UNITED NATIONS

EP

United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/98/59
25 May 2026

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Ninety-eighth Meeting
Montreal, 22–26 June 2026
Item 12 of the provisional agenda[1]

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON NEW ENERGY-EFFICIENCY TESTING CENTRES IN NON-MANUFACTURING COUNTRIES (DECISION 97/88(c))

Executive summary

1. Pursuant to decision 97/88(c), the Secretariat was requested to prepare additional information on the purpose, objective and sustainability of new energy-efficiency testing centres in non-manufacturing countries, with a view to identifying subregions where such centres would be needed to assist Article 5 countries in meeting minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) developed with Multilateral Fund (MLF) support. The present document was prepared on the basis of consultations with technical experts, bilateral and implementing agencies, industry representatives, UNEP's Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP), and stakeholders engaged in MEPS implementation, including inputs from network meetings.

2. A mapping of existing MEPS across Article 5 countries reveals that approximately 84 of the 140 reporting countries have adopted standards for at least one category of refrigeration, air-conditioning and heat pump equipment. While there is a discernible trend towards mandatory MEPS and labelling schemes, implementation and enforcement remain constrained by the absence of harmonized national legislation, limited market surveillance capacity, logistical barriers to cross-border equipment movement, and reliance on product registration in reference countries. In many non-manufacturing countries, MEPS compliance is currently achieved through mutual recognition arrangements and third-party certification from accredited facilities abroad, reflecting the absence of domestic testing infrastructure.

3. The financial parameters for establishing a regional energy-efficiency testing centre indicate capital costs of approximately US $950,000, excluding civil infrastructure, and annual operational costs ranging from US $172,000 to US $218,000. Cost recovery would require a minimum of 58 to 87 models tested per year, depending on the charge rate applied. Three business model options are considered: privately funded centres, fully government-funded centres, and facilities operated in partnership with universities or research institutes. Irrespective of the model selected, government co-financing is regarded as essential for long-term sustainability, while MLF support would be directed towards capital costs. Operational costs are expected

[1] UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/98/1

to be self-sustaining through service charges, market surveillance contracts, technical consultancy and capacity-building activities.

4. Based on a multi-criteria preliminary assessment, eight regions have been identified for further technical and financial feasibility analysis under two distinct tracks. The first track covers five regions lacking domestic refrigeration and air-conditioning manufacturing capacity but possessing established regional MEPS frameworks, namely the Caribbean, Central Africa, Western Africa, Southern Africa, and Pacific Island countries, which are considered primary candidates for the establishment of new regional testing centres. The second track applies to three regions Central Asia, the Gulf Cooperation Council and broader Arab States, and Latin America where existing laboratory infrastructure may be upgraded and formally designated as regionally recognized testing authorities. The Secretariat underscores that leveraging existing facilities should be prioritized over the establishment of new centres, to avoid duplication of infrastructure and build upon established governance and operating frameworks.

5. The Executive Committee is invited to note the information contained in the present document and to consider two recommended actions: requesting UNEP CAP to facilitate consultations with national ozone units and energy-efficiency policymakers during network meetings and the energy-efficiency twinning project; and requesting the Secretariat to prepare an updated report for consideration at the 102nd meeting, drawing on inputs from implementing agencies and regional network consultations, to inform a reassessment of the need for regional testing centres in non-manufacturing countries.

Background

6. At its 97th meeting, the Executive Committee considered the update on the operationalization of testing centres for energy efficiency and acknowledged their potential value in the context of rapid technological development. Members recognized that the proposed approach for establishing regional testing centres was logical and addressed many elements relevant to long-term sustainability. It was noted that projects approved under decisions 94/60 and 95/87 required robust systems for monitoring, verification and reporting of energy-efficiency performance, and that adequate coverage of testing centres could be achieved through targeted Multilateral Fund (MLF) support to upgrade existing national facilities or establish new centres on a case-by-case basis.

7. Members emphasized, however, that additional information would be required before committing resources for the establishment or upgrading of testing centres. In particular, further clarity was sought on the proposed business models, potential synergies with existing testing facilities, the benefits of regional cooperation, and the circumstances under which the MLF would constitute an appropriate financing mechanism for such centres.

8. With regard to regional testing centres, the Committee acknowledged the potential advantages of a regional network and agreed that a staged approach, including preparatory projects, could facilitate their development. At the same time, questions were raised concerning practical implementation aspects, including geographic coverage, financing arrangements and the management of cross-border movement of equipment for testing. Concerns were also expressed regarding the role of regional centres in supporting the enforcement of minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) or equivalent mechanisms, particularly in the absence of harmonized national standards.

9. Members also highlighted the importance of maximizing synergies with existing testing infrastructure. While a number of energy-efficiency testing centres were already in operation, these were not always aligned with Montreal Protocol requirements. Exploring options for alignment and cooperation was seen as a way to achieve cost efficiencies and avoid duplication. Additional clarification was requested on the scale of capital and operating costs, co-financing prospects, the gradual reduction of MLF support, and

the relevance of such centres to the implementation of countries' Kigali HFC implementation plans and energy-efficiency pilot projects.

10. Following the discussions, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare, for the 98th meeting, a document providing additional information on the purpose, objective and sustainability of new energy-efficiency testing centres in non-manufacturing countries, possibly identifying one or more subregions where such centres would be needed to assist Article 5 countries in meeting MEPS developed with MLF support (decision 97/88(c)).

11. This document was prepared based on consultations with technical experts, bilateral and implementing agencies, representatives of AHRI [2] and Eurovent, [3] teams from UNEP's Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP), and stakeholders engaged in MEPS implementation across Article 5 countries. Feedback from two network meetings (i.e., Caribbean countries, Pacific Island countries) held in March 2026 also informed the analysis. Given the limited experience in implementing regional energy-efficiency testing centres for refrigeration, air-conditioning and heat pump (RACHP) equipment to support the enforcement of energy-efficiency standards in non-manufacturing countries, the information presented in this document is based on analytical inputs and experiences provided by various respondents. Inputs were obtained from one testing centre currently at an early stage of operationalization in the African region.

Purpose of regional energy-efficiency testing centres

12. The purpose of establishing a regional testing centre is to provide a shared technical infrastructure for reliable, high-quality accredited testing and certification of RACHP equipment, thereby supporting enforcement of energy-efficiency standards, enabling harmonization of regional markets, and reducing costs for governments and industry. Regional testing centres will also facilitate regional market integration, lower industry compliance barriers, and strengthen data-driven policymaking.

Minimum energy performance standards in Article 5 countries

Mapping of MEPS

13. A mapping of existing MEPS was undertaken using information from the United for Efficiency (U4E) initiative and the UNEP Cool Coalition. Of the 140 Article 5 countries that reported information, about 84 have adopted MEPS for at least one of the four RACHP equipment categories: domestic refrigerators, self-contained commercial refrigeration equipment, residential air conditioners, and commercial air conditioners.[4] Among low-volume-consuming (LVC) countries, around 48 countries have adopted voluntary or mandatory MEPS for domestic refrigerators and/or self-contained commercial refrigeration equipment and/or residential air conditioners. As the status of MEPS development and implementation continues to evolve, information on the availability and enforcement of MEPS should be updated periodically based on research reports and publicly available information. Such updates could show stronger MEPS enforcement trends in Article 5 countries.

[2] The Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute (AHRI) is the trade association representing international manufacturers of heating, water heating, ventilation, air conditioning, commercial refrigeration (HVACR), and water heating equipment.

[3] Eurovent is a European organization representing the heating, ventilation, air conditioning and refrigeration industry; the majority of its members are small- and medium-sized manufacturers.

[4] These four categories of equipment are those which have the high volume of sales and for which MEPS are established in most of the countries.

Implementation and enforcement of MEPS

14. The implementation and enforcement of national MEPS are challenged by the factors outlined below:

(a) Regional standards (e.g., ASEAN,[5] CARICOM,[6] EAC,[7] ECOWAS)[8] are recognized by countries in those regions. However, the process of translating these standards into national legislation remains lengthy, as it requires alignment with national circumstances. This can limit the recognition of regional energy-efficiency testing centres by the countries and is expected to have implications on the viability of operation of such centres. For example, the member countries of ASEAN have agreed to adopt ISO 5151:2010 as the unified standard for testing the energy performance of room air conditioners and are transitioning to ISO 16358 (which measures Cooling Seasonal Performance Factor (CSPF)) to better reflect seasonal energy efficiency. The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) region (comprising Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates) has a largely harmonized framework for the testing and labelling of refrigeration and air-conditioning (RAC) appliances, facilitated by the GCC Standardization Organization (GSO). While harmonized GSO standards exist, member states often implement them through their own national regulatory bodies (e.g., SASO[9] in Saudi Arabia, MoIAT[10]/ESMA[11] in the United Arab Emirates), sometimes with additional local requirements.

(b) Based on information on the availability of MEPS across countries, it can be noted that several countries have adopted MEPS, either on a voluntary or mandatory basis, taking national circumstances into account. There is also an increasing trend toward the adoption of mandatory MEPS/labelling standards, as this would result in stronger enforcement of upgraded standards and framework to improve consumer product quality awareness. The level of MEPS, as well as the processes for their updating and upgrading, vary depending on national circumstances. This poses a challenge in making the choice of testing centres at a regional level that suits the needs of the specific region.

(c) Several LVC and very-LVC countries rely on energy-labelling schemes rather than MEPS. While this helps improve consumer awareness of energy-efficient products, it does not necessarily ensure higher energy-efficiency performance of those products. It must, however, be noted that labelling programmes are easily understood by consumers and play a key role in accelerating the purchase and use of energy-efficient products. While this results in non-availability of MEPS as a regulatory instrument, the markets continue to adopt energy-efficient equipment due to the labelling schemes.

(d) Some countries accept certification from a neighbouring "reference country" with established MEPS and accredited facilities. However, product listings or registries in those reference countries could create entry barriers of additional players whose products are not registered in those reference countries.

(e) Lack of market surveillance programmes on energy efficiency to support MEPS implementation is also an issue that could potentially result in non-conformant products

[5] ASEAN: Association of Southeast Asian Nations
[6] CARICOM: Caribbean Community
[7] EAC: East African Community
[8] ECOWAS: Economic Community of West African States
[9] Saudi Standards, Metrology and Quality Organization.
[10] Ministry of Industry and Advanced Technology.
[11] Emirates Authority for Standardization and Metrology.

being placed in the market; use of a regional testing centre with strong governance model,[12] including market surveillance can result in controlling such non-conformant products through appropriately designed surveillance programmes.

(f) High logistical and shipping costs, as well as challenges affecting the smooth movement of equipment among countries for testing, remain key barriers to sending models for regional testing and certification.

Energy-efficiency testing in the absence of national energy-efficiency testing centres

15. In the absence of national testing capacity, countries without manufacturing facilities rely on accredited overseas energy-efficiency testing centres' test reports, third-party certification schemes (e.g., Intertek)[13], regional product registries (e.g., allowing imports of tested and certified products in larger countries within the region), and import-stage document reviews supported by risk-based post-market sampling. While detailed information remains unavailable, feedback received from one region indicated energy-efficiency testing facilities may exist in certain countries that do not have RAC manufacturing facilities. With appropriate upgrades to testing capacity and infrastructure and the establishment of robust governance processes, such facilities could be established as regional testing facilities, provided that countries within the region recognize and use these facilities.

16. Confirmatory testing[14] is generally conducted in accredited foreign testing centres, although this is limited in practice in LVC and non-LVC countries. It must also be noted that market surveillance and monitoring programmes on the status of energy performance levels of products placed in the markets remain limited.[15] Some regional groups may have common conformity programmes (e.g., Gulf Conformity Mark for the GCC member states), which provide product performance conformity assurance for countries that have adopted the conformity mark.

Considerations for establishing regional energy-efficiency testing centres

Cost analysis and business model

Business volume

17. The establishment and operation of a testing centre can be viable only through a business model that generate a revenue. The generation of revenue depends heavily on the volume of equipment that will require testing. The business model can include either full cost recovery of the investment made or at least recovery of the operation costs of the centre. The business model for ensuring viable and sustainable operations of a testing centre will vary depending upon the financial structure of the centre, including the level of co-financing. For example, if the recurring operating costs are financed through non-MLF grant sources (e.g., through the governments, philanthropic funding), the business volumes required for viability would appropriately reduce.

[12] This would *inter alia* cover the legal framework, oversight process including independence and impartiality, cooperation and coordination between multiple states, and technical standards related to testing, recognition and performance.

[13] A multinational assurance, inspection, product testing and certification company; they offer product testing and certification services for RACHP equipment.

[14] Confirmatory testing is the process of verifying a manufacturer's claimed energy performance by subjecting a production-sample unit to independent evaluation at an ISO/IEC 17025 accredited laboratory; this is primarily aimed at ensuring that the appliances' energy performance declared is accurate.

[15] Information on declared product performance can differ from actual performance at the end user due to a user-level installation, equipment usage and maintenance practices.

Capital and operational costs

18. Based on the data collected on the capital and operational costs for establishing an energy-efficiency testing centre,[16] the capital costs for establishing the centre are estimated at US $950,000.[17] Estimated operational costs vary by geographic location, primarily due to significant variations in personnel costs. Assuming that the centre dedicates the equivalent of two staff members in each category (testing engineers, technicians, and administrative support), the total annual operational costs would range between US $172,000 and US $218,000. These figures include personnel costs ranging from US $92,000 to US $138,000, audit costs of US $15,000, and operations and maintenance costs of US $65,000.[18]

Viable business model

19. Three options may be considered, namely: privately funded energy-efficiency testing centres, fully government-funded centres, and centres operated with support from universities or research institutes. The co-financing could include committed funding for capital costs and/or operational costs for the respective centres. For the latter two options, financial commitment from local government(s) would also strengthen sustainability of the testing centres.

20. To ensure the recovery of operational costs of approximately US $172,000 per year, assuming testing of models with a validity period of two years and an average testing charge rate of US $3,000 per model,[19] a minimum of 58 models would need to be tested annually. Should operating costs be higher, a greater number of models would need to be tested to achieve viable operations. This analysis does not take into consideration logistics costs in the event of inter-country movement of equipment, nor other factors that may increase testing and certification costs (e.g., delays in the transport of goods for testing).[20]

21. In this example, only testing of models is being considered. However, as outlined in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/97/86, other activities such as market surveillance of equipment and consultancy services for improving product design and performance, as well as other such services in related areas can yield revenues to the testing centre and strengthen its business viability.

22. In terms of level of support from MLF for regional energy-efficiency testing centres, the Executive Committee could, provided a viable and sustainable business case is demonstrated, consider funding the capital costs associated with equipment and the establishment of such centres, up to a maximum of US $950,000. This amount depends on the categories of equipment to be tested and certified, as well as the levels of co-financing available from other sources (e.g., government co-financing). The regular operations of the centre should be funded through charges for the services provided by the centre and other funding sources, as explained above. This approach would facilitate the sustainable operations of the centre. MLF projects under the CAP and other energy-efficiency initiatives may support such awareness-raising and outreach activities in the relevant regions.

[16] This excludes civil infrastructure (e.g., land, building) for housing the testing centre.
[17] Table 1 of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/97/86. Future upgrades of the testing centres for strengthening their testing facilities would be based on market conditions, and funding for such upgrades is not included in these estimates.
[18] This includes best estimates of cost of utilities, consumables and maintenance related costs.
[19] This value is based on consultations with experts and data collected during the preparation of this paper; testing costs may vary depending on the type and capacity of the equipment, as well as the location of the centre. The average cost is estimated at US $2,000 per model, and the break-even point corresponds to approximately 87 models tested per year.
[20] This would vary depending on the choice of location and may need to be covered by the business unit selling the products.

Factors affecting operation and sustainability

23. The following aspects should be considered to ensure the cost-effective operation of a regional energy-efficiency testing centre:

(a) **Robust implementation of MEPS regulations and certification/surveillance processes** in the countries within the region recognizing the regional testing centre; this should include enforcement of regulations aimed at independently monitoring implementation of energy efficiency standards, as well as labelling programmes, including market surveillance programmes for monitoring compliance with energy efficiency standards.

(b) **Recognition of the regional testing centre by the identified countries** within the region; this is critical to ensure its operational viability and effective service provision. Arguably, an existing centre located in a manufacturing country may already have capabilities and an established governance model for energy-efficiency testing and certification and could represent a readily accessible option for the development of such regional facilities.

(c) **Identification of a testing centre location acceptable** to the countries, taking into account factors such as equipment supply routes, accessibility by the relevant local industry stakeholders, the cost and ease of transporting goods, and the testing costs charged by the centre. The location identification should also include an assessment of the possibility of utilizing testing centres (established or being established).

(d) **Establishment of a strong business model with appropriate cost recovery and support funding with non-MLF sources** for operations, maintenance and periodic upgrades of the testing centre. The revenue streams could include those identified in paragraph 6(f) and (g) of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/97/86. The business model may need to be redesigned depending upon the structure of the regional testing centre.

24. The following aspects must be addressed in the final implementation plan for strengthening sustainable operations of the regional energy-efficiency testing centres:

(a) **Diversified revenue streams**: Beyond standardized model testing, the centre should pursue high-value services, such as market surveillance contracts, technical consultancy, and capacity-building programmes.

(b) **Technological capability and agility**: A formalized commitment to ensure that technical personnel are available to undertake testing of equipment as per applicable standards and periodically update testing protocols. These protocols are required to keep pace with rapid advancements in RACHP technology and low-global-warming-potential refrigerant transitions.

(c) **Regional commitment and recognition**: Establishing a formal Mutual Recognition Agreement (MRA) among participating countries is the single most critical factor for ensuring the centre is utilized to its full capacity.

(d) **Government co-financing**: Committed funding for initial capital or transitional operating costs is essential to signal institutional ownership and ensure long-term stability.

Identification of potential regions or sub-regions

25. A preliminary assessment to identify regions where support for the establishment or upgrade of a regional energy-efficiency testing centre has been conducted based on a multi-criteria framework. The

criteria considered include the existence and maturity of regional MEPS; the degree to which these standards have been enacted and are actively enforced at the national level; the availability of credible and accessible testing infrastructures; and the growth trajectory of demand for RAC appliances, which directly determines the business volume required to sustain a testing centre. Regions meeting most of these conditions have been identified as priorities for further technical and financial feasibility analysis.

26. Two distinct tracks have been identified to guide the nature of support to be provided. The first track covers regions that lack domestic RAC manufacturing capacity but have established regional MEPS frameworks. These regions — comprising Caribbean countries, Central African countries, Western African countries, Southern African countries, and Pacific Island countries — are considered primary candidates for the establishment of new regional testing centres. The second track applies to regions where a mix of manufacturing and non-manufacturing countries coexist alongside existing laboratory infrastructure. In these cases — namely Central Asia, the GCC and broader Arab States, and Latin America — the recommended approach is to support the upgrade of existing facilities and formalize their mandate as regionally recognized testing authorities, rather than establishing new centres from the ground up.

27. Any proposal seeking support for the establishment or upgrade of a regional energy-efficiency testing centre must satisfy a defined set of requirements to demonstrate both political commitment and financial sustainability. Specifically, proposals must provide evidence of formal commitment by regional or sub-regional governments to recognize the centre as the preferred or mandatory testing authority and to anchor this designation in applicable regulation. They must also include a clear account of the current state of MEPS enforcement and national or regional market surveillance programmes. Additionally, proposals are required to present a credible business model for the centre's operation, including a comparative cost analysis that weighs the full cost of regional testing — incorporating logistics — against the cost of procuring third-party test certificates from facilities outside the region.

Collecting information through UNEP's CAP energy-efficiency twinning projects

28. At the 96th meeting, the Executive Committee approved funding in the amount of US $793,200, plus agency support costs, for UNEP, for a global technical assistance project for the twinning of national ozone officers and energy-efficiency policymakers (decision 96/28).[21] Under this project, UNEP would have joint consultations in the different regions with the respective national ozone unit (NOU) and energy-efficiency authorities on maintaining and/or enhancing energy efficiency while phasing down HFCs. This undertaking *inter alia* could provide a platform for collecting additional information on the needs and viability of the regional testing centres in the different regions. The Executive Committee may wish to request the Secretariat, in consultation with UNEP CAP, to provide an update based on the regional/sub-regional energy-efficiency testing centres for specific categories of RACHP equipment. This update would in turn help identify one or more subregions where such centres would be needed to assist Article 5 countries in implementing energy-efficiency performance standards.

Observations by the Secretariat

29. During consultations with various respondents on regional energy-efficiency testing centres, it was emphasized that establishing new regional centres requires meeting several enabling conditions, including agreed-upon regional testing standards; mutual recognition of testing centres' accreditation; viable and cost-efficient logistics; and sufficient business volume, particularly through integration of services with market-surveillance services. Leveraging existing facilities in the region is considered a faster and cost-effective approach and should be prioritized before investing in new facilities. This would avoid

[21] Information related to the project is contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/21.

duplication of infrastructure, reduce investment risk by building on already established business models, and utilize existing governance and operating structures.

30. A global mapping of RACHP equipment manufacturing indicates that manufacturing is present in multiple regions, although facilities are concentrated in a limited number of countries. There is very limited manufacturing capacity of RACHP equipment in LVC countries, which are generally import-dependent. MEPS, whether voluntary or mandatory, are available for various categories of equipment in most countries; labelling systems are more prevalent and provide a strong platform for the adoption of energy-efficient RACHP equipment. Over time, increased experience in implementing MEPS would result in a stronger enforcement framework and a greater need for energy-efficiency testing and certification.

31. In many import-dependent countries, MEPS or equivalent mechanisms are currently implemented through recognition of product registration in neighbouring countries with established testing infrastructure, mutual recognition agreements, and need-based sample testing conducted at regional testing centres. Thus, MEPS are enforced in certain non-manufacturing countries even in the absence of a national energy-efficiency testing centre. The viability and sustainability of regional energy-efficiency testing centres therefore require evaluation on a case-by-case basis.

32. There are instances of energy-efficiency testing centres located in non-manufacturing countries that could fulfill both national and regional testing requirements. If these centres are found to be viable and sustainable at a regional level, they could be considered for additional support to upgrade their testing facilities and expand their capacity to serve regional needs.

33. The capital costs required for establishing a regional energy-efficiency testing centre are estimated at US $950,000, excluding civil infrastructure. Annual operational costs are estimated at US $172,000 to US $218,000 and cost recovery requires a minimum of 58 to 87 models tested per year, depending on the average charge rate applied. For different types of business models that are not fully privately owned centres, co-financing from governments is considered essential to ensure sustainability, and MLF support could be considered for capital costs, while ongoing operations should be self-sustaining through service charges and other revenue streams.

34. Based on the preliminary assessment, eight regions have been identified as warranting more detailed technical and financial feasibility analysis, split across two tracks. The first track — focused on establishing new regional testing centres — covers the Caribbean, Central Africa, Western Africa, Southern Africa, and Pacific Island countries, all of which lack domestic RAC manufacturing capacity but have established regional MEPS frameworks in place. The second track — focused on upgrading existing laboratory infrastructure and formalizing regional mandates — covers Central Asia, the GCC and broader Arab States, and Latin America, where a mix of manufacturing and non-manufacturing countries coexist alongside existing facilities.

35. For the five regions without domestic manufacturing facilities, further analysis will be required to assess the strength of government commitment to recognizing a designated testing authority, the current status of MEPS enforcement and market surveillance, and the financial viability of regional testing relative to the cost of procuring third-party certification from outside the region. For the other three regions identified under the second track, regional energy-efficiency facilities may become operational as a result of market factors and industry needs; where needed, funding in these regions could be made available in line with decision 97/88(b).[22]

[22] The Executive Committee decided *inter alia* to consider providing funding to strengthen or upgrade existing energy-efficiency testing centres in manufacturing countries, in the context of proposals made or submitted under decision 94/60, taking into account the information provided in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/97/86.

36. UNEP CAP can play an important role in holding consultations with NOUs and other relevant stakeholders during network meetings on the need for regional testing centres. The existing projects approved under UNEP CAP and the twinning project can be leveraged as platforms for such consultations. Inputs received from these meetings, combined with future assessments, could inform a reassessment of the need for regional testing centres in non-manufacturing countries, to be undertaken in 2028.

Recommendation

37. The Executive Committee may wish to consider:

(a) Noting the additional information on new energy-efficiency testing centres in non-manufacturing countries (decision 97/88(c)) provided in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/98/59;

(b) Requesting the Secretariat and UNEP Compliance Assistance Programme, through the networks of national ozone units and the energy-efficiency twining project including with interested bilateral and implementing agencies, and taking into account the additional information contained in the document referred to in subparagraph (a) above, to complete consultations in the remaining regions and to collect any additional information from the two regions where consultations had taken place, on the need for regional testing centres to assist Article 5 countries in meeting minimum energy performance standards developed with Multilateral Fund support;

(c) Also requesting the Secretariat to prepare, for the 102nd meeting, an updated report including a reassessment, on the need for regional energy-efficiency testing centres, taking into account the findings from the consultations referred to in subparagraph (b) above.