

**MONTREAL PROTOCOL
ON SUBSTANCES THAT DEplete
THE OZONE LAYER**

**REPORT OF THE
TECHNOLOGY AND ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT PANEL**

AUGUST 2024

**VOLUME 4: EVALUATION OF 2024 CRITICAL USE NOMINATIONS FOR METHYL
BROMIDE AND RELATED ISSUES**

FINAL REPORT



Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel

August 2024

VOLUME 4: EVALUATION OF 2024 CRITICAL USE NOMINATIONS FOR METHYL BROMIDE AND RELATED ISSUES

The text of this report is composed in Times New Roman.

Co-ordination: **Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee**

Composition of the report: Co-chairs: Ian Porter, Marta Pizano

Reproduction: Ozone Secretariat Nairobi

Date: August 2024

Under certain conditions, printed copies of this report are available from:

United Nations Environment Programme
Ozone Secretariat
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya

This document is also available in portable document format from:

<https://ozone.unep.org/science/assessment/teap>

No copyright involved. This publication may be freely copied, abstracted and cited, with acknowledgement of the source of the material.

ISBN: 978-9914-733-76-1

Disclaimer

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) Co-Chairs and members, and the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (MBTOC) Co-Chairs and members, and the companies and organisations that employ them do not endorse the performance, worker safety, or environmental acceptability of any of the technical options discussed. Every industrial operation requires consideration of worker safety and proper disposal of contaminants and waste products. Moreover, as work continues - including additional toxicity evaluation - more information on health, environmental and safety effects of alternatives and replacements will become available for use in selecting among the options discussed in this document.

UNEP, TEAP Co-Chairs and members, and the MBTOC Co-Chairs and members, in furnishing or distributing this information, do not make any warranty or representation, either express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or utility; nor do they assume any liability of any kind whatsoever resulting from the use or reliance upon any information, material, or procedure contained herein, including but not limited to any claims regarding health, safety, environmental effect or fate, efficacy, or performance, made by the source of information.

Mention of any company, association, or product in this document is for information purposes only and does not constitute a recommendation of any such company, association, or product, either express or implied by UNEP, TEAP Co-Chairs and members, and the MBTOC Co-Chairs and members or the companies or organisations that employ them.

Acknowledgement

The Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee acknowledge with thanks the outstanding contributions from all of the individuals and organisations who provided support to Panel and Committee Co-Chairs and members. The opinions expressed are those of the Panel and the Committee and do not reflect the reviews of any sponsoring or supporting organisation.

Foreword

The 2024 TEAP Report

The 2024 TEAP Report consists of 5 volumes:

Vol 1 TEAP Progress Report

Vol 2 Interim CUN Assessment

Vol 3 Decision XXXV/11: Life-cycle refrigerant management

Vol 4 Final CUN Assessment

Vol 5 Decision XXXV/7: Emissions of HFC-23

This is Volume 4.

The Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP):

Bella Maranion, co-chair	US	Sergey Kopylov	RF
Marta Pizano, co-chair	COL	Fabio Polonara	IT
Ashley Woodcock, co-chair	UK	Roberto Peixoto	BRA
Omar Abdelaziz	EG	Ian Porter	AUS
Paulo Altoé	BRA	Helen Tope	AUS
Suely Machado Carvalho	BRA	Rajan Rajendran	US
Adam Chattaway	UK	Dan Verdonik	US
Sukumar Devotta	IN	Helen Walter-Terrinoni	US
Takeshi Eriguchi	J	Jianjun Zhang	PRC
Ray Gluckman	UK	Shiqiu Zhang	PRC
Marco Gonzalez	CR		

The Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee:

MBTOC Co-Chairs: Marta Pizano (Colombia); Ian Porter (Australia).

MBTOC Members: Aocheng Cao (China); Jonathan Banks (Australia); Mohammed Besri (Morocco); Fred Bergwerff (Netherlands); Guillermo Castella (Uruguay); Kang Fenfen (China); Ken Glassey (New Zealand); Alfredo Gonzalez (Philippines); Takashi Misumi (Japan); Ayse Ozdem (Turkey); Christoph Reichmuth (Germany); Jordi Riudavets (Spain); Akio Tateya (Japan); Alejandro Valeiro (Argentina); Nick Vink (South Africa); Tim Widmer (USA)

Common Acronyms

1,3-D	1,3-dichloropropene
A5	Article 5 Party
ASD	Anaerobic soil disinfestation
CUE	Critical Use Exemption
CUN	Critical Use Nomination
DMDS	Dimethyl disulphide
DOI	Disclosure of Interest
EU	European Union
ExMOP	Extraordinary Meeting of the parties
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EPPO	European Plant Protection Organisation
MI	Methyl iodide (Iodomethane)
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
ISPM	International Standard Phytosanitary Measure
LPBF	Low Permeability Barrier Film (including VIF films)
MB	Methyl Bromide
MBTOC	Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee
MITC	Methyl isothiocyanate
MOP	Meeting of the parties
MS	Metham (metam) sodium
Non-A5	Non-Article 5 Party
OEWG	Open Ended Working Group
Pic	Chloropicrin
QPS	Quarantine and Pre-shipment
SF	Sulfuryl fluoride
TEAP	Technology and Economics Assessment Panel
TIF	Totally Impermeable Film
VIF	Virtually Impermeable Film
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds

Table of Contents

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2	SCOPE OF THE REPORT	3
3	CRITICAL USE NOMINATIONS FOR METHYL BROMIDE.....	5
	3.1 MANDATE.....	5
	3.2 FULFILMENT OF DECISION IX/6.....	5
	3.3 ACCOUNTING FRAMEWORKS FOR CRITICAL USE	5
	3.4 TRENDS IN METHYL BROMIDE USE FOR CUEs SINCE 2005	6
	3.5 DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST.....	8
	3.6 SITUATION WITH MB USE IN ARTICLE 5 PARTIES.....	8
	3.8 CONSIDERATION OF STOCKS, DECISION EX.1/4 (9F).....	9
4	CUN PROCESS FOR THE 2024 ROUND	15
	4.1 CRITICAL USE NOMINATION REVIEW PROCESS.....	15
	4.2 ACHIEVING CONSENSUS	15
5	FINAL EVALUATION OF THE 2024 CRITICAL USE NOMINATION FOR METHYL BROMIDE FOR PRE-PLANT SOIL USE IN 2025	17
	5.1 SUMMARY	17
	5.2 CRITICAL USE NOMINATION ASSESSMENT	17
	5.3 REGISTRATION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ALL CONTROLLED MB USES - DECISION EX 1/4 (9I) AND (9J).....	17
	5.4 DECISION XXV/4 REGULATIONS IMPACTING THE USE OF ALTERNATIVES	18
	5.4.1 REGULATIONS IMPACTING USE OF ALTERNATIVES BY CANADA	18
	5.4.2 HEALTH EFFECTS OF MB USE AND ENVIRONMENTAL ACCEPTABILITY	18
	5.5 SUSTAINABLE ALTERNATIVES FOR PRE-PLANT SOIL USES.....	19
	5.6 STANDARD PRESUMPTIONS USED IN ASSESSMENT OF PRE-PLANT SOIL USES	19
	5.7 ADJUSTMENTS FOR STANDARD DOSAGE RATES USING MB/PIC FORMULATIONS.....	20
	5.8 USE/EMISSION REDUCTION TECHNOLOGIES - BARRIER FILMS AND DOSAGE REDUCTION	21
6.	ACTIVITY REPORT 2024 AND WORKPLAN FOR 2025	25
	6.1 ACTIVITY REPORT FOR 2024.....	25
	6.2 WORK PLAN AND INDICATIVE BUDGET FOR 2025	25
7	REFERENCES	27
	ANNEX I: DECISION IX/6. CRITICAL USE EXEMPTIONS FOR METHYL BROMIDE.....	29
	ANNEX II: DECISION EX.I/4. CONDITIONS FOR GRANTING AND REPORTING CRITICAL-USE EXEMPTIONS FOR METHYL BROMIDE	30
	ANNEX III: TRENDS IN NON-A5 PRE-PLANT SOIL NOMINATIONS AND EXEMPTIONS FOR USES OF MB REPORTED TO HAVE BEEN PHASED OUT	33
	ANNEX IV: TRENDS IN NON-A5 STRUCTURAL AND COMMODITY NOMINATIONS AND EXEMPTIONS FOR USES OF MB REPORTED TO HAVE BEEN PHASED OUT	38

1 Executive Summary

The amount of methyl bromide (MB) requested for critical use nominations (CUNs) has fallen from 18,700 t submitted in over 140 nominations for 2005 to less than 3 tonnes submitted in one nomination for 2025.

In this round, the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (MBTOC) received one nomination for critical use for 2.850 tonnes of MB for preplant fumigation of a strawberry nursery at Prince Edward Island in Canada in 2025. The total amount requested this year by Canada represented a significant decrease (26%) in the amount approved for critical use for Canada in 2024. Canada has further indicated that no further CUN will be submitted as of 2026. This shifts MBTOC’s focus more strongly on uses of MB exempted under the Protocol – quarantine and pre-shipment – and their alternatives.

After initial review, MBTOC made an interim recommendation for the full nominated amount of 2.850 tonnes of MB. Since parties expressed agreement on this recommendation at the 36th Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG-36), and no new information was submitted by Canada, this interim recommendation now becomes final.

Country and Sector	Non-Article 5 Party Nomination (tonnes)	Article 5 Party Nomination (tonnes)	Final Recommendation (tonnes)
1. Canada (2025) Strawberry runners	2.850	Nil	[2.850]
TOTAL	2.850	Nil	[2.850]

The accounting framework information received from parties reporting under Article 7 showed that of the parties applying for CUNs (i.e. Canada) in 2024 round, no stocks were reported as available at the end of 2023. MBTOC is unclear what has happened to stocks reported by countries who previously requested CUNs.

As in previous reports, MBTOC notes that the accounting information in this report, does not accurately show the total stocks of MB held globally for controlled uses by Article 5 (A5) parties. This is because only parties applying for CUNs are required to report stocks, some parties have no formal mechanism to account accurately for stocks for non-quarantine and pre-shipment (non-QPS) and QPS uses and there is no requirement for parties to report pre-2015 stocks under the Montreal Protocol. As in past years, MBTOC still considers that these latter stocks may be substantial (approximately 1,000 tonnes).

MBTOC again suggests that accounting frameworks or Article 7 reporting could be improved to provide information on all stocks held by parties. This means that reporting would occur for parties which held any stocks of MB for controlled uses or exempt QPS uses. These stocks would need to be reported as of the end of the year prior to the year of reporting.

Unreported stocks mean that some sectors globally may not have phased out controlled uses of MB (and thus have not moved to alternatives for controlled uses). MBTOC is unclear if these sectors which are not using alternatives will apply for use of MB under the critical use process in the future. Also, unreported stocks may in future (through leaking cylinders) emit directly to the atmosphere, and if substantial, make it difficult to align consumption with anthropogenic emissions of MB. Unwanted stocks will also need access to processes which allow for destruction or proper disposal of MB.

MBTOC is also concerned that not all parties are aware of the need to report all uses (whether controlled or not) under Article 7 of the Protocol and urges the parties to reinforce the mechanisms for reporting and if necessary, to provide assistance to parties finding difficulties with their reporting obligations.

2 Scope of the Report

This 2024 final Critical Use Nomination (CUN) report provides an evaluation by MBTOC of the CUN for MB submitted in 2024 by one non-A5 party for use in 2025. As per provisions set out in Decision IX/6 (Annex I, MOP16), CUNs were required to be submitted by the parties to the Ozone Secretariat in accordance with the timetable shown in paragraph 1 of Annex I, Decision XVI/4.

This report also provides:

1. The final recommendation for the CUN as per the timelines set by Parties at the 35th Meeting of the parties (MOP),
2. Information from parties on stocks (Decision Ex.1/4 (9f)),
3. Partial information on actual MB consumption for critical uses (in accordance with Decision XVII/9), and
4. Indication of adoption rates of alternatives, as evidenced by trend lines on reduction of MB for CUNs (in accordance with Decisions XIX/9, XX/5).

Standard presumptions used in this 2024 round were the same as those used in the 2023 evaluations of the CUNs. These are subjected to continual review. However, it is required that any changes proposed by MBTOC be approved by the parties in the MOP preceding the year of assessment based on a draft Decision presented to the MOP in accordance with paragraph 2 in Annex 1 to the report of MOP16.

3 Critical Use Nominations for Methyl Bromide

3.1 Mandate

Under Article 2H of the Montreal Protocol, parties not operating under Article 5(1) (non-A5 parties) were required to phase out all production and consumption (defined as production plus imports minus exports) of MB after 1st January 2005. The same requirements applied to parties operating under Article 5(1) (A5 parties) after 1st January 2015. However, the parties agreed to a provision enabling exemptions for those uses of MB that qualify as critical. Under Decision IX/6 of the Protocol parties established criteria, which all critical uses need to meet in order to qualify for an exemption (see Annex I of this report). TEAP and its MBTOC have provided guidance to the parties on recommendations regarding critical use exemptions in accordance with Decisions IX/6, Annex I of Decision XVI/2 and a number of subsequent decisions (XVI/2; XVII/9, XVIII/13, XIX/9, XX/5, XXI/11, XXII/6, XXIII/4, XXIV/5, XXV/4, XXVI/2, XXVII/3, XXVIII/7, XXIX/6, XXX/9, XXXI/4, XXXII/3, XXXIII/6, XXXIV/9 and XXXV/15).

MBTOC considers that any chemical or product registered for a particular use has been through the rigours of the national local regulatory authorities and accepts that these fall within guidelines for health effects and environmental acceptability. MBTOC particularly takes note of those products, which are generally listed in any CUN application.

Under Decision Ex I/4 it is stated that amounts of MB applied for in subsequent CUNs should ‘*avoid any increase in methyl bromide consumption except for unforeseen circumstances.*’

3.2 Fulfilment of Decision IX/6

Decisions XVI/2 and XXI/11 directed MBTOC to indicate whether all CUNs fully met the requirements of Decision IX/6. When the requirements of Decision IX/6 are met, MBTOC can recommend critical uses of MB. When the requirements of Decision IX/6 are not met, MBTOC does not recommend critical uses of MB. Where some of the conditions are not fully met, MBTOC can recommend a decreased amount depending on its technical and economic evaluation or determine the CUN as “unable to assess” and request further information from the party. When the information is submitted, MBTOC is required to re-assess the nomination, following the procedures defined in Annex 1 of the 16th Meeting of the parties.

MBTOC has in the past rounds recommended less MB than requested in a CUN when technically and economically feasible alternatives were considered to be available, in the sense of Decision IX/6, or, when the party did not show that there was no technically and economically feasible alternative for part of the nomination. MBTOC may have accepted that some allocation was appropriate to permit timely phase-out of MB (i.e. a transition time for phase-in of alternatives). In this round of CUNs, as in previous rounds, MBTOC considered all information provided by the party, including answers to questions from MBTOC and all additional information submitted by the party up to the date of the evaluation.

3.3 Accounting Frameworks for Critical Use

Under the Dec Ex I/4 9(f), parties previously applying for Critical Uses are required to continue to submit accounting frameworks. MBTOC suggests that parties may wish to consider a revision to submission of frameworks to enable accurate reporting of all stocks held by a party and by all parties irrespective of whether they seek Critical Use Exemptions (CUEs).

Canada submitted its accounting framework for this round, showing no stocks were held by the party at the end of 2023.

A number of decisions (Ex.I/4 (9f); XVI/2(4); XVII/9(5) and subsequent ‘Critical Use’ Decisions set out provisions which request parties to submit in accounting frameworks by 1st February each year information on how criteria in IX/6(1) are met when licensing permitting or authorizing CUEs.

Decision XVII/9 of the 17th MOP sets the timeline for reporting and also specifically requests TEAP and its MBTOC to “report for 2005 and annually thereafter, for each agreed critical use category, the amount of MB nominated by a party, the amount of the agreed critical use and either:

- (a) *The amount licensed, permitted or authorised; or*
- (b) *The amount used*

Since the start of the CUN reviews in 2003, MBTOC has provided tables of the historic amounts of MB nominated and agreed for each critical use (Annexes III and IV). Additionally, parties have provided accounting frameworks on amounts used for critical uses and stocks as required under Dec Ex.1/4 (9f). The same requirements applied to A5 parties after 2015.

The Meeting of the parties (34th MOP) authorised Canada to use 4.650 tonnes of MB in 2023. for strawberry runners and the party in its accounting framework reported that this amount was used for the critical use from new imports of MB, with no remaining stocks at the end of that year. For 2023, the MOP authorised 3.857 tonnes for the same use.

3.4 Trends in Methyl Bromide Use for CUEs since 2005

Decision XVII/9 requires TEAP to show trends in the phase-out of the critical uses of MB (Fig 1.1 to Fig 1.3, Annexes III and IV). Since 2005, there has been a progressive downward trend in the officially reported amounts of MB requested for CUNs by all parties for both soil and post-harvest uses, although this has occurred at different rates. Figure 1.1 and Tables 1.4a-1.4c show reduction trends in amounts approved/nominated by parties for ‘Critical Use’ from 2005 to 2024 for all uses. Figure 1.2 shows the reduction trend for the remaining soil use in the non-A5 party, i.e., strawberry runners in Canada. The complete trends in phase-out of MB by party, as indicated by change in CUE, are shown in Annexes III and IV.

The nominated amounts and the apparent rate of reduction in MB or adoption of alternatives achieved by parties are shown in Figures 1.1 and 1.2. It is noted that for all parties that have pre-2005 (non A5 parties) or 2015 stocks (A5 parties) of MB that are being drawn down, the reductions in CUEs from year to year or uses not identified for CUEs cannot be taken directly as evidence of adoption of alternatives since pre-2005 or 2015 stocks may have been used (or may still be used) in the same sectors.

Figure 1.1 Amounts of MB nominated (CUN) and exempted (CUE) for uses in pre-plant soil and commodities sectors from 2005 to 2024 by non-A5 and A5 countries.





Figure 1.2 Amounts of MB nominated (CUN) and exempted (CUE) for uses in pre-plant soil sectors from 2005 to 2025 by Canada.. The blue line indicates the trend in MB nominated in the CUN and the red line the amount of MB approved as a CUE for the party



* Prince Edward Island

3.5 *Disclosure of Interest*

As in past assessments, MBTOC members were requested to update their disclosure of interest forms relating specifically to their level of national, regional or enterprise involvement for the 2023 CUN process. The Disclosure of Interest declarations for 2024, updated in February 2024 can be found on the Ozone Secretariat website at: <https://ozone.unep.org/science/assessment/teap/methyl-bromide-toc-members> and a list of members at the end of this report. No members recused from or abstained to participate in a particular CUN assessment in this round.

3.6 *Situation with MB Use in Article 5 Parties*

MB was due to be fully phased out in A5 parties by January 1, 2015, 10 years after the phase-out date for non-A5 parties. In both cases, uses for feedstock and QPS are exempted from phase-out under the control measures described in Article 2H. There is also provision for exemption from phase-out for uses deemed ‘critical’ according to Article 2H, as complying with Decision IX/6.

In A5 parties, 91.5% of previous controlled uses were replaced by the 2015 deadline, largely as a result of investment projects implemented by the Montreal Protocol agencies with MLF funding, bilateral cooperation and also national funding.

By end of 2022, over 99% of the global consumption for non-exempt uses has reportedly (under Article 7) been phased out. This assumption is provided parties report accurately. The reduction does not account for stocks still being used for non-controlled uses.

MBTOC is still concerned that not all parties are aware of the need to report all uses (whether controlled or not) under Article 7 of the Protocol and urges the parties to reinforce the mechanisms for reporting and if necessary, to provide assistance to parties finding difficulties with their reporting obligations.

3.7 *Reporting requirements and agreed conditions under Decision Ex.1/4*

Decision Ex. I/4 taken at the 1st Extraordinary Meeting of the parties (2004) set forth a series of requirements from parties requesting CUNs after the phase-out date, which non-A5 parties have fulfilled over the past decade and now become relevant for A5 parties. This decision also includes some agreed conditions for requesting continuing CUNs.

Such requirements are fully considered by MBTOC during its CUN evaluations and also when preparing the ‘Handbook of CUN nominations’. The following list has been prepared to assist A5 parties with the preparation of CUNs.

The full text of Dec. Ex. I/4 is included in the Appendix II of this report for reference. In summary, parties for which a CUE has been approved need to submit the following materials to the Ozone Secretariat (dates in brackets have been inserted by MBTOC so they apply to the A5 timeline):

1. *Information before 1 February 2005 [2015] on the alternatives available, listed according to their pre-harvest or post-harvest uses and the possible date of registration, if required, for each alternative;*
2. *A **national management strategy** for phase-out of critical uses of methyl bromide before 1 February 2006 [2016]. The management strategy should aim, among other things:*
 - a) *To avoid any increase in methyl bromide consumption except for unforeseen circumstances;*
 - b) *To encourage the use of alternatives through the use of expedited procedures, where possible, to develop, register and deploy technically and economically feasible alternatives;*
 - c) *To provide information, for each current pre-harvest and post-harvest use for which a nomination is planned, on the potential market penetration of newly deployed alternatives and alternatives which may be used in the near future, to bring forward the time when it is estimated that methyl bromide consumption for such uses can be reduced and/or ultimately*

eliminated;

- d) *To promote the implementation of measures which ensure that any emissions of methyl bromide are minimized;*
- e) *To show how the management strategy will be implemented to promote the phase-out of uses of methyl bromide as soon as technically and economically feasible alternatives are available, in particular describing the steps which the party is taking in regard to subparagraph (b) (iii) of paragraph 1 of decision IX/6 in respect of research programmes in non-Article 5 parties and the adoption of alternatives by Article 5 parties;*

3.8 Consideration of stocks, Decision Ex.1/4 (9f)

One criterion for granting a critical use is that MB “*is not available in sufficient quantity and quality from existing stocks of banked or recycled methyl bromide*” (paragraph 1 (b) (ii) of Decision IX/6). parties nominating critical use exemptions are requested under Decision Ex I/4 (9f) to submit an accounting framework with the information on stocks.

To assist parties with their consideration of stocks, and in accordance with Decision XVIII/13(7), a summary of the data on stocks as reported by non-A5 parties in the first year for accounting in 2006, and then reports submitted in 2022 and 2023 are summarised in Tables 1.1 - 1.3 below.

MBTOC notes that reported stocks have significantly decreased in recent years, however the use of MB stocks makes the assessment of the rates of adoption of MB alternatives hard to assess. In A5 parties, there is no reporting mechanism for pre-2015 stocks and it is possible that there are substantial unreported stocks. There is also confusion in some parties as to whether stocks held by that party are for QPS or non QPS uses.

Reported stocks for controlled non QPS uses are now nil (see Table 1.3), but stocks held for other non-reported controlled uses may be around 1000 t.

MBTOC suggests that accounting frameworks or Article 7 reporting could be improved to provide information on all stocks held by parties. This means that reporting would occur for parties which held any stocks of MB for controlled uses or have been granted critical uses of methyl bromide and still hold stocks and the exempt uses. These stocks would need to be reported as of the end of the year prior to the year of reporting.

MBTOC acknowledges that efficient functioning of commerce requires a certain level of available stocks and additional stocks to respond to emergencies. Additionally, stocks may be held on behalf of other parties or for exempted uses (feedstock and QPS uses). Some parties have reported on having old cylinders of MB which will no longer be used, and not knowing how to dispose of them. The correct or optimal level of stocks for virtually every input to production is not zero. In addition, stocks are privately owned and may not be readily available for critical uses, or there may be national regulations preventing the transfer of stocks. Despite these restrictions, parties may wish to ensure that stocks are used wherever possible in order to minimise the quantity of MB that need to be produced each year for critical uses. Tables 1.1 - 1.3 report the quantities of MB ‘on hand’ at the beginning and end respectively of 2005, 2022 and 2023 as required under Decision Ex. 1/4 (9f). The earlier CUN reports identified stocks for the other years.

Table 1.1 Quantities of MB (tonnes) ‘on hand’ at the beginning and end of 2005, as first reported by parties in 2006/2007 under Decision Ex 1/4.

	CUEs authorized by MOP for 2005	Quantity of MB as reported by parties (tonnes)				
		Amount on hand at start of 2005 ^(a)	Quantity acquired for CUEs in 2005 (prod. +imports)	Amount available for use in 2005	Quantity used for CUEs in 2005	Amount on hand at the end of 2005
Australia	146.6	0	114.912	114.912	114.912	0
Canada	61.792	0	48.858	48.858	45.146	3.712
EU	4,392.812	216.198	2,435.319	2,651.517	2,530.099	121.023
Israel	1,089.306	16.358	1,072.350	1,088.708	1,088.708	0
Japan	748.000	0	594.995	594.995	546.861	48.134
New Zealand	50.000	6.900	40.500	47.400	44.580	2.810
USA(a)	9,552.879		7,613.000	not reported	7,170.000	443.000

Additional information on stocks was reported on US EPA website, September 2006: MB inventory held by USA companies: 2004 = 12,994 tonnes; 2005 = 9,974 tonnes.

Table 1.2 Quantities of MB ‘on hand’ at the beginning and end of 2022, as reported by parties in 2023

Party	Critical use exemption authorized by MOP for 2022	Quantity of MB as reported by parties (tonnes)				
		Amount on hand at start of 2022	Acquired for CUEs in 2022 (prod. +imports)	Amount available for use in 2022	Used for CUEs in 2022	Amount on hand at the end of 2022
Canada	5.017	0	5.017	5.017	5.017	0

Table 1.3 Quantities of MB ‘on hand’ at the beginning and end of 2023, as reported by parties in 2024

Party	Critical use exemption authorized by MOP for 2023	Quantity of MB as reported by parties (tonnes)				
		Amount on hand at start of 2023	Acquired for CUEs in 2023 (prod.+imports)	Amount available for use in 2023	Used for CUEs Exempted for 2023	Amount on hand at the end of 2023
Canada	4.650	0	4.650	4.650	4.650	0

Table 1.4a Summary of nominations for critical use of MB (tonnes) sought by non A5 parties since 2005

Party	Quantity of MB Nominated																				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Australia	206.950	81.250	52.145	52.900	38.990	37.610	35.450	34.660	32.164	30.947	29.79	29.79	29.79	29.76	28.98	28.98	28.98	28.98	14.49	14.49	0
Canada	61.992	53.897	46.745	42.241	39.115	35.080	19.368 +3.529	16.281	13.444	10.305	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.017	5.017	3.875	2.850
EC	5754.361	4213.47	1239.873	245.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Israel	1117.156	1081.506	1236.517	952.845	699.448	383.700	232.247	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Japan	748.000	741.400	651.700	589.600	508.900	288.500	249.420	221.104	3.317	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Zealand	53.085	53.085	32.573	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	8.700	7.000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	10753.997	9386.229	7417.999	6415.153	4958.034	3299.490	2388.128	1181.779 + 6.339	691.608	442.337	377.170	234.78	3.240	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18704.241	15617.837	10677.552	8297.739	6244.487	4044.380	2928.142	1460.163	740.533	483.589	412.221	269.831	38.291	35.021	34.241	34.241	34.241	33.997	19.507	18.365	[2.850]

Table 1.4b Summary of critical use exemptions of MB (tonnes) approved by the parties for non-A5 parties

Party	Quantity of MB Approved																			
	2005 (1ExMOP and 16MOP)	2006 (16MOP+ 2ExMOP+ 17MOP)	2007 (17MOP + 18MOP)	2008 (18MOP+ 19MOP)	2009 (19MOP)	2010 (20MOP+ 21MOP)	2011 (21MOP)	2012 (22MOP)	2013 (23MOP)	2014 (24MOP)	2015 (25 MOP)	2016 (26 MOP)	2017 (27 MOP)	2018 (28 MOP)	2019 (29 MOP)	2020 (30 MOP)	2021 (31 st MOP)	2022 (32MOP)	2023 (33 rd and 34 th MOP)	2024 (35MOP)
Australia	146.600	75.100	48.517	48.450	37.610	36.440	28.710	31.708	32.134	30.947	29.79	29.79	29.79	29.73	28.98	28.98	28.98	28.98	28.98	0
Canada	61.792	53.897	52.874	36.112	39.020	30.340 +3.529	19.368	16.281	13.109	10.305	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.017	5.017	4.650	3.857
EC	4392.812	3536.755	689.142	245.146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Israel	1089.306	880.295	966.715	860.580	610.854	290.878	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Japan	748.000	741.400	636.172	443.775	305.380	267.000	239.746	219.609	3.317	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Zealand	50.000	42.000	18.234	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	8.700	7.000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	9552.879	8081.753	6749.060	5355.976	4261.974	3232.856 +2.018	2055.200	993.706	562.328	442.337	376.900	234.780	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	16050.09	13418.20	9160.714	6990.039	5254.838	3866.583	2343.024	1261.304	610.888	483.589	411.951	269.831	35.051	34.991	34.241	34.241	33.997	33.997	33.630	[3.857]

Table 1.4c Summary of Critical Use Nominations and Exemptions of MB (tonnes) for A5 parties

Party	Quantity of MB Nominated									Quantity of MB Approved								
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Argentina	245	177.0	120.3	120.7	71.5	35.70	20.33	9.65	0	134.3	129.25	102.94	76.70	41.31	20.62	11.31	9.65	0
China	120	114.0	99.75	92.977	0	0	0	0	0	114.0	99.75	92.977	87.24	0	0	0	0	0
Mexico	140	120.978	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84.96	84.957	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Africa	-	81.6	83.0	50.0	41.5	41.5	35.0	0*	20	-	74.062	59.10	45.65	41.00	34.3	24.3	0	19.0
Total	505	411.978	303.05	263.677	113.0	77.20	55.33	9.65	20.00	333.26	388.019	255.017	209.59	82.31	54.92	35.61	9.65	19.0

4 CUN Process for the 2024 Round

4.1 *Critical Use Nomination review process*

As already mentioned in volume 2 of the TEAP 2024 Progress Report, MBTOC conducted its interim assessment meeting in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam from the 11-14 March 2024. The meeting was held in accordance with the time schedule for the consideration of CUNs as required by Decision XVI/4 (see Annex 1). MBTOC recommendations were discussed and signed off in plenary discussions and by consensus and all members fully participated in the decision-making process.

Since the interim recommendation was agreed to by the parties at OEWG-46 and no new information was submitted by Canada, MBTOC is now putting forward this recommendation as final. This decision was taken by virtual means as a new in-person meeting was not deemed necessary.

In assessing the CUN submitted in 2024, as in previous rounds, MBTOC applied the standards contained in Annex I of the final report of the 16thMOP and, where relevant, the standard presumptions given below. In particular, MBTOC sought to provide consistent treatment of CUNs within and between parties while at the same time taking local circumstances into consideration. The most recent CUE approved by the parties for a particular CUN was used as baseline for consideration of continuing nominations. In evaluating the CUN for preplant use of MB as a soil treatment, MBTOC assumed that the presence of a technically feasible alternative to MB or alternative technology would need to provide sufficient pest and/or weed control to allow for continued production of that crop within existing market standards. The economic viability of production was also considered.

4.2 *Achieving consensus*

In accordance with Decision XX/5(9) and subsequent Decisions (XXI/11(4), XXII/6(4) and XXIII/4(3) and XXIV/5 and 8) the parties have indicated that MBTOC ‘*should ensure that it develops its recommendations in a consensus process that includes full discussion among all available members of the Committee....*’

In keeping with this mandate as well as the new working scheme put in place by the co-chairs, all members were given access to the information and were able to discuss issues related to the nomination, for this stage by electronic means. All views were discussed fully and no minority positions arose during the meetings; no members needed to recuse.

5 Final Evaluation of the 2024 Critical Use Nomination for Methyl Bromide for Pre-Plant Soil Use in 2025

5.1 Summary

Only one party requesting a CUN in 2024 for CUE in 2025 sent information to the Ozone Secretariat around the January 24, 2023 deadline.

Information on CUN was forwarded by the Secretariat to MBTOC co-chairs, who in turn, provided this information to MBTOC members for preliminary assessment and to confirm that it complied with requirements of Decision IX/6 and Annex 1 of the 16th MOP. After initial review by MBTOC, Canada provided further information to questions by MBTOC. This was required in order to fully assess the nomination. At the OEWG-46, the party expressed agreement with MBTOC's interim recommendation and did not submit any new information for further reassessment. Therefore MBTOC puts forward this recommendation as final for consideration at the 36th MOP.

The CUN submitted from Canada for 2025 was for pre-plant soil use of MB and represented a 26% reduction over the amount approved by the parties at the 35th MOP for use in 2024. Although highlighting difficulties with the uptake of technical alternatives, Canada has continued to implement a step-down plan to reduce the nominated amounts with the aim to phase out MB requests by 2026.

The justification for a CUN being submitted by Canada related to environmental conditions and regulatory restrictions which did not allow partial or full use of alternatives which have been successful for this sector in other countries, difficulties in the scale-up of substrate technologies and the economic cost of scale up of these technologies. In paragraph 20 of Annex 1 referred to in Decision XVI/4, parties specifically requested MBTOC to explicitly state the specific basis for the parties' economic statement relating to CUNs. Table 1.9 provides this information for this CUN as prepared by the MBTOC members and the MBTOC economist.

5.2 Critical Use Nomination assessment

Table 1.5 identifies the quantities recommended by MBTOC after consideration of all the information provided by the parties requesting critical uses.

Detailed information on the nominations can be found in Table 1.9.

Table 1.5 Summary of the final recommendation (in square brackets) for CUE's for pre-plant use of MB (tonnes) submitted in 2024 recommended for use in 2025

Country and Sector	Non-Article 5 Party Nomination (tonnes)	Article 5 Party Nomination (tonnes)	Final Recommendation (tonnes)
1. Canada (2024) Strawberry runners	2.850	Nil	[2.850]
TOTAL	2.850	Nil	[2.850]

5.3 Registration of Alternatives for all Controlled MB Uses - Decision Ex I/4 (9i) and (9j)

Decision Ex. I/4 (9i) requires MBTOC "To report annually on the status of re-registration and review of methyl bromide uses for the applications reflected in the critical-use exemptions, including any information on health effects and environmental acceptability". Further, Decision Ex I/4 (9j) requires MBTOC "To report annually on the status of registration of alternatives and substitutes for methyl

bromide, with particular emphasis on possible regulatory actions that will increase or decrease dependence on methyl bromide”.

Where these have impacted a nomination, the party or MBTOC may have adjusted quantities to allow for effective use of the alternative. A description of any changes has been made available in the CUN text boxes (Tables 1.9). MBTOC notes that although all key fumigant alternatives are presently prevented from being used at PEI due to groundwater concerns, the party is urged to consider their use to assist future phase out of MB if feasible.

Any future nominations if submitted by any party should include information on expected rates of adoption of alternatives following registration, in accordance with paragraphs 34-35 of Annex 1 of the 16thMOP, as this information would assist MBTOC in its evaluation of these CUNs.

5.4 Decision XXV/4 Regulations Impacting the Use of Alternatives

In response to Decision XXV/4 from the 25th MOP, MBTOC notes that all of the non-A5 nominations contained a discussion of national, sub national or local regulations impacting the potential use of alternatives to MB. In addition, the Canadian nomination contained information on the status of the registration of alternatives and substitutes for MB. These comments are summarised below for each party.

5.4.1 Regulations impacting use of alternatives by Canada

- Groundwater warning statements are currently on Canadian pesticide labels for all key fumigant replacements to MB, including MB/Chloropicrin (MB/Pic) formulations. However, the government of PEI only accepts MB/Pic mixtures to be used for soil disinfestation.

5.4.2 Health effects of MB use and environmental acceptability

Over the past two decades, numerous studies have characterised the health hazards resulting from exposure to methyl bromide. Its acute and chronic toxicities are very high and, in many countries, it is classified as “toxicity class I”. It is known as a developmental, neurologic and respiratory toxin (Gemmill *et al.*, 2013, De Souza *et al.*, 2013, Bulathsinghala and Shaw, 2014). Other known target organs are the heart, adrenal glands, liver, kidneys and testis (Gemmill *et al.*, 2013).

Accidental exposure to high concentrations of MB has been reported in many instances including fumigation of museums in Japan (Yamano and Nakadate, 2006), when handling the fumigant in a manufacturing facility in India (De Souza *et al.*, 2013), when opening imported freight containers (Baur *et al.*, 2010a and 2010b) and even in a home used for vacations (Kulkarni *et al.*, 2015).

Additional findings reinforce suggested links between exposure to MB and health problems, including increased risk of developing prostate cancer, derived from occupational and community exposure (Budnik *et al.*, 2012; Cockburn *et al.*, 2011). In another study (Gemmill *et al.*, 2013), a correlation was found between impaired foetal growth during the third trimester of human pregnancies and exposure to methyl bromide in residential areas. A study by McCall *et al.* (2016) that focussed on toxicity effects from chronic use of methyl bromide, found that effects of exposure at what are believed to be safe and appropriate concentrations of methyl bromide under federal guidelines are under-reported and not previously present in the literature. Patients included in this study developed similar syndromes of ataxia, urinary retention and psychiatric symptoms that were matched by unique abnormalities on MR imaging of the brain and serum lab abnormalities.

Research in Korea reported that high and hazardous exposure levels to MB in workers conducting chamber and tent fumigations, and this underlines the need for appropriate protective equipment (Jeong *et al.*, 2020). A further study, also conducted in the Korean port of Busan indicated that

occupational exposure to MB can have negative effects on the health of workers, even when they do not show symptoms of toxicity (Park *et al.*, 2020).

Risk of exposure is or has been especially high when small disposable canisters (i.e. 500 to 750g) are used for MB fumigation for pre plant soil under plastic sheets or commodity use in non-QPS and QPS applications. Canister applications have been eliminated for soil use in all non-A5 and in many A5 countries as this application is considered to be less efficient than other methods for the control of soil borne pathogens. Besides, this treatment is considered to be more dangerous to workers than injection methods, because trained contractors are not generally involved in MB application. Also, canister applications are not considered to be as effective for pathogen control as injection of MB/Pic mixtures. Also, such applications are more likely to lead to high emissions of MB as the gas is released immediately beneath plastic barrier sheets. MBTOC also notes that, in some circumstances, MB can leak out from the canister. MBTOC notes with concern that canister use is still allowed for quarantine uses in a number of A5 parties e.g. China, Egypt, Jordan, India and Mexico.

The environmental acceptability of MB is handled by national regulatory authorities in each country.

5.5 Sustainable alternatives for pre-plant soil uses

In the past, MBTOC has urged parties to consider the long-term sustainability of treatments adopted as alternatives to MB. The combination of chemical and non-chemical alternatives in an integrated pest management (IPM) program provides excellent results in the longer term. Decision IX/6 1(a) (ii) refers to alternatives that are ‘*acceptable from the standpoint of environment and health*’. MBTOC has visited various regions and countries in the world where successful chemical and non-chemical alternatives, e.g., soil less culture, grafting, solarisation, steam, bio-disinfestation (biofumigation) and anaerobic soil disinfestation, are used as sustainable alternatives to MB for strawberry runners and other crops.

5.6 Standard presumptions used in assessment of pre-plant soil uses

The tables below (Tables 1.6 - 1.8 present the standard presumptions applied by MBTOC for this round of CUNs for pre-plant soil uses. These standard presumptions were first proposed in the MBTOC report of October 2005 and were presented to the parties at the 17th MOP. Studies and reports to support them have been provided in previous reports and were revised for some sectors after consideration by the parties at the 19th MOP. The rates and practices adopted by MBTOC as standard presumptions are based on maximum rates considered acceptable by published literature and actual commercial practice.

As in the evaluations in previous years, MBTOC considered reductions to quantities of MB in particular nominations to a standard rate per treated area where technical evidence supported its use. As a special case, MBTOC continues to accept a maximum rate of 200 kg/ ha (20 g/m²) in MB/Pic formulations with high Pic-containing mixtures with or without barrier films for certified nursery production, unless regulations prescribe lower or higher rates. However, MBTOC notes that most studies have shown that rates of 200 kg/ha (20 g/m²) or less of MB: Pic 50:50 to be effective with barrier films for production of ‘certified’ nursery material and urge parties to consider regulations which permit these lower rates. MBTOC also notes that certified runner production sometimes involves regulations specifying the mandatory use of a specific fumigant, such as MB, or an alternative, in order for the runners to be “certified runners”. The Canadian nomination in this round satisfied these presumptions.

The indicative rates used by MBTOC were maximum guideline rates, for the purpose of calculation only. MBTOC recognises that the actual rate appropriate for a specific use may vary with local circumstances, soil conditions and the target pest situation.

Table 1.6 Standard presumptions used in assessment of the CUN for pre-plant soil use of MB

	Comment	CUN adjustment	Exceptions
1. Dosage rates	Maximum guideline rates for MB:Pic 98:2 are 25 to 35 g/m ² with barrier films (VIF or equivalent); for mixtures of MB/Pic are 12.5 to 17.5 g MB/m ² for pathogens and nutsedge respectively, under barrier films depending on the sector. All rates are on a 'per treated hectare' basis.	Amount adjusted to maximum guideline rates. Maximum rates set dependent on formulation and soil type and film availability.	Higher rates accepted if specified under national legislation or where the party had justified otherwise.
2. Barrier films	All treatments to be carried out under low permeability barrier film (e.g. VIF, TIF)	Nomination reduced proportionately to conform to barrier film use.	Where barrier film prohibited or restricted by legislative or regulatory reasons
3. MB/Pic Formulation: Pathogens control	Unless otherwise specified, MB/Pic 50:50 (or similar) was considered to be the standard effective formulation for pathogen control, as a transitional strategy to replace MB/Pic 98:2.	Nominated amount adjusted for use with MB/Pic 50:50 (or similar).	Where MB/Pic 50:50 is not registered, or Pic is not registered
4. MB/Pic Formulation: Weeds/nutsedge ass control	Unless otherwise specified, MB/Pic 67:33 (or similar) was used as the standard effective formulation for control of resistant (tolerant) weeds, as a transitional strategy to replace MB/Pic 98:2.	Nominated amount adjusted for use with MB/Pic 67:33 (or similar).	Where Pic or Pic-containing mixtures are not registered
5. Strip vs. Broadacre	Fumigation with MB and mixtures to be carried out under strip	Where rates were shown in broad acre hectares, the CUN was adjusted to the MB rate relative to strip treatment (i.e. treated area). If not specified, the area under strip treatment was considered to represent 67% of the total area.	Where strip treatment was not feasible e.g. some protected cultivation, emission regulations on MB, or open field production of high health propagative material

Table 1.7 Maximum dosage rates for pre-plant soil use of MB by sector used since 2009 (standard presumptions) with or without barrier films.

Film Type	Maximum MB Dosage Rate (g/m²) in MB/Pic mixtures (67:33, 50:50) considered effective for:			
	Strawberries and Vegetables	Plant Nurseries*	Orchard Replant	Ornamentals
Barrier films - Pathogens	12.5	15	15	15
Barrier films –Nutsedge	15.0	17.5	17.5	17.5
No Barrier films – Pathogens	20	20	20	20
No Barrier films - Nut sedge	26	26	26	26

* Maximum rate unless certification specifies otherwise

5.7 Adjustments for standard dosage rates using MB/Pic formulations

As in previous assessments, one key transitional strategy to reduce MB dosage has been the adoption of MB/Pic formulations with lower concentrations of MB (e.g. MB/Pic 50:50, 33:67 or less). These formulations are considered to be equally as effective in controlling soil-borne pathogens as

formulations containing higher quantities of MB (e.g. 98:2, 67:33) (Porter *et al.*, 2006; Santos *et al.*, 2007; Hamill *et al.*, 2004; Hanson *et al.*, 2010), (Table 1.7).

Table 1.8 Actual dosage rates applied during pre-plant fumigation when different rates and formulations of MB/Pic mixtures are applied with and without barrier films. Rates of application reflect standard commercial applications rates.

Commercial application rates (kg/ha) of MB/Pic formulation	MB/Pic formulation (dose of MB in g/m ²)			
	98:2	67:33	50:50	30:70
A. With Standard Polyethylene Films				
400	39.2	26.8	20.0	12.0
350	34.3	23.5	17.5	10.5
300	29.4	20.1	15.0	9.0
B. With Low Permeability Barrier Films (LPBF)				
250	24.5	16.8	12.5	7.5
200	19.6	13.4	10.0*	6.0
175	17.2	11.8	8.8	5.3

* Note: Trials from 1996 to 2008 (see previous MBTOC CUN reports: <http://ozone.unep.org/en/assessment-panels/documents>) show that a dosage of 10g/m² (e.g. MB/Pic 50:50 at 200kg/ha with Low Permeability Barrier Films) is technically feasible for many situations and equivalent to the standard dosage of >20g/m² using standard PE films

5.8 Use/Emission reduction technologies - barrier films and dosage reduction

Decision XXI/11 (para. 9) requested further reporting on Decision IX/6 to ensure parties adopted emission controls where possible. For pre-plant soil use, this includes the use of barrier films or other mitigation strategies such as high moisture sealing and the lowest effective dose of MB with mixtures of chloropicrin. Other methods include deep shanking and use of ammonium thiosulphate and different irrigation technologies (Yates *et al.*, 2002). These latter technologies have not been reported or adopted widely by parties.

In southeast USA, the reported use of barrier films in vegetable crops expanded rapidly to over 20,000 hectares in a few years. MBTOC notes that barrier films, particularly totally impermeable films (TIF), can be used with alternatives and this is consistently improving the performance of alternatives at lower dosage rates (Driver *et al.*, 2011; Cabrera *et al.*, 2015; Weiland *et al.*, 2016; Holmes *et al.*, 2020) and making them more acceptable as a replacement to MB. For example, effectiveness at lower dosages can allow for greater areas to be treated with 1,3-D under township cap regulations in the US.

Table 1.9 Final recommendation for the CUN from a non A5 Party for pre-plant soil fumigation submitted in 2024 for use in 2025 (tonnes).

Country	Industry	CUE for 2005 ¹	CUE for 2006 ²	CUE for 2007 ³	CUE for 2008 ⁴	CUE for 2009 ⁵	CUE for 2010 ⁶	CUE for 2011 ⁷	CUE for 2012 ⁸	CUE for 2013 ⁹	CUE for 2014 ¹⁰	CUE for 2015 ¹¹	CUE for 2016 ¹²	CUE for 2017 ¹³	CUE for 2018 ¹⁴	CUE for 2019 ¹⁵	CUE for 2020 ¹⁶	CUE for 2021 ¹⁷	CUE for 2022 ¹⁸	CUE for 2023 ¹⁹	CUE for 2024 ²¹	CUN for 2025 and final rec.
Canada	Strawberry runners	6.840	6.840	7.995	7.462	7.462	7.462	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.261	5.017	5.017	4.650	3.857	[2.850]
<p>MBTOC final recommendation for 2025:</p> <p>MBTOC recommends the total amount nominated of 2.850 tonnes of MB for this use in 2025. According to the CUN, Canada will not submit a nomination for the 2026. This nomination for 2025 is the final step in the Government of Canada’s policy-based approach to the phase out of methyl bromide.</p> <p>Nomination by the party for 2025:</p> <p>In 2024, for 2025 use, Canada is requesting 2.850 tonnes which is the equivalent to the use of 4.254 tonnes of Terr-O-Gas® (67:33 MB/Pic mixture). This is a reduction of 26.1% (1.007 t) from the 3.857 t of methyl bromide authorized by the MOP for 2024.</p> <p>The nomination is based on a reduced rate of MB of 20 g/m² under high barrier plastic films (TIF) covering the entire cropping area, which is consistent with MBTOC’s standard presumption for certified propagation material.</p> <p>Circumstances of the nomination by the party:</p> <p>The use of Terr-O-Gas (MB/Pic 67:33) as a pre-plant fumigant in strawberry runner production is permitted because it has been successfully used by the grower for over 30 years and has not resulted in any known contamination of groundwater.</p> <p>A key alternative to methyl bromide for this use by some other parties, chloropicrin (Pic) is registered and used in other regions in Canada for strawberry runners under certain conditions. However, the Government of Prince Edward Island (PEI) does not allow the use of Pic due to concerns regarding groundwater contamination (the Island relies on groundwater for their potable water and the soil type is sandy). Metham sodium or metham potassium are also prohibited due to the same concerns.</p> <p>In its response to MBTOC questions, Canada reported that the only suitable alternative to fumigation with MB that will be used by the grower in 2025 is indoor soilless production. The party states that his technology is a suitable technical alternative to fumigation with methyl bromide, in the absence of chemical alternatives, and that the higher capital and operational costs of indoor soilless production are not sufficient to further delay commercial implementation of this technical alternative.</p> <p>The Government of PEI has authorized a trial to ascertain whether it is possible for the grower to fumigate with PIC (100%), without resulting groundwater contamination. The decision to allow, or not, the use of PIC by the grower is at the sole discretion of the Government of PEI. The grower conducts annual groundwater monitoring for both MB and PIC, as a condition of their use permit for Terr-O-Gas® 67, issued by the Government of PEI. The specific wells to be tested each year (are pre-determined by the Government of PEI. Since the ground water sampling began in 2015, there has never been a detection of either MB or Pic, at a reporting limit of 5 µg/l.</p>																						

MBTOC assessment for MB use in this sector in 2025:

MBTOC considers that soilless production is a suitable alternative for this nomination. In the absence of any suitable fumigants being presently being approved for use at PEI this technology offers the only suitable alternative. Soilless production is a non-chemical alternative to MB widely used in strawberry runner production (López-Galarza *et al.*, 2010; Rodríguez-Delfín 2012; Wei *et al.*, 2020). The Party has been evaluating soilless systems under outdoor and indoor conditions for over four years and is convinced that this technology is the best alternative to MB.

MBTOC welcomes that the grower has been conducting groundwater studies for Pic since 2015 and acknowledges that its future adoption will be determined by the authorities at PEI. MBTOC notes that Lalonde and Garron (2020) surveyed nine sites in other areas within and outside PEI (i.e. Nova Scotia, three sites in PEI and one site in New Brunswick) for groundwater contamination of various pesticides including Pic. In all 13 sites, no Pic was detected in groundwater including the three sites in PEI, despite Pic being used as part of the existing MB formulation (67:33). Therefore, MBTOC considers that Pic could be used, if authorized, as an alternative to MB.

MBTOC comments on economics provided in the CUN for MB use in 2025:

The party has accepted that soilless production is suitable for G2 plug production. The party previously has stated that the adoption of the Haygrove high tunnel multi span soilless systems would affect no more than 4% of MB use at the time (405kg); would require a significant change to production practices; and would increase costs significantly. In its application for 2022, The Party subsequently provided an economic analysis for the alternative of soilless production in a greenhouse using “Botanicoir Precision Plus” growbags for G2 plants. The Party argued that, if successful, this would result in a 45% reduction in the use of MB on condition that productivity could be maintained or increased. The party now reports that the grower has been able to lower the cost of production per plant but has yet to calculate the capital cost associated with the construction and setup of the greenhouses. Based on the cost of the existing structures and the lower unit costs of larger structures, it is estimated that the capital costs can be recovered by 2031 with achievable levels of productivity.

Comments requested in Dec. XX1/11 (para 9):

- **Dec. IX/6 b(i) Emission Reduction:** Yes, barrier films are used with a reduced application rate of MB conforming to MBTOC’s presumptions.
- **Dec. IX/6 b (iii) Research Program:** A new research program focussed on substrate production as a key alternative to MB has been operational for many years. Groundwater analysis for Pic residues are being conducted by the grower and experiments with Pic authorized by the government.
- **Dec. IX/6 b (iii) Appropriate Effort:** MBTOC recognizes the efforts to research substrates for later production stages and commends the party in continuing to optimise these research efforts to secure other alternatives (e.g. Pic) as indicated by Dec. IX/6 b (iii).

¹ExMOP and 16MOP; ²16MOP+2ExMOP+17MOP; ³MOP17+MOP18; ⁴MOP18+MOP19; ⁵MOP19+MOP20; ⁶MOP20+MOP21; ⁷MOP21+MOP22; ⁸MOP22, ⁹MOP23, ¹⁰MOP24, ¹¹MOP25, ¹²MOP26, ¹²MOP26, ¹³MOP27, ¹⁴MOP28, ¹⁵MOP29, ¹⁶MOP30, ¹⁷MOP31, ¹⁸MOP32, ¹⁹MOP33, ²⁰MOP34, ²¹MOP35

6. Activity Report 2024 and Workplan for 2025

6.1 Activity report for 2024

As at September 2024, MBTOC has 18 members, including two co-chairs. The current list of members together with individual terms of appointment can be found in the TEAP Progress Report of May 2024. The main activities conducted by the committee in the current year are listed below:

- Initial summarisation of the 2024 CUNs which consisted of a request for 2025.
- Face-to-face MBTOC meeting in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam in March 2024 for assessment of the CUN and preparation of the 2024 Progress Report.
- Preparation of the MBTOC 2024 Interim CUN Report and Progress Report for consideration by the 46th OEWG held in Montreal, 8-12th July 2024.
- Participation at 46th OEWG and presentation of CUN interim report and overview of the 2024 Progress Report.
- MBTOC prepared and submitted the final CUN report at the end of August for consideration by the parties at their 36th Meeting of the Parties in late October 2024 in Bangkok.
- Prepared a report for the International Plant Protection Committee (IPPC) 18th Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and followed up on outcomes from the Chemical Review Committee (CRC-18) of the Rotterdam Convention (on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade),.

6.2 Work plan and indicative budget for 2025

The following “Actions” and “Indicative Completion Dates” are the “*Working procedures of MBTOC relating to the evaluation of nominations for critical uses of MB*”, as described in Annex 1 of the 16th Meeting of the parties. The annual work plan is required to be drawn up by MBTOC (supported by the Ozone Secretariat) in consultation with TEAP, for submission to the Meeting of the parties each year.

Tasks and actions	Indicative budget needs where applicable	Indicative completion date	Dates of meetings
1. Parties submit their nominations for critical-use exemptions to the Secretariat	-	24 January 2025	
2. The nominations are forwarded to MBTOC co-chairs for distribution to the subgroups of appointed members	-	7 February 2025	
3. Nominations in full are assessed by MBTOC members. Initial findings and any requests for additional information are forwarded to the MBTOC co-chairs for clearance	-	21 February 2025	
4. MBTOC co-chairs forward the cleared advice on initial findings and may request additional information on to the nominating party concerned and consult with the party on the possible presumption therein	-	28 February 2025	
5. Nominating party develops and submits its response to the MBTOC co-chairs	-	7 March 2025	

Tasks and actions	Indicative budget needs where applicable	Indicative completion date	Dates of meetings
<p>6. MBTOC Meeting (prepare Progress Report, assess CUNs and begining preparation of MBTOC 2026 Assessment Rewport)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To assess nominations, including any additional information provided by the nominating party prior to the MBTOC meeting under action 5 and any additional information provided by nominating party through pre-arranged teleconference, or through meetings with national experts, in accordance with paragraph 3.4 of the terms of reference of TEAP (see Annex I of MOP16, Dec XVI/4) • Bilateral meetings if requested by parties • To discuss and finalise the CUN evaluation process • If necessary, discuss any new or standard presumptions that MBTOC seeks to apply in its future assessment of critical-use nominations, for approval by the Meeting of the parties • Draft the 2025 Progress Report • Any other tasks assigned by the parties at the 36th MOP 	<p>Funds for travel of two non-A5 member: US\$4,000</p> <p>Meeting Costs \$3,000</p>	<p>March 2025</p>	<p>TBD</p>
<p>7. MBTOC provides its draft recommendations on the CUNs to TEAP for review</p>		<p>May, 2025</p>	
<p>8. TEAP Meeting: To assess the MBTOC report on critical-use nominations and submit the finalized interim report on recommendations and findings to the Secretariat.</p>		<p>May 2025</p>	<p>Vienna, Austria (to be confirmed)</p>
<p>9. The Secretariat posts the finalised report on its web site and circulates it to the parties</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>May 2025</p>	
<p>10. OEWG Bilateral Discussions: Nominating party has the opportunity to consult with MBTOC on a bilateral basis in conjunction with the Open-ended Working Group meetings</p>		<p>7-11 July 2025</p>	<p>TBD</p>
<p>11. The nominating party submits further clarification for the critical-use nomination requested by MBTOC or if requested to do so by the Open-ended Working Group, and provides additional information should it wish to appeal against a critical-use nomination recommendation by MBTOC/TEAP</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>August, 2025</p>	
<p>12. Meeting of the Parties. MBTOC submits final CUN report</p>		<p>October, 2025</p>	<p>TBC</p>

7 References

- Baur, X., Budnik, L.T., Preisser, A.M. (2010a). Gesundheitsrisiken durch Begasungsmittelreste in Importcontainern [Health risks of residual fumigants in international transport containers]. *Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift* 135(11):516-21. German. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0030-1249198>. PMID: 20221968.
- Baur, X., Poschadel, B., Budnik L.T. (2010b); High frequency of fumigants and other toxic gases in imported freight containers--an underestimated occupational and community health risk. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 67(3):207-12. <https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.2008.043893> PMID: 19858536.
- Budnik, L.T., Kloth, S., Velasco-Garrido, M., Baur, X. (2012). Prostate cancer and toxicity from critical use exemptions of methyl bromide: Environmental protection helps protect against human health risks. *Environmental Health* 11(5), 12 pp. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-069X-11-5>.
- Bulathsinghala, A.T., Shaw, I.C. (2014). The toxic chemistry of methyl bromide. *Human & Experimental Toxicology* 33(1), 81-91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0960327113493299>. PMID: 23800997.
- Cabrera, A.J., Hanson, B.D., Abit, M.M., Gerik, J.S., Gao, S., Qin, R., Wang, D. (2015). Pre-plant soil fumigation with reduced rates under low permeable films for tree nursery production, orchard and vineyard replanting. *Crop Protection Journal* 75, 34-39.
- Cockburn, M., Mills, P., Zhang, X., Zadnick, J., Goldberg, D., Ritz, B. (2011). Prostate cancer and ambient pesticide exposure in agriculturally intensive areas in California. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 173(11), 1280-1288.
- de Souza, A., Narvencar, K.P., Sindhoora, K.V. (2013). The neurological effects of methyl bromide intoxication. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences* 335(1-2), 36-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2013.09.022>. PMID: 24094859.
- Driver, J.G., Welker, R., Louws, F.J. (2011). Totally impermeable films for fumigant rate reduction in North Carolina. In: Obenauf, G. L. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Annual International Research Conference on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emission Reductions*, (MBAO), October 31 – November 2, 2011, San Diego, CA, USA, <http://www.mbao.org>, 16.1 - 16-4.
- Gemmill, A., Gunier, R.B., Bradman, A., Eskenazi, B., Harley, K.G. (2013). Residential proximity to methyl bromide use and birth outcomes in an agricultural population in California. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 121(6),737-43. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1205682>. PMID: 23603811; PMCID: PMC3672911.
- Hamill, J.E., Dickson, D. W., T-Ou, L., Allen, L. H., Burelle, N. K., Mendes, M. L. (2004). Reduced rates of MBR and C35 under LDPE and VIF for control of soil pests and pathogens. In: Obenauf, G. L. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Annual International Research Conference on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emission Reductions*, (MBAO), October 31- November 3, 2004, Orlando, Florida, USA, <http://www.mbao.org>, 2-1 – 2-5
- Hanson, B.D., Gerik, J.S., Schneider, S.M. (2010) Effects of reduced-rate methyl bromide applications under conventional and virtually impermeable plastic film in perennial crop field nurseries. *Pest Management Science* 66(8), :892-9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.1959>. PMID: 20602523.
- Holmes, G.J., Mansouripour, S.M., Hewavitharana, S. (2020). Strawberries at the crossroads: Management of soilborne diseases in California without methyl bromide. *Phytopathology* 110(5): 956-968.
- Jeong, J.Y, Yi, G.Y., Cho, S.J.Park, S.H. (2020). Assessment of methyl bromide exposure levels in fumigation workers on import and export plant. *Journal of Korean Society of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene* 30(1), 50-57. <https://doi.org/10.15269/JKSOEH.2020.30.1.50>
- Kulkarni, P., Duncan, M., Watters, M., Graziano, L., Vaouli, E., Cseh, L., Risher, J., Orr, M., Hunte, T., Ellis, E.. (2015). Severe illness from methyl bromide exposure at a condominium resort — U.S. Virgin Islands, March 2015. *MMWR. Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 64, 763-6. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6428a4>.
- Lalonde, B., Garron, C. (2020). Temporal and spatial analysis of surface water pesticide occurrences in the Maritime region of Canada. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-020-00742-x>.

- López-Galarza, S., Bautista, S., Martínez, A., Pascual, B., & Maroto, J. V. (2010). Influence of substrate on strawberry plug plant production. *The Journal of Horticultural Science and Biotechnology*, 85(5), 415–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14620316.2010.11512690>.
- McCall, J., Harris, D., Berk, M. (2016). Examination of the Effects of Chronic Exposure to Federally-Regulated and Approved Levels of Methyl Bromide in Dock Workers: A Case Series (S8.003) *Neurology* April 5, 86 no. 16 Supplement S8.003.
- Park M-G, Choi J, Hong Y-S, Park CG, Kim B-G, Lee S-Y, et al. (2020) Negative effect of methyl bromide fumigation work on the central nervous system. *PLoS ONE* 15(8), e0236694. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0236694>
- Porter, I.J., Trinder, L., Partington, D. (2006). Special report validating the yield performance of alternatives to methyl bromide for pre-plant fumigation. *TEAP/MBTOC Special Report*, UNEP Nairobi, May 2006, 97pp.
- Rodríguez-Delfin, A. (2012). Advances of Hydroponics in Latin America. *Acta Horticulturae*, 947, 23-32. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17660/ActaHortic.2012.947.1>
- Santos, B.M., J.P. Gilreath, J.M. López-Aranda, L., Miranda, C. S., Medina, J.J. (2007). Comparing Methyl bromide alternatives for strawberry in Florida and Spain. *Journal of Agronomy* 6(1), 225 – 227.
- Wei, H., Liu, C., Ryong Jeong, B., (2020). An optimal combination of the propagation medium and fogging duration enhances the survival, rooting and early growth of strawberry daughter plants. *Agronomy* 10, 557. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy10040557>.
- Weiland, J. E., Littke, W. R., Browning, J. E., Edmonds, J. L., Davis, A., Beck, B. R., Miller, T. W. (2016) Efficacy of reduced rate fumigant alternatives and methyl bromide against soilborne pathogens and weeds in western forest nurseries. *Crop Protection* 85, 57-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2016.03.016>
- Yamano, Y., Nakadate, T. (2006). Three occupationally exposed cases of severe methyl bromide poisoning: accident caused by a gas leak during the fumigation of a folklore museum. *Journal of Occupational Health* 48(2), 129-33. <https://doi.org/10.1539/joh.48.129>. PMID: 16612042.
- Yates, S.R., Gan, J., Papiernik, S.K., Dungan, R., Wang, D. (2002). Reducing fumigant emissions after soil application. *Phytopathology* 92(12), 1344-8. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO.2002.92.12.1344>. PMID: 18943891.

ANNEX I: Decision IX/6. Critical use exemptions for methyl bromide

1. To apply the following criteria and procedure in assessing a critical methyl bromide use for the purposes of control measures in Article 2 of the Protocol:
 - (a) That a use of methyl bromide should qualify as “critical” only if the nominating party determines that:
 - (i) The specific use is critical because the lack of availability of methyl bromide for that use would result in a significant market disruption; and
 - (ii) There are no technically and economically feasible alternatives or substitutes available to the user that are acceptable from the standpoint of environment and health and are suitable to the crops and circumstances of the nomination;
 - (b) That production and consumption, if any, of methyl bromide for critical uses should be permitted only if:
 - (i) All technically and economically feasible steps have been taken to minimise the critical use and any associated emission of methyl bromide;
 - (ii) Methyl bromide is not available in sufficient quantity and quality from existing stocks of banked or recycled methyl bromide, also bearing in mind the developing countries’ need for methyl bromide;
 - (iii) It is demonstrated that an appropriate effort is being made to evaluate, commercialise and secure national regulatory approval of alternatives and substitutes, taking into consideration the circumstances of the particular nomination and the special needs of Article 5 parties, including lack of financial and expert resources, institutional capacity, and information. Non-Article 5 parties must demonstrate that research programmes are in place to develop and deploy alternatives and substitutes. Article 5 parties must demonstrate that feasible alternatives shall be adopted as soon as they are confirmed as suitable to the party’s specific conditions and/or that they have applied to the Multilateral Fund or other sources for assistance in identifying, evaluating, adapting and demonstrating such options;
2. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to review nominations and make recommendations based on the criteria established in paragraphs 1 (a) (ii) and 1 (b) of the present decision;
3. That the present decision will apply to parties operating under Article 5 and parties not so operating only after the phase-out date applicable to those parties.

Para. 2 of Decision IX/6 does not assign TEAP the responsibility for determining the existence of “significant market disruption” specified in paragraph 1a (i).

TEAP assigned its Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (MBTOC) to determine whether there are no technically and economically feasible alternatives or substitutes available to the user that are acceptable from the standpoint of environment and health and are suitable to the crops and circumstances of the nomination, and to address the criteria listed in Decision IX/6 1(b).

ANNEX II: Decision Ex.I/4. Conditions for granting and reporting critical-use exemptions for methyl bromide

Mindful of the principles set forth in the report¹ by the chair of the informal consultation on methyl bromide held in Buenos Aires on 4 and 5 March 2004, namely, fairness, certainty and confidence, practicality and flexibility, and transparency,

Recognizing that technically and economically feasible alternatives exist for most uses of methyl bromide,

Noting that those alternatives are not always technically and economically feasible in the circumstances of nominations,

Noting that Article 5 and non-Article 5 parties have made substantial progress in the adoption of effective alternatives,

Mindful that exemptions must comply fully with decision IX/6 and are intended to be limited, temporary derogations from the phase-out of methyl bromide,

Recognizing the desirability of a transparent presentation of data on alternatives to methyl bromide to assist the parties to understand better the critical-use volumes and to gauge progress on and impediments to the transition from methyl bromide,

Resolved that each party should aim at significantly and progressively decreasing its production and consumption of methyl bromide for critical uses with the intention of completely phasing out methyl bromide as soon as technically and economically feasible alternatives are available,

Recognizing that parties should revert to methyl bromide only as a last resort, in the event that a technically and economically feasible alternative to methyl bromide which is in use ceases to be available as a result of de-registration or for other reasons,

1. That each party which has an agreed critical use under the present decision should submit available information to the Ozone Secretariat before 1 February 2005 on the alternatives available, listed according to their pre-harvest or post-harvest uses and the possible date of registration, if required, for each alternative; and on the alternatives which the parties can disclose to be under development, listed according to their pre-harvest or post-harvest uses and the likely date of registration, if required and known, for those alternatives, and that the Ozone Secretariat shall be requested to provide a template for that information and to post the said information in a database entitled "Methyl Bromide Alternatives" on its web site;

2. That each party which submits a nomination for the production and consumption of methyl bromide for years after 2005 should also submit information listed in paragraph 1 to the Ozone Secretariat to include in its Methyl Bromide Alternatives database and that any other party which no longer consumes methyl bromide should also submit information on alternatives to the Secretariat for inclusion in that database;

3. To request each party which makes a critical-use nomination after 2005 to submit a national management strategy for phase-out of critical uses of methyl bromide to the Ozone Secretariat before 1 February 2006. The management strategy should aim, among other things:

- (a) To avoid any increase in methyl bromide consumption except for unforeseen circumstances;
- (b) To encourage the use of alternatives through the use of expedited procedures, where possible, to develop, register and deploy technically and economically feasible alternatives;

¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro.ExMP/1/INF/1, para. 11.

- (c) To provide information, for each current pre-harvest and post-harvest use for which a nomination is planned, on the potential market penetration of newly deployed alternatives and alternatives which may be used in the near future, to bring forward the time when it is estimated that methyl bromide consumption for such uses can be reduced and/or ultimately eliminated;
 - (d) To promote the implementation of measures which ensure that any emissions of methyl bromide are minimized;
 - (e) To show how the management strategy will be implemented to promote the phase-out of uses of methyl bromide as soon as technically and economically feasible alternatives are available, in particular describing the steps which the party is taking in regard to subparagraph (b) (iii) of paragraph 1 of decision IX/6 in respect of research programmes in non-Article 5 parties and the adoption of alternatives by Article 5 parties;
4. To request the Meeting of the parties to take into account information submitted pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 3 of the present decision when it considers permitting a party to produce or consume methyl bromide for critical uses after 2006;
5. To request a party that has submitted a request for a critical use exemption to consider and implement, if feasible, Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee recommendations on actions which a party may take to reduce critical uses of methyl bromide;
6. To request any party submitting a critical-use nomination after 2004 to describe in its nomination the methodology used to determine economic feasibility in the event that economic feasibility is used as a criterion to justify the requirement for the critical use of methyl bromide, using as a guide the economic criteria contained in section 4 of annex I to the present report;
7. To request each party from 1 January 2005 to provide to the Ozone Secretariat a summary of each crop or post-harvest nomination containing the following information:
- (a) Name of the nominating party;
 - (b) Descriptive title of the nomination;
 - (c) Crop name (open field or protected) or post-harvest use;
 - (d) Quantity of methyl bromide requested in each year;
 - (e) Reason or reasons why alternatives to methyl bromide are not technically and economically feasible;
8. To request the Ozone Secretariat to post the information submitted pursuant to paragraph 7 above, categorized according to the year in which it was received, on its web site within 10 days of receiving the nomination;
9. To request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel:
- (a) To identify options which parties may consider for preventing potential harmful trade of methyl bromide stocks to Article 5 parties as consumption is reduced in non-Article 5 parties and to publish its evaluation in 2005 to enable the Seventeenth Meeting of the parties to decide if suitable mitigating steps are necessary;
 - (b) To identify factors which Article 5 parties may wish to take into account in evaluating whether they should either undertake new accelerated phase-out commitments through the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol or seek changes to already agreed accelerated phase-outs of methyl bromide under the Multilateral Fund;
 - (c) To assess economic infeasibility, based on the methodology submitted by the

nominating party under paragraph 6 above, in making its recommendations on each critical-use nomination. The report by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel should be made with a view to encouraging nominating parties to adopt a common approach in assessing the economic feasibility of alternatives;

- (d) To submit a report to the Open-ended Working Group at its twenty-sixth session on the possible need for methyl bromide critical uses over the next few years, based on a review of the management strategies submitted by parties pursuant to paragraph 3 of the present decision;
- (e) To review critical-use nominations on an annual basis and apply the criteria set forth in decision IX/6 and of other relevant criteria agreed by the parties;
- (f) To recommend an accounting framework for adoption by the Sixteenth Meeting of the parties which can be used for reporting quantities of methyl bromide produced, imported and exported by parties under the terms of critical-use exemptions, and after the end of 2005 to request each party which has been granted a critical-use exemption to submit information together with its nomination using the agreed format;
- (g) To provide, in consultation with interested parties, a format for a critical-use exemption report, based on the content of annex I to the present report, for adoption by the Sixteenth Meeting of the parties, and to request each party which reapplies for a methyl bromide critical-use exemption after the end of 2005 to submit a critical-use exemption report in the agreed format;
- (h) To assess, annually where appropriate, any critical-use nomination made after the end of 2006 in the light of the Methyl Bromide Alternatives database information submitted pursuant to paragraph 1 of the present decision, and to compare, annually where appropriate, the quantity, in the nomination, of methyl bromide requested and recommended for each pre-harvest and post-harvest use with the management strategy submitted by the party pursuant to paragraph 3 of the present decision;
- (i) To report annually on the status of re-registration and review of methyl bromide uses for the applications reflected in the critical-use exemptions, including any information on health effects and environmental acceptability;
- (j) To report annually on the status of registration of alternatives and substitutes for methyl bromide, with particular emphasis on possible regulatory actions that will increase or decrease dependence on methyl bromide;
- (k) To modify the handbook on critical-use nominations for methyl bromide to take the present decision and other relevant information into account, for submission to the Sixteenth Meeting of the parties.

ANNEX III: Trends in Non-A5 Pre-plant Soil Nominations and Exemptions for Uses of MB reported to have been phased out

(Includes list of nominated (2005 – 2016) and exempted (2005 – 2016) amounts of MB granted by parties under the CUE process for each industry sector).

Party	Industry	Total CUN MB Quantities												Total CUE Quantities											
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Australia	Cut Flowers – field	40.000	22.350											18.375	22.350										
Australia	Cut flowers – protected	20.000												10.425											
Australia	Cut flowers, bulbs – protected Vic	7.000	7.000	6.170	6.150									7.000	7.000	3.598	3.500								
Australia	Strawberry Fruit	90.000												67.000											
Australia	Strawberry runners	See Section 1.2.4																							
Belgium	Asparagus	0.630	0.225											0.630	0.225										
Belgium	Chicory	0.600	0.180											0.180	0.180										
Belgium	Chrysanthemums	1.800	0.720											1.120											
Belgium	Cucumber	0.610	0.545											0.610	0.545										
Belgium	Cut flowers – other	6.110	1.956											4.000	1.956										
Belgium	Cut flowers – roses	1.640																							
Belgium	Endive (sep from lettuce)		1.650												1.650										
Belgium	Leek & onion seeds	1.220	0.155											0.660											
Belgium	Lettuce(& endive)	42.250	22.425											25.190											
Belgium	Nursery	Not Predictable	0.384											0.900	0.384										
Belgium	Orchard pome & berry	1.350	0.621											1.350	0.621										
Belgium	Ornamental plants	5.660												0.000											
Belgium	Pepper & egg plant	5.270	1.350											3.000	1.350										

Party	Industry	Total CUN MB Quantities												Total CUE Quantities											
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Belgium	Strawberry runners	3.400	0.900											3.400	0.900										
Belgium	Tomato (protected)	17.170	4.500											5.700	4.500										
Belgium	Tree nursery	0.230	0.155											0.230	0.155										
Canada	Strawberry runners (PEI)	See Section 1.2.4																							
Canada	Strawberry runners (Quebec)	1.826	1.826											(a)	1.826	1.826									
Canada	Strawberry runners (Ontario)		6.129													6.129									
France	Carrots	10.000	8.000	5.000										8.000	8.000	1.400									
France	Cucumber	85 revised to 60	60.000	15.000										60.000	60.000	12.500									
France	Cut-flowers	75.000	60.250	12.000										60.000	52.000	9.600									
France	Forest tree nursery	10.000	10.000	1.500										10.000	10.000	1.500									
France	Melon	10.000	10.000											7.500	6.000										
France	Nursery: orchard, raspberry	5.000	5.000	2.000										5.000	5.000	2.000									
France	Orchard replant	25.000	25.000	7.500										25.000	25.000	7.000									
France	Pepper	Inclin. tomatocun	27.500	6.000											27.500	6.000									
France	Strawberry fruit	90.000	86.000	34.000										90.000	86.000										
France	Strawberry runners	40.000	4.000	35.000										40.000	40.000	28.000									
France	Tomato (and eggplant for 2005 only)	150(all solanaceous)	60.500	33.250										125.000	48.400										
France	Eggplant		27.500	33.250											48.400										
Greece	Cucurbits	30.000	19.200											30.000	19.200										
Greece	Cut flowers	14.000	6.000											14.000	6.000										
Greece	Tomatoes	180.000	73.600											156.000	73.600										
Israel	Broomrape			250.000	250.000	125.000	12.500	12.500								250.000	250.000	125.000	12.500						
Israel	Cucumber - protected new 2007			25.000	18.750		18.750	12.500								25.000	18.750	-	15.937						
Israel	Cut flowers – open field	77.000	67.000	80.755	53.345	42.777	42.554	23.292						77.000	67.000	74.540	44.750	34.698	28.554						

Party	Industry	Total CUN MB Quantities												Total CUE Quantities											
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Israel	Cut flowers – protected	303.000	303.000	321.330	163.400	113.821	72.266	52.955						303.000	240.000	220.185	114.450	85.431	63.464						
Israel	Fruit tree nurseries	50.000	45.000	10.000										50.000	45.000	7.500									
Israel	Melon – protected & field	148.000	142.000	140.000	87.500	87.500	87.500	35.000						125.650	99.400	105.000	87.500	87.500	70.000						
Israel	Potato	239.000	231.000	137.500	93.750	75.000								239.000	165.000	137.500	93.750	75.000							
Israel	Seed production	56.000	50.000			22.400								56.000	28.000			NR							
Israel	Strawberries – fruit (Sharon)	196.000	196.000	176.200	64.125	52.250	47.500	28.500						196.000	196.000	93.000	105.960	42.750							
Israel	Strawberries – fruit (Sharon & Ghaza)																		57.063						
Israel	Strawberry runners (Sharon)	35.000	35.000		20.000	15.800	13.570	13.500						35.000	35.000	28.000	31.900	15.825							
Israel	Strawberry runners and fruit Ghaza				87.875	67.500	67.500	34.000										47.250							
Israel	Strawberry runners (Sharon & Ghaza)																		22.320						
Israel	Tomatoes			90.000												22.750									
Israel	Sweet potato					95.000	20.000	20.000									111.500	95.000	20.000						
Italy	Cut flowers (protected)	250.000	250.000	30.000										250.000	187.000	30.000									
Italy	Eggplant (protected)	280.000	200.000	15.000										194.000	156.000										
Italy	Melon (protected)	180.000	135.000	10.000										131.000	131.000	10.000									
Italy	Pepper (protected)	220.000	160.000	67.000										160.000	130.000	67.000									
Italy	Strawberry Fruit (Protected)	510.000	400.000	35.000										407.000	320.000										
Italy	Strawberry Runners	100.000	120.000	35.000										120.000	120.000	35.000									

Party	Industry	Total CUN MB Quantities												Total CUE Quantities											
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Italy	Tomato (protected)	1300.000	1030.00	418.000										871.000	697.000	80.000									
Japan	Cucumber	88.300	88.800	72.400	68.600	61.400	34.100	29.120	26.162					88.300	88.800	72.400	51.450	34.300	30.690	27.621					
Japan	Ginger – field	119.400	119.400	112.200	112.100	102.200	53.400	47.450	42.235					119.400	119.400	109.701	84.075	63.056	53.400	47.450					
Japan	Ginger – protected	22.900	22.900	14.800	14.800	12.900	8.300	7.770	6.558					22.900	22.900	14.471	11.100	8.325	8.300	7.036					
Japan	Melon	194.100	203.900	182.200	182.200	168.000	90.800	77.600	67.936					194.100	203.900	182.200	136.650	91.100	81.720	73.548					
Japan	Peppers (green and hot)	189.900	200.700	169.400	162.300	134.400	81.100	68.260	61.101					187.200	200.700	156.700	121.725	81.149	72.990	65.691					
Japan	Watermelon	126.300	96.200	94.200	43.300	23.700	15.400	13.870	12.075					129.000	98.900	94.200	32.475	21.650	14.500	13.050					
Malta	Cucumber		0.096												0.127										
Malta	Eggplant		0.128												0.170										
Malta	Strawberry		0.160												0.212										
Malta	Tomatoes		0.475												0.594										
New Zealand	Nursery material	1.085	1.085												0										
New Zealand	Strawberry fruit	42.000	42.000	24.78										42.000	34.000	12.000									
New Zealand	Strawberry runners	10.000	10.000	5.720										8.000	8.000	6.234									
Poland	Strawberry Runners	40.000	40.000	25.000	12.000									40.000	40.000	24.500									
Portugal	Cut flowers	130.000	8.750											50.000	8.750										
Spain	Cut Flowers – Cadiz	53.000	53.000	35.000										53.000	42.000										
Spain	Cut Flowers – Catalonia	20.000	18.600	12.840	17 (+Andalucia)									20.000	15.000	43.490 (+Andalucia)									
Spain	Pepper	200.000	155.000	45.000										200.000	155.000	45.000									
Spain	Strawberry Fruit	556.000	499.290	80.000										556.000	499.290	0.0796									
Spain	Strawberry Runners	230.000	230.000	230.000	215.000									230.000	230.000	230.000									
UK	Cut flowers		7.560												6.050										
UK	Ornamental tree nursery	12.000	6.000											6.000	6.000										

Party	Industry	Total CUN MB Quantities												Total CUE Quantities											
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
UK	Strawberry (& raspberry in 2005)	80.000	63.600											68.000	54.500										
UK	Raspberry nursery		4.400											4.400	54.500										
USA	Chrys. Cuttings/roses	29.412												29.412	0										
USA	Cucurbits – field	1187.8	747.839	598.927	588.949	411.757	340.405	218.032	59.500	11.899				1187.800	747.839	592.891	486.757	407.091	302.974	195.698	59.500				
USA	Eggplant – field	76.761	101.245	96.48	79.546	62.789	34.732	21.561	6.904	1.381				76.721	82.167	85.363	66.018	48.691	32.820	19.725	6.904				
USA	Forest nursery seedlings	192.515	157.694	152.629	133.140	125.758	120.853	106.043						192.515	157.694	122.032	131.208	122.060	117.826	93.547					
USA	Ginger	9.2												9.2	0										
USA	Orchard replant	706.176	827.994	405.415	405.666	314.007	226.021	203.591	18.324	6.230				706.176	527.600	405.400	393.720	292.756	215.800	183.232	18.324				
USA	Ornamentals	210.949	162.817	149.965	138.538	137.776	95.204	70.178	48.164	48.164				154.000	148.483	137.835	138.538	107.136	84.617	64.307	48.164				
USA	Nursery stock - fruit trees, raspberries, roses	45.789	64.528	12.684	51.102	27.663	17.954	7.955	1.591	0.541				45.800	64.528	28.275	51.102	25.326	17.363	7.955	1.591				
USA	Peppers – field	1094.782	1498.53	1151.751	919.006	783.821	463.282	212.775	28.366					1094.782	1243.542	1106.753	756.339	548.984	463.282	206.234					
USA	Strawberry fruit – field	2468.873	1918.40	1733.901	1604.669	1336.754	1103.422	1023.471	753.974	610.339	415.067	373.660	231.540	2052.846	1730.828	1476.019	1349.575	1269.321	1007.477	812.709	678.004	532.442	415.067	373.660	231.540
USA	Strawberry runners	54.988	56.291	4.483	8.838	8.837	7.381	7.381	3.752	3.752				54.988	56.291	4.483	8.838	7.944	4.690 + 2.018	6.036	3.752				
USA	Tomato – field	2876.046	2844.985	2334.047	1840.1	1406.484	994.582	336.191	54.423	10.741				737.584	2476.365	2065.246	1406.484	1003.876	737.584	292.751	54.423				
USA	Turfgrass	352.194	131.600	78.040	52.189	0									131.600	78.04	0								
USA	Sweet potato	224.528			18.144	18.144	18.144	14.515	8.709								18.144	18.144	14.515	11.612					
USA	Research								2.768	2.768															

ANNEX IV: Trends in Non-A5 Structural and Commodity Nominations and Exemptions for Uses of MB reported to have been phased out

(Includes list of nominated (2005 – 2016) and exempted (2005 – 2016) amounts of MB granted by parties under the CUE process for each industry sector)

Party	Industry	Total CUN MB Quantities												Total CUE Quantities											
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Australia	Almonds	1.900	2.100											1.900	2.100										
Australia	Rice consumer packs	12.300	12.300	10.225	9.200 +1.8	9.2	7.82	5.66	3.653	2.374	1.187	1.187		6.150	6.150	9.205	9.200	7.820	6.650	4.870	3.653	1.187	1.187		
Belgium	Artefacts and structures	0.600	0.307											0.590	0.307										
Belgium	Antique structure & furniture	0.750	0.199											0.319	0.199										
Belgium	Churches, monuments and ships' quarters	0.150	0.059											0.150	0.059										
Belgium	Electronic equipment	0.100	0.035											0.100	0.035										
Belgium	Empty silo	0.050	0.043											0.050	0.043										
Belgium	Flour mill see mills below	0.125	0.072											See mills below	0.072										
Belgium	Flour mills	10.000	4.170											9.515	4.170										
Belgium	Mills	0.200	0.200											0.200	0.200										
Belgium	Food processing facilities	0.300	0.300											0.300	0.300										
Belgium	Food Processing premises	0.030	0.030											0.030	0.030										
Belgium	Food storage (dry) structure	0.120	0.120											0.120	0										
Belgium	Old buildings	7.000	0.306											1.150	0.306										
Belgium	Old buildings and objects	0.450	0.282											0	0.282										

Party	Industry	Total CUN MB Quantities												Total CUE Quantities											
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Belgium	Woodworking premises	0.300	0.101											0.300	0.101										
Canada	Flour mills	47.200	34.774	30.167	28.650	26.913	22.878	14.107	11.020	7.848	5.044	5.044		(a)47	34.774	30.167	28.65	26.913	22.878	14.107	11.020	5.044	5.044		
Canada	Pasta manufacturing facilities	(a)	10.457	6.757	6.067	4.740	4.740	2.084						(a)	10.457	6.757	6.067	4.740	3.529						
Canada	Commodities					0.068																			
France	Seeds sold by PLAN-SPG company	0.135	0.135	0.100										0.135	0.135	0.096									
France	Mills	55.000	40.000	8.000										40.000	35.000	8.000									
France	Rice consumer packs	2.000	2.000											2.000	2.000										
France	Chestnuts	2.000	2.000	1.800										2.000	2.000	1.800									
Germany	Artefacts	0.250	0.100											0.250	0.100										
Germany	Mills and Processors	45.000	19.350											45.000	19.350										
Greece	Dried fruit	4.280	3.081	0.900										4.280	3.081	0.450									
Greece	Mills and Processors	23.000	16.000	1.340										23.000	15.445	1.340									
Greece	Rice and legumes		2.355												2.355										
Ireland	Mills		0.888	0.611											0.888										
Israel	Artefacts	0.650	0.650	0.600										0.650	0.6500										
Israel	Dates (post harvest)	3.444	3.444	2.200	1.800	2.100								3.444	2.755	2.200	1.800	2.100	1.040						
Israel	Flour mills (machinery & storage)	2.140	1.490	1.490	0.800	0.300								2.140	1.490	1.040	0.312	0.300							
Israel	Furniture-imported	1.4220	1.4220	2.0420										1.4220	0										
Italy	Artefacts	5.500	5.500	5.000										5.225	0	5.000									
Italy	Mills and Processors	160.000	130.000	25.000										160.000	65.000	25.000									
Japan	Chestnuts	7.100	6.500	6.500	6.300	5.800	5.400	5.350	3.489	3.317				7.100	6.800	6.500	6.300	5.800	5.400	5.350	3.489				
Latvia	Grains		2.502												2.502										

Party	Industry	Total CUN MB Quantities												Total CUE Quantities											
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Netherlands	Strawberry runners post harvest		0.120	0.120		0.120									0	0.120									
Poland	Medicinal herbs & dried mushrooms as dry commodities	4.000	3.560	1.800	0.500									4.100	3.560	1.800	1.800								
Poland	Coffee, cocoa beans	(a)	2.160	2.000	0.500										2.160	1.420	1.420								
Spain	Rice		50.000												42.065										
Switzerland	Mills & Processors	8.700	7.000											8.700	7.000										
UK	Aircraft			0.165												0.165									
UK	Mills and Processors	47.130	10.195	4.509										47.130	10.195	4.509									
UK	Cereal processing plants	8.131	3.480						(a)						8.131										
UK	Cheese stores	1.640	1.248	1.248										1.640	1.248	1.248									
UK	Dried commodities (rice, fruits and nuts) Whitworths	2.400	1.256											2.400	1.256										
UK	Herbs and spices	0.035	0.037	0.030										0.035	0.037										
UK	Mills and Processors (biscuits)	2.525	1.787	0.479										2.525	1.787										
UK	Spices structural equip.	1.728												1.728	0	0.479									
UK	Spices stored	0.030												0.030	0										
UK	Structures buildings (herbs and spices)	3.000	1.872	0.908										3.000	1.872	0.908									
UK	Structures, processors and storage (Whitworths)	1.100	0.880	0.257										1.100	0.880	0.257									
UK	Tobacco equipment	0.523												0.050											

Party	Industry	Total CUN MB Quantities												Total CUE Quantities											
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
UK	Woven baskets	0.770												0.770											
USA	Dried fruit and nuts (walnuts, pistachios, dried fruit and dates and dried beans)	89.166	87.719	91.299	67.699	58.912	19.242	10.041	2.419	0.822	0.740	0.310		89.166	87.719	78.983	58.921	45.623	19.242	5.000	2.419	0.740	0.740		
USA	Dry commodities / structures (cocoa beans)	61.519	61.519	64.028	52.256	51.002								61.519	55.367	64.082	53.188								
USA	Dry commodities / structures (processed foods, herbs and spices, dried milk and cheese processing facilities) NPMA	83.344	83.344	85.801	72.693	66.777	37.778	17.365	0.200					83.344	69.118	82.771	69.208	54.606	37.778	17.365					
USA	Smokehouse hams (Dry cure pork products) (building and product)	136.304	135.742	40.854	19.669	19.699	4.465	3.730	3.730	3.730	3.730	3.730	3.240	67.907	81.708	18.998	19.699	18.998	4.465	3.730	3.730	3.730	3.730	3.730	3.240
USA	Mills and Processors	536.328	505.982	401.889	362.952	291.418	173.023	135.299	74.51	25.334	22.800			483.000	461.758	401.889	348.237	291.418	173.023	135.299	74.510	22.800	22.800		
USA	Research								0.159	0.159															