

MONTREAL PROTOCOL
ON SUBSTANCES THAT DEplete
THE OZONE LAYER



UNEP

2002 REPORT OF THE
METHYL BROMIDE
TECHNICAL OPTIONS COMMITTEE

2002 Assessment

Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) 2002 Report of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee

2002 Assessment

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

Coordination: Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee

Final editing, composition and layout: Jonathan Banks

Reproduction: UNEP/ Ozone Secretariat, Nairobi

Date:

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:

<http://www.teap.org>

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

ISBN 92-807-2287-5

Disclaimer

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) Co-chairs and members, the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee 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 and agricultural operation requires consideration of environmental and 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, the TEAP Co-chairs and members, the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee 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, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel Co-chairs or members, the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee Co-chairs or members, or the companies or organisations that employ them

Acknowledgement

The Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, its Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee Co-chairs and members 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 Committee and do not necessarily reflect the views of any sponsoring or supporting organisation.

Dedication

This 2002 MBTOC Assessment Report is dedicated to our good friend and colleague Dr Miguel Costilla (Investigador, Seccion Zoologia, Estacion Experimental Agro-Industrial Obispo Colombres, Argentina) who passed away suddenly in 2001. He will be remembered by his MBTOC colleagues for his friendship, hard work and dedication toward finding alternatives to methyl bromide.

UNEP
2002 REPORT OF THE
METHYL BROMIDE
TECHNICAL OPTIONS COMMITTEE

2002 ASSESSMENT

Table of Contents

Page

CHAPTER 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
THE METHYL BROMIDE TECHNICAL OPTIONS COMMITTEE	1
MANDATE AND REPORT STRUCTURE	1
GENERAL FEATURES OF METHYL BROMIDE	2
PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION	2
<i>MB production trends</i>	2
<i>MB consumption trends</i>	3
<i>Methyl bromide emissions</i>	3
METHYL BROMIDE CONTROL MEASURES	3
ALTERNATIVES TO METHYL BROMIDE	4
<i>Definition of an alternative</i>	4
<i>Availability of alternatives</i>	4
<i>Alternatives for soil treatments</i>	5
<i>Alternatives for treatment of durables, wood products and structures (non-QPS)</i>	7
<i>Alternatives evaluated in Article 5(1) countries – Response to Decision IX/5(1e)</i>	9
<i>Alternatives to methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment applications (perishables, durable commodities and structures)</i>	12
REDUCTION OF EMISSIONS FROM METHYL BROMIDE USE	14
CHAPTER 2. INTRODUCTION TO THE ASSESSMENT	17
2.1 METHYL BROMIDE	17
2.2 MBTOC MANDATE	17
2.3 COMMITTEE PROCESS AND COMPOSITION	18
2.4 UNEP ASSESSMENTS	19
2.5 DEFINITION OF AN ALTERNATIVE	19
2.6 REPORT STRUCTURE	20
2.7 REFERENCES	21
CHAPTER 3. METHYL BROMIDE PRODUCTION, CONSUMPTION AND LIMITATIONS ON USE	23
3.1 INTRODUCTION	23
3.2 USES OF METHYL BROMIDE	23
3.3 PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY	24
3.3.1 <i>Production for all uses</i>	24
3.3.2 <i>Production for controlled uses</i>	26
3.3.3 <i>Regions of production</i>	26
3.4 CONSUMPTION AND USAGE	27
3.4.1 <i>Reported consumption for controlled uses</i>	27
3.4.2 <i>Usage by sector</i>	28
3.4.3 <i>Quarantine and pre-shipment</i>	29
3.5 APPLICATION METHODS	30
3.5.1 <i>Soil fumigation</i>	30
3.5.2 <i>Commodities and structures</i>	31
3.6 LIMITATIONS ON METHYL BROMIDE USE	32
3.6.1 <i>Technical limitations</i>	32
3.6.2 <i>Legislative limitations</i>	32
3.6.3 <i>Consumer/market preferences</i>	34

3.6.3.1	Importance of market factors in phaseout.....	34
3.6.3.2	Users and pest control companies taking leadership in alternatives.....	34
3.6.3.3	Supermarket policies on MB in agriculture	35
3.6.3.4	Policies of manufacturers, traders and auction houses	36
3.6.3.5	Eco-labelling and product information	36
3.6.4	<i>Levies and taxes on methyl bromide</i>	37
3.6.4.1	Example of voluntary levy on MB.....	37
3.6.4.2	Taxes on ODS chemicals	37
3.6.4.3	Taxes on products	38
3.7	REFERENCES	38

CHAPTER 4. ALTERNATIVES TO METHYL BROMIDE FOR SOIL TREATMENT..... 41

4.1	INTRODUCTION	41
4.2	ADOPTION OF ALTERNATIVES.....	42
4.3	TRANSITIONAL STRATEGIES TO REDUCE MB DOSAGES.....	42
4.4	ALTERNATIVES WHICH REPLACE MB FOR SOIL DISINFESTATION	43
4.4.1	<i>Chemical alternatives</i>	43
4.4.1.1	Chloropicrin (trichloronitromethane).....	44
4.4.1.2	1,3-Dichloropropene	45
4.4.1.3	Methyl isothiocyanate (MITC) and MITC generators.....	45
4.4.2	<i>Chemical alternatives that require further development</i>	46
4.4.2.1	Methyl iodide and other iodinated compounds.....	46
4.4.2.2	Iodinated hydrocarbon fumigants.	47
4.4.2.3	Other iodinated compounds	47
4.4.2.4	Propargyl bromide	47
4.4.2.5	Inorganic azides.	48
4.4.2.6	Propylene oxide	49
4.4.2.7	Sulphuryl fluoride, carbonyl sulphide, cyanogen	49
4.4.2.8	Other chemicals	49
4.4.3	<i>Naturally occurring chemicals</i>	51
4.4.3.1	Biorational pesticides.....	51
4.4.4	<i>Combinations of chemicals</i>	51
4.4.4.1	Fumigant mixtures	51
4.4.5	<i>Chemical and non-fumigant chemical mixtures</i>	53
4.5	NON-CHEMICAL ALTERNATIVES	53
4.5.1	<i>Resistant varieties and rootstocks</i>	53
4.5.1.1	<i>Varities</i>	53

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_12055

