

**SUBMISSION BY KENYA ON
POTENTIAL WAYS AND MEANS OF LIMITING EMISSIONS OF
HYDROFLUOROCARBONS AND PERFLUOROCARBONS**

Kenya notes that a number of alternatives for Ozone-depleting substances have been accepted and adopted by the Parties to Montreal Protocol. These substances include Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) which have zero Ozone Depleting Potential (ODP) and Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) which even though have negligible ODP, have some ODP nonetheless. HCFCs are therefore being used on the interim basis and are to be phased out by 2030 in the developed countries and by 2040 in the developing countries. In view of global warming potentials of HCFCs earlier phase out dates are currently being negotiated by the meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

Both HFC and HCFC have high global warming potentials (GWPs).

It is to be noted that Montreal Protocol allows a certain level of production of controlled substances (about 15%) ostensibly for basic domestic needs of the developing countries. This allowance encourages continuous production of these Ozone Depleting Substance (ODSs). The developed countries have also remained passive to the export of equipment that are designed to use, contain, or depend on CFCs and it can therefore be stated that they have encouraged continued use of ODSs.

HFCs and HCFCs are costly, are not readily available and the non-availability of technical know-how on their handling and service etc. have acted as disincentive for their adoption. Therefore, their use has not yet taken strong root. However, these substances can be phased out and replaced with hydrocarbons (HC) on which current indications are that they are better alternatives due to their availability and low cost. HC do not also deplete the Ozone layer or cause global warming. However, since HC are flammable, consideration should be taken to improve safety aspects in using them as alternatives to ODS.

Perfluorocarbons are alternatives to ODS used as alternative solvents. They do cause global warming. For this reason, they can also be replaced with other non-ozone depleting alternatives that are listed by the Protocol.

The Montreal Protocol provision for increased production of ozone depleting substances, except where it is for essential use as defined by the Protocol, should be reviewed. This is a little area where the developed countries could face the litmus test in transfer of technology.

We note that control of emission of ODS, or alternatives to ODS known to have GWPs, remains to be the priority of the Montreal Protocol. Since some of these ODS are listed in Annex A to the Kyoto Protocol, it is recommended that Technical Options Committee of the Montreal Protocol and the SBSTA of the UNFCCC should form a joint working group or Task force to establish ways and means of limiting emissions of these ODSs with GWPs.