing institutional strengthening projects (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/10/40, para. 134).

18. With the view to strengthening the data collection and dissemination capabilities of Article 5 countries, the Executive Committee does approve components in the institutional strengthening projects that are aimed at facilitating data collection activities. These include cost of dedicated personnel for the country programme implementation and information management, operational costs for collation/dissemination of information, official local travel, telecommunication charges and capital expenditure on data collection, processing and dissemination systems including microcomputers and software, photocopiers, fax machines etc.

### **UNEP's Training, Workshops and Networking Activities and Data Collection**

19. UNEP IE/PAC has organized four regional workshops — for Africa (October 1992) attended by 30 developing countries, for Asia and the Pacific (November 1991) attended by 20 developing countries, for Latin America and the Caribbean (May 1992) attended by 20 developing countries and for West Asia and Arabic-speaking countries (December 1991) attended by 10 developing countries. Detailed attention had been given to data reporting at all these workshops and the Ozone Secretariat has participated actively to discuss data collection for reporting on implementation of the Montreal Protocol explaining the provisions on reporting, indicating the difficulties and possible solutions. In addition to these workshops, a special workshop for ODS officers in South East Asia and the Pacific countries (March 1992) attended by 8 developing countries, at which the problems of data collection were discussed, and a workshop devoted to collecting and reporting of data when implementing the Montreal Protocol for ODS Officers Network for South East Asia and the Pacific (June 1993) attended by the same group of countries have been organized by UNEP IE/PAC with assistance from the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA).

20. At its 12th Meeting the Executive Committee approved funds within UNEP's 1994 Work Programme to start a three-year programme of networking activities in Africa and Latin America in addition to the ongoing South East Asia and the Pacific Network (ODSONET/SEAP) supported by SIDA. The networks will provide a mechanism for identifying and addressing common regional or sub-regional problems. In this context, one of the objectives is to support the design of systems to monitor ODS consumption for national planning and implementation of phase-out strategies, an activity which subsumes data collection and management.

21. As part of the networking activities, funds have been provided within the UNEP 1994 Work Programme for full time Regional Network liaison consultants and network managers who would be presumed to assist the countries in the networks to identify common and priority problems and establish agenda for addressing them. As in the case of ODSONET/SEAP, the other networks could use their planned workshops (for which funds have been provided) to address from the onset, the issue of data collection since this is still considered to be a basic problem constraining the compliance of some Article 5 countries with the provisions of the Protocol and by implication, the effective implementation of their national strategies.

### **Conclusion**

22. The process of preparation of country programmes, especially in cases where this is coupled with the funding and establishment of an institutional infrastructure, appears to be the best means of providing direct technical know-how for data collection and reporting in a sustainable manner, since each Article 5 Party is obliged to prepare a country programme. The incentives that country programmes provide by way of the potential financial and technical assistance accruing to industry and other users of ODS make the country programme an attractive and cost effective means for transferring the know-how for data collection to a country.

23. Although the format for country programme preparation does not include tables for baseline data, evidence shows that, in some cases, these data are collected as a matter of expediency (though these are not always reported in the country programme). By incorporating tables for collecting baseline data in the format as required by the Protocol, the baseline data would be formally included in the country programme in the appropriate format.

24. Since country programmes are official reports by the governments concerned, the data in the approved country programmes should be considered as official data for purposes of reporting data under Article 7 of the Protocol.

25. While it is difficult to assess the impact of workshops on the ability of Article 5 countries to collect and report data, it is evident that in spite of their attendance at these workshops, some countries still have problems with data reporting.

### **Recommendation**

26. Given the opportunities provided through the Regional Networks, other regional and national training workshops, the process of country programme preparation and institutional strengthening activities, there should not be a need for regional workshops specifically on data collection and reporting.