

# Technical note: A method for calculating offsets to ozone depletion and climate impacts of ozone-depleting substances

Gabrielle B. Dreyfus<sup>1,2</sup>, Stephen A. Montzka<sup>3</sup>, Stephen O. Andersen<sup>1</sup>, and Richard (“Tad”) Ferris<sup>1</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> Institute for Governance & Sustainable Development (IGSD), Washington, DC, 20016, USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Physics, Georgetown University, Washington, DC 20057, USA

<sup>3</sup> Global Monitoring Laboratory, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Boulder, CO, 80305, USA

*Correspondence to:* Gabrielle B. Dreyfus ([gdreyfus@igsd.org](mailto:gdreyfus@igsd.org))

**Abstract.** By phasing out production and consumption of most ozone depleting substances (ODSs), the Montreal Protocol on  
10 Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Montreal Protocol) has avoided consequences of increased ultraviolet (UV) radiation  
and will restore stratospheric ozone to pre-1980 conditions by mid-century, assuming compliance with the phaseout. However,  
several studies have documented an unexpected increase in emissions and suggested unreported production of  
trichlorofluoromethane (CFC-11) and potentially other ODSs after 2012 despite production phaseouts under the Montreal  
Protocol. Furthermore, because most ODSs are powerful greenhouse gases (GHGs) there are significant climate protection  
15 benefits in collecting and destroying the substantial quantities of historically allowed production of chemicals under the  
Montreal Protocol that are contained in existing equipment and products and referred to as ODS “banks”. This technical note  
presents a framework for considering offsets to ozone depletion, climate forcing, and other environmental impacts arising from  
occurrences of unexpected emissions and unreported production of Montreal Protocol controlled substances, as recently  
20 banks of controlled ODSs and GHGs, or to halon or other production allowed under a Montreal Protocol Essential Use  
Exemption or Critical Use Exemption. Further, roughly estimate the magnitude of offset each type of action could provide for  
ozone depletion, climate, and other environmental impacts should Montreal Protocol Parties agree require remedial action.

## 1 The stratospheric ozone layer and the Montreal Protocol

The stratospheric ozone layer shields Earth against ultraviolet (UV) radiation that causes skin cancer and cataracts, suppresses  
25 the human immune system, and damages agricultural and natural ecosystems including terrestrial carbon sinks; and deteriorates  
the built environment (United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Environmental Effects Assessment Panel (EEAP),  
2018; Bais et al., 2018; Young et al., 2021). Ozone-depleting substances (ODSs) deplete stratospheric ozone, thus increasing  
the amount of UV radiation reaching Earth’s surface. Some ODSs, primarily chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs),  
hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs), carbon tetrachloride (CTC or CCl<sub>4</sub>), and halons are also potent GHGs (Ramanathan,

30 1975) (World Meteorological Organization (WMO), 2022), as are long-lived hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) used as ODS-substitutes.

The 1987 Montreal Protocol is an international treaty that has already phased out more than 99% of the production and consumption of about 100 ozone-depleting GHGs and will soon phase down about a dozen HFCs that don't contain ozone-depleting chlorine or bromine. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), has estimated that ODS phaseout under the fully revised and Amended Montreal Protocol compared with a scenario of no controls will prevent approximately 443 million cases of skin cancer, 2.3 million skin cancer deaths, and 63 million cataract cases for people in the United States born in the years 1890–2100 (EPA, 2020; Madronich et al., 2021). Global impacts are significantly higher considering that these estimates are for the US alone, representing about 4.25% of global population, and do not include the economic consequences of the full spectrum in health, agricultural productivity, and product deterioration. Even a seemingly small increase in UV radiation from unexpected emissions of unreported CFC-11 production has been estimated to contribute to an additional 31,600 to 59,800 cases of skin cancer and 170 to 340 deaths and 4,100 to 9,300 cases of cataracts that would otherwise have been avoided in the US alone (EPA, 2020). Consider also that every ecosystem would suffer adverse effects owing to any increase in damaging UV radiation (Young et al., 2021). Furthermore, the family and community consequences are far worse in societies without adequate health and where food is already in short supply (Andersen and Sarma, 2002).

In May 2018, scientists warned that emissions of CFC-11 had unexpectedly increased despite a production phaseout under the Montreal Protocol (Montzka et al., 2018). In May 2019, scientists pinpointed  $\sim 60 \pm 40\%$  of unexpected emission increase to an area in China's north-eastern provinces of Shandong and Hebei and found no evidence of a significant increase in CFC-11 emissions from any other locations where monitoring stations are sensitive to emissions on a regional scale (Rigby et al., 2019; Adcock et al., 2020). Over the course of 2018 and 2019, the unexpected emissions and unreported production of CFC-11 globally and from eastern China dropped substantially (Montzka et al., 2021; Park et al., 2021). Enhanced emissions of dichlorodifluoromethane (CFC-12) from eastern China, perhaps associated with CFC-11 production, have also been suggested (Park et al., 2021). A separate study, which analyzed 27 whole air samples collected in 2016 over Hebei province, implied new production and emissions of CFC-11, CFC-12, and 1,2-dichlorotetrafluoroethane (CFC-114) in various locations in China during spring 2016 (Benish et al., 2021). Another analysis of global atmospheric concentrations of CFC-11, CFC-12, and 1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane (CFC-113) confirmed unexpected emissions of CFC-11, but suggested the possibility of unexpected emissions of these other gases during 2014-16 and called for further investigation of potential sources of these emissions (Lickley et al., 2021). Increases in global emission and atmospheric concentrations of several CFCs with production allowed under the Montreal Protocol for use as feedstocks in the production of hydrofluorocarbons, e.g., 1,1,1-Trichloro-2,2,2-trifluoroethane (CFC-113a), CFC-114a and chloropentafluoroethane (CFC-115), are also being observed, together with emission increases in CFC-13 and CFC-112a, although the driver of the increase for these latter two CFCs is unclear (Western et al., 2023).

65 Emissions of another Montreal Protocol-controlled substance, CTC, also have been substantially higher than expected after  
the phaseout of CFC production (SPARC, 2016). CTC is used as a feedstock in the production of CFC-11 and CFC-12 and as  
a solvent. While the ongoing CTC emissions have not yet been implicated in non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol, they  
add significantly to the ozone-depleting halogen burden of the atmosphere. Hence, stakeholders may benefit from  
understanding how to offset the impacts of such emissions on stratospheric ozone and its recovery and to offset the impacts on  
70 climate forcing.

Here we propose an approach for calculating the quantity of ODSs for offsetting adverse environmental impacts arising from  
occurrences of unreported and unauthorized production ODSs and chemical substitutes such as HFCs. These offsets could take  
the form of preventing the emissions of ODSs and HFCs that were legally produced and would otherwise be emitted, such as  
75 through collecting and destroying banks of these chemicals. Other options are highlighted that could also be considered to  
offset the ozone depletion, climate, and other environmental impacts arising from instances of unexpected emissions or  
unreported production should Montreal Protocol Parties agree require remedial action. Note that an offset approach could also  
be applied to management and destruction of ODS banks or could be used to manage halon production allowed under a  
Montreal Protocol Essential Use Exemption in cases where entities are allowed to use and emit available halon banks.

80 An important aspect of offsetting impacts relates to the timing of the impact compared to the offset. Given the added  
uncertainties associated with estimating the year-to-year impacts of unexpected or illicit production and associated emission  
that one might hope to offset, we focus here on offsetting cumulative impacts. We note that this approach is the only possible  
path to offset adverse impacts of uncertain emissions that occurred in the past. We also recognize that the approach of offsetting  
85 impacts with a cumulative timeframe and not year-by-year will lead to a different time-history for an impact compared to the  
offset, especially when the chemical being considered for supplying an offset has a substantially different lifetime than the  
chemical causing the adverse impact. This latter point will likely always be true when devising an offset to an impact that has  
already occurred. Consider however, that environmental justice usually requires judgement of both the environmental impact  
and which victims are worthy and qualified for compensation. The approach to calculating offsets presented here offsets  
90 cumulative impacts but does not compensate those harmed by increased UV radiation.

## **2 Usage implications on estimating the magnitude of impacts to be offset**

Atmospheric observations of a long-lived ODS and HFC substances can provide an estimate of an unexpected emission  
magnitude that is to be offset. For many halocarbon substances, however, anomalous emissions will represent only a fraction  
of the total amount of chemical produced and the total cumulative impact, owing to the retention of chemical in cooling  
95 appliances, fire protection equipment, closed-cell foams, etc., and emission from the banks well after original production and

use. Relating changes in atmospheric concentrations to production and, therefore, a more complete picture of the cumulative impact into the future as the banked chemical slowly escapes to the atmosphere, requires an understanding of how substances are produced and used. We summarize in the Supplemental Information typical historical production and uses for several ODSs for which unexpected emissions have been observed.

### 100 **3 Quantifying ozone depletion, environmental, and climate impacts**

The damages from unexpected emissions and unreported production of substances controlled under the Montreal Protocol can be quantified for the impacts related to ozone depletion for ODSs, UV radiation exposure to estimate health and environmental effects, damage to the terrestrial carbon sink, deterioration of the build environment, and climate forcing for GHGs. In an ideal scenario, an offset would match the impacts year-by-year. However, this is likely to be impractical due to differences in the time-dependent impacts of different chemicals due to differences in potency and lifetimes and that unreported production and emissions of the controlled substances to be offset will likely precede any offset actions. For these reasons, we focus here on estimating cumulative impacts and offsets, although we realize that there are limitations of this approach, for example in cases where the impact is non-linearly related to the atmospheric abundance, as in the case of biological effects that depend on behavioral and other factors (Slaper et al., 1996). Specifically, we propose to use the established metrics of ozone depletion potential (ODP) and global warming potential (GWP) when calculating offsets associated with an emission. While the ODP is defined as the ratio at steady-state of calculated ozone column change for each mass unit of a gas emitted into the atmosphere relative to the calculated depletion for the reference gas CFC-11 (Fisher et al., 1990), it is also true that the ODP can be reliably used to estimate the cumulative impacts arising from a pulsed emission (Prather, 2002). In this way, ODP integrates the cumulative impact on the ozone column of a chemical relative to CFC-11 over the lifetime of the chemical and the timescale of secondary impacts. The ODP differs from the GWP in one important respect, however, in that the GWP reflects the ratio of a change in radiative forcing from an emission of gas relative to that same mass emission of carbon dioxide *integrated over a specific time horizon* (usually 100 or 20 years), and not over the lifetime of the chemical and its impacts. Choosing an appropriate integration period for estimating the impact and deriving an appropriate offset therefore will require a choice to be made, and this choice hinges on the relative importance of near-term vs long-term impacts. We discuss additional considerations of impacts and offset metrics in this section by type of impact and conclude with an illustrative example.

#### **3.1 Ozone depletion for ODSs**

The approach of offsetting, through a reduction in emission or production of an ODS, the cumulative ozone depletion arising from unexpected or illicit emissions after weighting those emissions by the ODP, is supported by the near-linear relationships between cumulative emissions of a particular long-lived ODS and stratospheric ozone impacts from that ODS, both globally and over the Antarctic (Keeble et al., 2020; Fleming et al., 2020; Dhomse et al., 2019) as summarized in (WMO, 2021). This is because the impacts on stratospheric ozone of an emission roughly scale by the amount of chlorine (Cl) released in the

stratosphere, all other factors (aerosol loading, etc.) being equal, so can be applied to CFC-12, CTC, and other ODS species (Dhomse et al., 2019; Keeble et al., 2020; WMO, 2021). Other metrics such as the Integrated Ozone Depletion (IOD) could be used for quantifying the impact on stratospheric ozone of an emission to be offset, and use of this metric would provide results very similar to use of ODP unless the chemical being used to offset an impact had a substantially different loss frequency in the troposphere and stratosphere (Pyle et al., 2022).

The ODPs used in Table 1 are based on atmospheric model simulations and can be expressed as a semi-empirical relationship:

$$ODP_i = \frac{n_{Cl}}{3} \times \frac{f_i}{f_{CFC-11}} + \frac{\tau_i}{\tau_{CFC-11}} + \frac{m_{CFC-11}}{m_i} \quad (1)$$

where  $n_{Cl}$  is the number of chlorine atoms in the molecule,  $f_i$  is the fractional release factor for the molecule,  $\tau_i$  is the total lifetime, and  $m_i$  is the molecular mass of the molecule (Burkholder et al., 2022).

The IOD for comparison, and not used here, is given by Eq. (2):

$$IOD = KE_{Eq} \left( \frac{\tau_{atmos}}{\tau_{strat}} \right) \quad (2)$$

where  $K=100 \pm 16$  Dobson Units years per Tg Cl,  $E_{Eq}$  is the total emission in Tg Cl, multiplied by the ratio of the whole atmosphere lifetime of the molecule to its stratospheric lifetime,  $\tau_{atmos}/\tau_{strat}$  (Pyle et al., 2022).

### 140 3.2 Environmental impacts from ozone depletion

UV radiation exposure can be estimated from ozone depletion to estimate health and environmental effects. For example, the EPA used its Atmospheric and Health Effects Framework (AHEF) model to estimate that in the US alone the unexpected CFC-11 emissions,<sup>1</sup> absent offset, would result in nearly 60,000 cancer deaths through 2100 that compliance with the Montreal Protocol would have avoided (EPA, 2020). This and other health effects models can be extrapolated taking into account geographic location, genetic vulnerability, lifestyle differences, and access to preventative and therapeutic mitigation (Slaper et al., 1996; Longstreth et al., 1998; Struijs et al., 2010; van Dijk et al., 2013). A calculation of the health and environmental impacts from ozone depletion and global warming of emissions is beyond the scope of this paper, as the authors are unaware of simplified metrics for these impacts analogous to the metrics for estimating ozone column and climate impacts. In addition to human health impacts, UV exposure can harm aboveground plant biomass and diminish the uptake of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) by the terrestrial biosphere in its capacity as a carbon sink. Studies suggest a UV response strength of a 3% reduction in biomass for a 10% increase in plant-weighted surface UV fluxes which can be related to total column ozone (Young et al.,

---

<sup>1</sup> This estimate is based on the “bank scenario”, which assumes that CFC-11 emissions began increasing in 2012 above those expected under the reference WMO A1 scenario, peak around 77 Gg/yr in 2015–2017, then decline sharply through 2100. While the end date of unreported production is unclear, the report states that: “In the fourth scenario, CFC-11 emissions were estimated based on Dhomse et al. (2019), which constructs an emissions scenario curve based on initial rapid increase in CFC-11 emissions and slower release from accumulated CFC-11 banks. This scenario first takes the estimate of 13 Gg/year in new emissions due to unreported production and assumes an immediate production release rate of 15 percent followed by 3.5 percent/year. This creates a gradually decreasing emissions curve where CFC-11 emissions continue past 2100 due to releases from the accumulated bank even after production goes to zero” (EPA, 2020).

2021). These impacts could also be included in deriving appropriate offsets if desired in terms of ozone offsets for UV impacts and protection of carbon sinks or GHG mitigation to offset the CO<sub>2</sub> impacts (section 3.3).

### 3.3 Climate forcing for greenhouse gases (GHGs)

155 Offsets in carbon emissions are measured in tonnes of carbon dioxide-equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>-eq) using GWPs from the most recently published set, e.g. (Burkholder et al., 2022). The issue of timescales is also important with this metric, as the GWP involves a comparison of the cumulative climate impact over a specified time interval of a pulse emission for chemicals having different lifetimes. While 100-year GWP are most commonly used to capture the longer-term warming effects of long-lived greenhouse gases like CO<sub>2</sub> and CFCs, the use of 20-year GWP may be more relevant when considering near-term warming impacts of  
160 potent but short-lived GHGs like most HFCs, such as 1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane (HFC-134a) (13.5 year lifetime), difluoromethane (HFC-32) (5.27 year lifetime), Pentafluoroethane (HFC-125) (30.7 year lifetime) (Burkholder et al., 2022). Such near-term impacts are particularly relevant to temperature goals such as limiting warming to 1.5°C with no- or limited overshoot, noting that the possibility of crossing the 1.5°C warming target of the Paris Agreement as soon as the 2030s (Abernethy and Jackson, 2022; Xu et al., 2018; Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2021).

165 The GWP for a molecule  $x$  is given by Eq. (3):

$$GWP_x = \frac{\int_0^{t'} a_x \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\tau_x}\right) dt}{\int_0^{t'} a_{CO_2} R(t) dt} \quad (3)$$

where  $a$  is the radiative efficiency per unit mass,  $\tau_x$  is the global lifetime of molecule  $x$ ,  $R(t)$  is the decay time of a pulse of the reference gas CO<sub>2</sub> and  $t'$  is the time horizon over which the integrated radiative forcing is calculated (Daniel et al., 2012).

### 3.4 Illustrative offset calculation

170 When deriving offsets based on anomalies in emissions, it is important to remember to consider the potential for future emissions that have not yet escaped to the atmosphere (e.g., from banked chemicals that were produced illicitly but that have not yet reached the atmosphere, see earlier text). In the case of the unexpected CFC-11 emissions, the TEAP Task Force found: “the estimated cumulative total of unreported CFC-11 production is 320-700 kilotonnes in the period 2007-2019. Assuming usage in closed-cell foam production, this cumulative unreported CFC-11 production would lead to an estimated increase in  
175 the magnitude of the CFC-11 bank of 300 (266-333) kilotonnes by the end of 2019.” (TEAP, 2022) Taking the cumulative total of unreported production of 320-700 kilotonnes CFC-11, we calculate an ODP-weighted emission of 320–700 kilotonnes and GWP<sub>20</sub> of 2.7–6.0 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e and GWP<sub>100</sub> of 2.1–4.5 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e (Table 1). To calculate equivalent offsets, the formula in Eq. (4) is considered below to derive offsets for three ODS that are being phased out under the Montreal Protocol with the largest remaining eligible production and consumption (Table 1).

180

$$\text{Mass of Chemical X (kilotonnes)} = [\text{Mass CFC-11 (kilotonnes)}] \times [\text{metric for CFC-11}] / [\text{metric for Chemical X}] \quad (4)$$

Offsetting this cumulative total CFC-11 production on ozone depletion would require preventing emission of 8,420 to 10,840 kilotonnes of HCFC-22, either through the destruction of that amount from existing banks or as reduced production allowances.

185 In this case, the amount of HCFC required to offset the cumulative ozone impacts is greater than the amount that would be needed to offset the global warming impacts under both 20- and 100-year time horizons. For comparison, the estimated cumulative HCFC-22 production allowed under the Montreal Protocol phaseout schedule for controlled uses (excluding feedstocks) through 2040 to be on the order of 1,300 kilotonnes (Table 2). Even if recent HCFC-22 production from 2021-2023 were considered available for recovery and destruction, this would only amount to about 900 kilotonnes available for

190 offset. Due to the low ozone depleting potential of HCFC-22, it would take the additional step of recovery and destruction of CFC banks or some other actions to offset the ozone impacts of the unexpected CFC-11 production. Elimination or prevention of remaining eligible consumption for 1,1-Dichloro-1-fluoroethane (HCFC-141b) and 1-Chloro-1,1-difluoroethane (HCFC-142b) would also be insufficient, as those magnitudes are estimated to be 1.3 kt and 7.6 kt, respectively, based on reporting through the 92<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund, as reported in Table 4-1 of the TEAP

195 Replenishment Task Force Supplementary Report (TEAP, 2023b). However, narrowing exemptions for production of ODS for feedstock uses could expand the amount of ODS available for offset (see Table 2).

Table 1. CFC-11 cumulative production in ODP- and GWP-weighted and calculated mass of HCFC-22, HCFC-141b, and HCFC-142b to achieve equivalent offsets. ODP and GWP values are from Table A-5 in the 2022 Quadrennial Ozone

200 Assessment (Burkholder et al., 2022).

	ODP Weighted (kilotonnes)	GWP <sub>20</sub> Weighted (GtCO <sub>2e</sub> )	GWP <sub>100</sub> Weighted (GtCO <sub>2e</sub> )
<b>CFC-11</b>			
Conversion values for 1 kilotonne of CFC-11	1	8560	6410
Estimated cumulative total of unreported CFC-11 production in the period 2007-2019	320–700	2.7–6.0	2.1–4.5
<b>HCFC-22</b>			
Conversion values for 1 kilotonne of HCFC-22	0.038	5610	1910
Kilotonnes of HCFC-22 that would need to be destroyed to offset unreported CFC-11 production in terms of ODP or GWP equivalent impact	8,420–10,840	488–1,070	1,070–2,350
<b>HCFC-141b</b>			
Conversion values for 1 kilotonne of HCFC-141b	0.102	2590	808

Kilotonnes of HCFC-141b that would need to be destroyed to offset unreported CFC-11 production in terms of ODP or GWP equivalent impact	3,140–6,860	1,060–2,310	2,540–5,550
HCFC-142b			
Conversion values for 1 kilotonne of HCFC-142b	0.057	5400	2190
Kilotonnes of HCFC-142b that would need to be destroyed to offset unreported CFC-11 production in terms of ODP or GWP equivalent impact	5,610–12,300	510–1,110	937–2,050

#### 4 Offsets are one option to maintain the integrity of ozone and climate protection under the Montreal Protocol

205 While any given instance of unexpected and unreported emissions may seem small in terms of atmospheric impacts, such impacts are cumulative and in absolute terms significant compared to other environmental violations where compensation is sought—consider for example the settlement requiring Volkswagen (VW) to provide nearly US\$3 billion to an Environmental Mitigation Trust to “fully remediate the excess NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the illegal vehicles” (Breyer, 2016). Stratospheric ozone depletion and climate-forcing offsets can compensate for unexpected and unreported production by: reducing production or emissions of an ODS produced legally prior to phaseout under the Montreal Protocol or by preventing emissions or production of an ODS not yet subject to the Montreal Protocol’s phaseout requirements (e.g., trifluoromethyl iodide (CF<sub>3</sub>I), methylene chloride (CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>), or nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)); and/or with respect to climate forcing, avoiding cumulative emissions or removing GHGs equivalent to the near term (20-year GWP) forcing of the unexpected and unreported emission to help prevent triggering tipping points and longer-term climate change (Lenton et al., 2019). In the absence of chemical offsets being applied, an alternative approach might be to calculate cumulative health impacts and determine monetary compensation and/or punitive 215 damages of loss in health, life, productivity, ecological impact, and materials degradation.

Offsets in ozone depletion are measured in tonnes of CFC-11 emission-equivalent (as an ODP-weighted emission). In the case of ozone depletion, the size of the offset estimated to be needed would ensure that the cumulative adverse impact of the unreported or illicit activity would be offset. Such an approach would contribute to ozone recovery and towards offsetting the 220 health and environmental damage done prior to mitigation.

#### 5 Potential actions that could offset the ozone depletion and climate impacts of unexpected and unreported production

In Table 2 we present a non-exhaustive list of potential actions that could be used to offset the ozone depletion, climate, and other environmental impacts arising from instances of unexpected and unreported production that Parties may agree warrant



remedial action. Any of these measures could also be employed to offset the ozone and climate impacts of Essential Use Exemptions (EUEs) for ODSs other than HCFCs and methyl bromide (including emergency EUEs), Critical Use Exemptions (CUEs) for methyl bromide (including emergency CUEs) (UNEP, Ozone Secretariat Decisions IV/25, IX/6, IX/7, and TEAP Handbook 2005).<sup>2</sup> We provide indicative numbers on the potential available offsets for each type of action.

**Table 2. Overview of potential offset activities and indicative available offsets.**

Potential Offset Activity	Indicative Available Offsets for Potential Activity
Accelerate the HCFC phaseout faster than mandated by the Protocol (reducing both ozone depletion and climate forcing)	Based on baseline levels, phaseout schedule and current production in 2021 from Table 2 in Multilateral Fund (MLF) document 92/5 (MLF, 2023), we estimate the cumulative allowed HCFC production for controlled uses (excluding feedstocks) from 2024 through phaseout in 2040 to be on the order of 50,000 ODP tonnes, primarily HCFC-22, which is equivalent to approximately 1,300 kilotonnes of HCFC-22. Allowed production for controlled uses from 2021 to 2023 totaled about 900 kilotonnes of HCFC-22.
Limiting emissions associated with feedstock exemptions	While HCFC-22 production for controlled uses is phasing out, production for exempted feedstock uses is increasing as a share of total production. HCFC-22 production for feedstock uses was 56% of total reported production in 2017 (UNEP and TEAP, 2019) compared with reported production for controlled uses (MLF 2023). If feedstock production exemptions were to be revisited by the parties to the Montreal Protocol (Andersen et al., 2021), then this sector could be considered in an offset framework. Total annual feedstock production in 2019 was estimated at 558 ODP-weighted kilotonnes, with emissions of 15.0–18.7 ODP kilotonnes (Daniel et al., 2022).
Leapfrog HFCs to low-GWP energy-efficient, next-generation fluids or technology (also mitigating ozone and climate forcing)	Estimated baseline annual HFC consumption for Article 5 parties for 2020–2022 was estimated to total 1.1 billion tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> e using Annex F GWP <sub>100</sub> in Table 3-2 (UNEP

<sup>2</sup> Numerous decisions of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol establish and interpret criteria and procedures for EUEs and CUEs, and related emergency exemption applications. Examples of key decisions concerning EUEs and CUEs are provided in the references.

<p>Accelerate the HFC phasedown and transition to technologies with lower environmental impacts including non-fluorocarbon replacements (also not-in-kind -- NIK)</p>	<p>and TEAP, 2023). Non-A5 parties are currently subject to a 10% reduction compared to baseline consumption levels, and in 2024 will start the 40% reduction step. For a sense of scale of potential for acceleration of phasedown, the baseline HFC consumption for the United States is 300 million metric tonnes (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2023) and the European Union is 164 million metric tonnes (UNEP, 2023) (both use 2007 IPCC GWP<sub>100</sub> values).</p>
<p>Collect and destroy ODSs and HFCs banks (ozone and climate mitigation for ODS destruction; climate mitigation only for HFC destruction)</p>	<p>CFC-11 banks have been estimated to range from 70 to 1 475 kilotonnes for 2018, but the lower range was considered outside the range of realistic values and the higher range includes “inaccessible” banks that would be difficult to recover, such as foams in landfills (WMO, 2021), with higher estimates of 2,568 kilotonnes of CFC-11 (not including unexpected) and CFC-12 banks of 2,900 ODP-weighted kilotonnes (Lickley et al., 2020).</p> <p>A high-end range for potential HFC offsets can be estimated from a scenario where emissions from new production and banks ceased in 2023, which would reduce cumulative emissions by 32–37 GtCO<sub>2e</sub> relative to the Kigali Amendment schedule (Liang et al., 2022).</p>
<p>Replace inefficient air conditioners (ACs) with super-efficient, low-GWP ACs and destroy recovered ODS and HFC refrigerants</p>	
<p>Reduce production and emissions of ozone-depleting GHGs not controlled under the Montreal Protocol (i.e., N<sub>2</sub>O or CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>) or GHGs not controlled under the Montreal Protocol (i.e., CH<sub>4</sub>)</p>	<p>Industrial emissions were 307 kt N<sub>2</sub>O (84 GtCO<sub>2e</sub>) from adipic acid and 136 kt N<sub>2</sub>O (37 GtCO<sub>2e</sub>) from nitric acid production in 2020; U.S. EPA estimates 80% abatement potential at break-even costs (Davidson and Winiwarter, 2023).</p>
<p>Increase the energy efficiency performance of building air conditioning and residential, commercial, and industrial refrigeration together with ODS and HFC transitions</p>	<p>Cumulative energy-related CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for cooling for 2023-2050 could be reduced by 47–69% through improved energy efficiency, while transitioning to low-GWP refrigerant would add a further 25–53% reduction in CO<sub>2e</sub> terms (TEAP, 2023a).</p>

Others have implicitly suggested the usefulness of offsets: “The recovery and destruction of CFC-11 banks would not only accelerate the ozone layer recovery, but also yield climate benefits (WMO, 2021). Based on the TEAP/UNEP (2019b) scenario, recovery and destruction of the active and inactive banks would reduce emissions by 1.6 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>-eq [GWP<sub>100</sub>; 2.2 GtCO<sub>2</sub>-eq GWP<sub>20</sub>] between 2020 and 2060 and 2.6 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>-eq [GWP<sub>100</sub>; by 3.6 GtCO<sub>2</sub>-eq GWP<sub>20</sub>] between 2020 and 2100 (see Table 5.2). Using their estimates of much larger banks, Lickley et al. (2020) estimated that recovery and destruction of the CFC-11 and CFC-12 banks would reduce emissions by 9 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>-eq [GWP<sub>100</sub>; 13 Gt GtCO<sub>2</sub>-eq GWP<sub>20</sub>] between 2020 and 2100.” Recent analysis by (Lickley et al., 2022) suggests that production may have been underreported for nearly all chemicals examined, implying larger banks, and they conclude that “in terms of climate impacts, CFC-11, CFC-12, and HCFC-22 are the largest banked materials weighted by GWP<sub>100</sub>, accounting for 36 %, 14 %, and 36 % of current [ODS] banks, respectively. When banks are weighted by ODP, CFC-11 and CFC-12 represent 46 % and halons also represent 46 % of current banked chemicals.... In terms of GWP<sub>100</sub>, CFC-11 banks largely reside in foams, whereas CFC-12 and HCFC-22 are largely in non-hermetic refrigeration. The latter may be more readily recoverable. In terms of ODP, CFC-11 foams and CFC-12 non-hermetic refrigeration remain important, along with halons which are all contained in fire extinguishers, a recoverable reservoir.”<sup>3</sup>

## 245 **6 Conclusion**

This technical note describes approaches for offsetting the ozone depletion and climate forcing from unexpected and unreported production and associated emissions of ozone-depleting substances (ODSs) (e.g., CFC-11, CFC-12, CFC-113, and CTC). Scientists can calculate the contribution of each option in offsetting potentially both the annual and cumulative ozone depletion and climate forcing over the atmospheric lifetime of the ODSs but we argue here that typically the most practical approach (and in some instances the only approach) will be to consider offsetting cumulative impacts without consideration of timing. The Montreal Protocol Parties have shown creativity and flexibility in their non-compliance remedies (UNEP, 1992). Parties to the Montreal Protocol may wish to consider action on compliance to minimize ozone and climate consequences and to discourage future unexpected and unreported production.

## 255 **Author contribution**

SOA conceptualized the study. GBD, SAM, SOA, RF wrote the paper.

## **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

---

<sup>3</sup> If an alternative is identified for those essential uses preserving health and safety, halons could be a recoverable reservoir.

## Acknowledgements

- 260 The authors thank colleagues who helped identify the policy relevant science and the also opportunities to offset ODS and HFC emissions. We are particularly grateful to John S. Daniel, David W. Fahey, Korey G. Silverman-Roati, and Durwood Zaelke. GBD, SOA and RF acknowledge support from the Children’s Investment Fund Foundation.

## References

- 265 Abernethy, S. and Jackson, R. B.: Global temperature goals should determine the time horizons for greenhouse gas emission metrics, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 17, 024019, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac4940>, 2022.
- Adcock, K. E., Ashfold, M. J., Chou, C. C.-K., Gooch, L. J., Mohd Hanif, N., Laube, J. C., Oram, D. E., Ou-Yang, C.-F., Panagi, M., Sturges, W. T., and Reeves, C. E.: Investigation of East Asian Emissions of CFC-11 Using Atmospheric Observations in Taiwan, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 54, 3814–3822, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b06433>, 2020.
- 270 Andersen, S. O. and Sarma, K. M.: *Protecting the Ozone Layer: The United Nations History*, Earthscan Press (official publication of the United Nations Environment Programme), London, England, 513 pp., 2002.
- Andersen, S. O., Gao, S., Carvalho, S., Ferris, T., Gonzalez, M., Sherman, N. J., Wei, Y., and Zaelke, D.: Narrowing feedstock exemptions under the Montreal Protocol has multiple environmental benefits, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 118, e2022668118, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2022668118>, 2021.
- 275 Bais, A. F., Lucas, R. M., Bornman, J. F., Williamson, C. E., Sulzberger, B., Austin, A. T., Wilson, S. R., Andrady, A. L., Bernhard, G., McKenzie, R. L., Aucamp, P. J., Madronich, S., Neale, R. E., Yazar, S., Young, A. R., de Gruijl, F. R., Norval, M., Takizawa, Y., Barnes, P. W., Robson, T. M., Robinson, S. A., Bailaré, C. L., Flint, S. D., Neale, P. J., Hylander, S., Rose, K. C., Wängberg, S.-Å., Hader, D.-P., Worrest, R. C., Zepp, R. G., Paul, N. D., Cory, R. M., Solomon, K. R., Longstreth, J., Pandey, K. K., Redhwi, H. H., Torikai, A., and Heikkilä, A. M.: Environmental effects of ozone depletion, UV radiation and interactions with climate change: UNEP Environmental Effects Assessment Panel, update 2017, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 17, 127–179, <https://doi.org/10.1039/c7pp90043k>, 2018.
- 280 Benish, S. E., Salawitch, R. J., Ren, X., He, H., and Dickerson, R. R.: Airborne Observations of CFCs Over Hebei Province, China in Spring 2016, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres*, 126, e2021JD035152, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JD035152>, 2021.
- Breyer, C. R.: VOLKSWAGEN “CLEAN DIESEL” MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES, AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION, 2016.
- 285 Burkholder, J. B., Hodnebrog, Ø., McDonald, B. C., Orkin, V., Papadimitriou, V. C., and Van Hoomissen, D.: Annex: Summary of Abundances, in: *Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2022*, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, 2022.
- Daniel, J. S., Solomon, S., Sanford, T. J., McFarland, M., Fuglestedt, J. S., and Friedlingstein, P.: Limitations of single-basket trading: lessons from the Montreal Protocol for climate policy, *Clim. Change*, 111, 241–248, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0136-3>, 2012.
- 290 Daniel, J. S., Reimann, S., Ashford, P., Fleming, E. L., Hossaini, R., Lickley, M. J., Schofield, R., Walter-Terrinoni, H., McBride, L., Park, S., Ross, M. N., Salawitch, R. J., Sherry, D., Tegmeier, S., and Velders, G. J. M.: Chapter 7: Scenarios

- and Information for Policymakers, in: *Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2022*, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, 2022.
- 295 Davidson, E. A. and Winiwarter, W.: Urgent abatement of industrial sources of nitrous oxide, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 13, 599–601, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-023-01723-3>, 2023.
- Dhomse, S. S., Feng, W., Montzka, S. A., Hossaini, R., Keeble, J., Pyle, J. A., Daniel, J. S., and Chipperfield, M. P.: Delay in recovery of the Antarctic ozone hole from unexpected CFC-11 emissions, *Nat. Commun.*, 10, 5781, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13717-x>, 2019.
- 300 van Dijk, A., Slaper, H., den Outer, P. N., Morgenstern, O., Braesicke, P., Pyle, J. A., Garny, H., Stenke, A., Dameris, M., Kazantzidis, A., Tourpali, K., and Bais, A. F.: Skin cancer risks avoided by the Montreal Protocol--worldwide modeling integrating coupled climate-chemistry models with a risk model for UV, *Photochem. Photobiol.*, 89, 234–246, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-1097.2012.01223.x>, 2013.
- EPA: Updating the Atmospheric and Health Effects Framework Model: Stratospheric Ozone Protection and Human Health Benefits, Stratospheric Protection Division, Office of Air and Radiation, Washington, D.C, 2020.
- 305 Fisher, D. A., Hales, C. H., Filkin, D. L., Ko, M. K. W., Sze, N. D., Connell, P. S., Wuebbles, D. J., Isaksen, I. S. A., and Stordal, F.: VIII. Ozone Depletion Potentials, Relative Effects on Stratospheric Ozone of Halogenated Methanes and Ethanes of Social and Industrial Interest, in: *Scientific Assessment of Stratospheric Ozone, 1989, vol. 2*, World Meteorological Organization, Global Ozone Research and Monitoring Project], Geneva, Switzerland, 303–377, 1990.
- 310 Fleming, E. L., Newman, P. A., Liang, Q., and Daniel, J. S.: The Impact of Continuing CFC-11 Emissions on Stratospheric Ozone, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres*, 125, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD031849>, 2020.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis, Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, 2021.
- 315 Keeble, J., Abraham, N. L., Archibald, A. T., Chipperfield, M. P., Dhomse, S., Griffiths, P. T., and Pyle, J. A.: Modelling the potential impacts of the recent, unexpected increase in CFC-11 emissions on total column ozone recovery, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 20, 7153–7166, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-7153-2020>, 2020.
- Lenton, T. M., Rockström, J., Gaffney, O., Rahmstorf, S., Richardson, K., Steffen, W., and Schellnhuber, H. J.: Climate tipping points — too risky to bet against, *Nature*, 575, 592–595, <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03595-0>, 2019.
- 320 Liang, Q., Rigby, M., Fang, X., Godwin, D., Mühle, J., Saito, T., Stanley, K. M., Velders, G. J. M., Bernath, P., Derek, N., Reimann, S., Simpson, I. J., and Western, L.: Chapter 2: Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), in: *Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2022*, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, 2022.
- Lickley, M., Solomon, S., Fletcher, S., Velders, G. J. M., Daniel, J., Rigby, M., Montzka, S. A., Kuijpers, L. J. M., and Stone, K.: Quantifying contributions of chlorofluorocarbon banks to emissions and impacts on the ozone layer and climate, *Nat. Commun.*, 11, 1380, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-15162-7>, 2020.
- 325 Lickley, M., Fletcher, S., Rigby, M., and Solomon, S.: Joint inference of CFC lifetimes and banks suggests previously unidentified emissions, *Nat. Commun.*, 12, 2920, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-23229-2>, 2021.
- Lickley, M. J., Daniel, J. S., Fleming, E. L., Reimann, S., and Solomon, S.: Bayesian assessment of chlorofluorocarbon (CFC), hydrochlorofluorocarbon (HCFC) and halon banks suggest large reservoirs still present in old equipment, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 22, 11125–11136, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-11125-2022>, 2022.

- 330 Longstreth, J., de Gruijl, F. R., Kripke, M. L., Abseck, S., Arnold, F., Slaper, H. I., Velders, G., Takizawa, Y., and van der Leun, J. C.: Health risks, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. B*, 46, 20–39, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1011-1344\(98\)00183-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1011-1344(98)00183-3), 1998.
- Madronich, S., Lee-Taylor, J. M., Wagner, M., Kyle, J., Hu, Z., and Landolfi, R.: Estimation of Skin and Ocular Damage Avoided in the United States through Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, *ACS Earth Space Chem.*, 5, 1876–1888, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsearthspacechem.1c00183>, 2021.
- 335 MLF: Country programme data and prospects for compliance, Ninety-second Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, Montreal, Canada, 2023.
- Montzka, S. A., Dutton, G. S., Yu, P., Ray, E., Portmann, R. W., Daniel, J. S., Kuijpers, L., Hall, B. D., Mondeel, D., Siso, C., Nance, J. D., Rigby, M., Manning, A. J., Hu, L., Moore, F., Miller, B. R., and Elkins, J. W.: An unexpected and persistent increase in global emissions of ozone-depleting CFC-11, *Nature*, 557, 413–417, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0106-2>,  
340 2018.
- Montzka, S. A., Dutton, G. S., Portmann, R. W., Chipperfield, M. P., Davis, S., Feng, W., Manning, A. J., Ray, E., Rigby, M., Hall, B. D., Siso, C., Nance, J. D., Krummel, P. B., Mühle, J., Young, D., O’Doherty, S., Salameh, P. K., Harth, C. M., Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R. F., Elkins, J. W., Walter-Terrinoni, H., and Theodoridi, C.: A decline in global CFC-11 emissions during 2018–2019, *Nature*, 590, 428–432, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03260-5>, 2021.
- 345 Park, S., Western, L. M., Saito, T., Redington, A. L., Henne, S., Fang, X., Prinn, R. G., Manning, A. J., Montzka, S. A., Fraser, P. J., Ganesan, A. L., Harth, C. M., Kim, J., Krummel, P. B., Liang, Q., Mühle, J., O’Doherty, S., Park, H., Park, M.-K., Reimann, S., Salameh, P. K., Weiss, R. F., and Rigby, M.: A decline in emissions of CFC-11 and related chemicals from eastern China, *Nature*, 590, 433–437, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03277-w>, 2021.
- Prather, M. J.: Lifetimes of atmospheric species: Integrating environmental impacts: ATMOSPHERIC LIFETIMES &  
350 INTEGRATED EFFECTS, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 29, 20-1-20–3, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002GL016299>, 2002.
- Pyle, J. A., Keeble, J., Abraham, N. L., Chipperfield, M. P., and Griffiths, P. T.: Integrated ozone depletion as a metric for ozone recovery, *Nature*, 608, 719–723, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04968-8>, 2022.
- Ramanathan, V.: Greenhouse Effect Due to Chlorofluorocarbons: Climatic Implications, *Science*, 190, 50–52, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.190.4209.50>, 1975.
- 355 Rigby, M., Park, S., Saito, T., Western, L. M., Redington, A. L., Fang, X., Henne, S., Manning, A. J., Prinn, R. G., Dutton, G. S., Fraser, P. J., Ganesan, A. L., Hall, B. D., Harth, C. M., Kim, J., Kim, K.-R., Krummel, P. B., Lee, T., Li, S., Liang, Q., Lunt, M. F., Montzka, S. A., Mühle, J., O’Doherty, S., Park, M.-K., Reimann, S., Salameh, P. K., Simmonds, P., Tunnicliffe, R. L., Weiss, R. F., Yokouchi, Y., and Young, D.: Increase in CFC-11 emissions from eastern China based on atmospheric observations, *Nature*, 569, 546–550, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1193-4>, 2019.
- 360 Slaper, H., Velders, G. J. M., Daniel, J. S., de Gruijl, F. R., and van der Leun, J. C.: Estimates of ozone depletion and skin cancer incidence to examine the Vienna Convention achievements, *Nature*, 384, 256–258, <https://doi.org/10.1038/384256a0>, 1996.
- SPARC: SPARC Report on the Mystery of Carbon Tetrachloride, 2016.
- 365 Struijs, J., van Dijk, A., Slaper, H., van Wijnen, H. J., Velders, G. J. M., Chaplin, G., and Huijbregts, M. A. J.: Spatial- and Time-Explicit Human Damage Modeling of Ozone Depleting Substances in Life Cycle Impact Assessment, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 44, 204–209, <https://doi.org/10.1021/es9017865>, 2010.

- TEAP: Report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel May 2022, UNEP, 2022.
- TEAP: Report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel: Decision XXXIV/3 Energy Efficiency Working Group Report, 2023a.
- 370 TEAP: Supplement to the May 2023 TEAP Replenishment Task Force Report “Assessment of the Funding Requirement for the Replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Period 2024–2026,” 2023b.
- UNEP: Annex V: Indicative list of measures that might be taken by a Meeting of the Parties in respect of non-compliance with the Protocol, 1992.
- 375 UNEP and TEAP: Decision XXX/3 TEAP Task Force Report on Unexpected Emissions of Trichlorofluoromethane (CFC-11)(September 2019), Nairobi, Kenya, 2019.
- UNEP and TEAP: Volume 3: Assessment of the funding requirement for the replenishment of the multilateral fund for the period 2024–2026, Nairobi, Kenya, 2023.
- UNEP EEAP: 2018 Assessment Report of the Environment Effects Assessment Panel (EEAP): Environmental Effects and Interactions of Stratospheric Ozone Depletion, UV Radiation, and Climate Change, 2018.
- 380 UNEP, O. S.: Country Data for European Union: Consumption of controlled substances in ODP tonnes or in CO<sub>2</sub>-eq tonnes (Database last updated: Tuesday, 10th October 23 10:17am), 2023.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Phasedown of Hydrofluorocarbons: Adjustment to the Hydrofluorocarbon Production Baseline, 2023.
- 385 Western, L. M., Vollmer, M. K., Krummel, P. B., Adcock, K. E., Fraser, P. J., Harth, C. M., Langenfelds, R. L., Montzka, S. A., Mühle, J., O’Doherty, S., Oram, D. E., Reimann, S., Rigby, M., Vimont, I., Weiss, R. F., Young, D., and Laube, J. C.: Global increase of ozone-depleting chlorofluorocarbons from 2010 to 2020, *Nat. Geosci.*, 1–5, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-023-01147-w>, 2023.
- WMO: Report on the Unexpected Emissions of CFC-11: A Report of the Scientific Assessment Panel of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, Geneva, Switzerland, 2021.
- 390 World Meteorological Organization (WMO): Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2022, WMO, Geneva, 509 pp., 2022.
- Xu, Y., Ramanathan, V., and Victor, D. G.: Global warming will happen faster than we think, *Nature*, 564, 30–32, <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-07586-5>, 2018.
- 395 Young, P. J., Harper, A. B., Huntingford, C., Paul, N. D., Morgenstern, O., Newman, P. A., Oman, L. D., Madronich, S., and Garcia, R. R.: The Montreal Protocol protects the terrestrial carbon sink, *Nature*, 596, 384–388, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03737-3>, 2021.