

MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

Inter-agency Coordination Meeting
Montreal, 9 – 10 September 2026

MLF/IACM.2026/2/2

25 September 2026

REPORT OF THE INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION MEETING

FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS AFTER THE IACM

Institution	Action	Timeline
Secretariat	To send comments on progress and financial reports as soon as the review is completed	As soon as possible
Secretariat	To send comments on business plan tables as soon as the review is completed	As soon as possible
Agencies	To submit reports of projects with specific reporting requirements	28 September 2026
Agencies	To submit reports on projects for the preparation of national inventories of banks of waste-controlled substances and action plans	Early October 2026
Agencies	To submit the complete business plans including narratives and revised tables	12 October 2026
Agencies	To submit reports on projects with implementation delays and additional project status reports	12 October 2026
Agencies	To submit project completion reports due	12 October 2026

AGENDA ITEM 1: WELCOME BY THE CHIEF OFFICER

1. Ms. Tina Birmpili, Chief Officer, welcomed representatives of the bilateral and implementing agencies¹ to Montreal and referred to the Multilateral Fund replenishment discussions to take place this year at the Meeting of the Parties. She encouraged agencies to move away from isolated, single-purpose activities toward integrated project packages combining phase-down of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) and energy efficiency. She noted that stage I Kigali HFC implementation programmes (KIPs) in a number of low-volume-consuming (LVC) countries had not consistently reflected this strategic approach, and asked agencies to identify a few strong examples of what a genuinely strategic project looks like in practice.

2. The Chief Officer stressed the importance of coordination between agencies working in the same country, well ahead of submission deadlines, so that their interventions form a coherent country approach. On cooling, it called for better alignment with wider initiatives, including those within UNEP, while preserving the Montreal Protocol's compliance-based mandate. On the business plan, the Chief Officer reported that only around 60 per cent of the plan for the 99th meeting was expected to be submitted, while some unplanned projects had been received. She noted that this strained small teams and complicated the reported implementation rate, and reminded agencies that the plan, though indicative, remains the basis for anticipating workload and resources. The Chief Officer closed by encouraging the agencies' full

¹ The list of participants is attached as annex I to the present report.

engagement in projects under the decision 94/60 funding window, alongside existing initiatives. UNDP welcomed this framing and agreed on the plan's importance for country-level programming.

AGENDA ITEM 2: ORGANIZATION OF WORK

3. The Chief Officer introduced the agenda and described the organization of work for the two days of the meeting. Bilateral meetings would be held in the margins of the meeting and after the plenary concluded. Discussion sessions on project review and the servicing sector would take place in the morning of the second day of the meeting, and it would be open for online participation for agency colleagues in the regions.

4. The meeting followed the agenda presented in document MLF/IACM.2026/2/1.

AGENDA ITEM 3: COUNTRY PROGRAMME DATA

5. The Secretariat reported that 131 country programme (CP) submissions for 2025 had been received, a 91 per cent submission rate compared with 81 per cent at the same point the previous year. Outstanding submissions remain for twelve countries, and the Secretariat reminded agencies that, under decision 52/5(f), projects cannot be considered for countries with outstanding data.

6. UNEP credited the improved rate in part to the online CP module as well as webinars jointly run with the Secretariat for African and Latin American countries and suggested this model of joint outreach could usefully be extended to other reporting areas. Agencies indicated that most countries with outstanding data are facing political and institutional constraints, which affect access to data and that they would continue working with these countries. On a small group of countries that had submitted 2025 data using Excel tables sent by email rather than through the online portal, agencies indicated that these countries have experienced difficulties in accessing the portal; the Secretariat requested agencies to report credential problems promptly so that log-in accounts can be reset or reassigned. The Secretariat also confirmed that while Excel submissions may be accepted in exceptional circumstances, online submission is expected.

7. UNDP highlighted the Fund's data reporting system as a pillar of the Montreal Protocol's success, noting that compliance with reporting requirements across countries, and the resulting consistency between production and consumption data, was a significant achievement that could be more actively communicated. On a question raised by the Secretariat on data collection and data quality, agencies described how countries typically collect data, generally through licensing systems, customs records, associations, or dealer networks, with agencies providing support where capacity is limited, and confirmed that before submitting a project, agencies routinely reconcile country programme data with survey data, Article 7 data, and, where available, verification reports. Agencies were asked to disclose any known discrepancies to the Secretariat as they are identified, rather than leaving them unresolved until a project reaches the review stage.

AGENDA ITEM 4: EVALUATION: 2026–2027 WORK PROGRAMMES

8. The Senior Evaluation Officer (SEO), who took up the role in May 2026, presented the proposed evaluation work programme for 2027 and invited agency input on both the programme's priorities and the ongoing recovery, recycling, and reclamation (RRR) evaluation. The 2027 programme carries forward work on the second stage of the evaluation for UNEP's Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP), the second stage of the evaluation for RRR, the evaluation of the HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMP) policies, and HPMP training and certification, along with follow-up to decision 96/4 on the new evaluation policy, leaving room for a maximum of one new evaluation topic. Six possible topics were presented under four broad clusters covering the thematic priorities: technology transition and sustainability including sustainability of conversions in non-LVC countries and sustainability of the servicing sector in LVC countries; beneficiaries and stakeholders including support to small and medium-sized enterprises (SME)

and sectoral transformation, and end-user interventions in high-cooling-demand sectors such as fisheries and tourism; funding modalities including the impact of energy efficiency projects under decisions 91/65 and 89/6; and national capacities and institutional arrangements for implementation of HPMPs, KIPs, and energy-efficiency activities concurrently.

9. Agencies generally identified the evaluation of the energy-efficiency pilot projects as the most relevant of the six priorities, while cautioning that the evaluation would need to be timed carefully, since the number of completed projects under decision 91/65 to date may not yet support robust conclusions. Institutional arrangements were seen as a timely subject given the multiplying number of concurrent country-level mechanisms, though agencies were candid that the diversity of government structures across countries could make it difficult to extract clear, actionable recommendations for the Executive Committee, and suggested that combining a desk study with visits to a small number of pilot countries might yield richer, context-specific, evidence. The topic of barriers to the uptake of low-global-warming-potential (GWP) alternatives in LVC and non-manufacturing countries was also considered important, with agencies linking slow uptake partly to the adequacy of available funding and partly to market factors, including supplier caution around specific technologies. One agency also indicated it is timely to evaluate the lessons learned for stage I of the KIPs and use the findings to feed the design of stage II. The SEO indicated he would narrow the six proposals to two or three for the Executive Committee's consideration, incorporating the feedback received, together with realistic data availability, and confirmed it would separately seek agency comments on the proposed terms of reference for the CAP stage II evaluation.

10. On the RRR evaluation, the SEO reported that the study was approved in 2025, that an expert engaged in 2026 has since shared a sample package and circulated questionnaires, and that country information has been received from all but three countries with reminders already sent. The SEO explained the timeline that is set out to finalise data collection and prepare the document for submission to the Executive Committee, with the draft to be shared with agencies which, in turn, with countries for verification before finalisation. For the second phase, agencies recommended examining how RRR operations are financed, the business model supporting the RRR systems, what makes them functional in practice, and their policy linkages with e-waste and extended producer responsibility systems; the SEO agreed to weigh these suggestions alongside site visits and existing case studies from both Article 5 and Article 2 countries. The Secretariat also flagged that this study could also be useful for the preparation of the forthcoming document for the 100th meeting on life-cycle refrigerant management (LRM).

AGENDA ITEM 5: MATTERS ON PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

(a) Financial progress reports as at 31 December 2025

11. The Secretariat thanked agencies for completing the financial progress-reporting through the new module of the knowledge management system (KMS) and reported that the reports, as well as the feedback received on the module, are being reviewed. It noted that the system now derives information directly from master data and standardises reporting dates, which has reduced the kinds of errors that characterised the previous, more manual process. **(ACTION: Secretariat to send comments on progress and financial reports as soon as the review is completed.)**

12. On progress report narratives, agencies sought clarification on whether these need to be revised when underlying data changes following Secretariat comments. The Secretariat confirmed that agencies may revise and resubmit the narratives, and that future reviews will address both the narrative and the data, since narrative content adds context that the data alone do not capture.

13. On reporting under the gender-policy field, the Secretariat clarified that the field should be marked “yes” or “no” wherever the underlying decision framework applies, with a blank field intended to represent non-applicability, whether because a project predates the policy’s entry into effect or because the activity in question falls outside its scope. The Secretariat indicated it may consider introducing an explicit “not-

applicable” option, and reiterated that, where the policy does apply, agencies should reflect how the relevant considerations were incorporated, for example through equal-opportunity or recruitment-related measures.

14. The Secretariat also reminded agencies to record the actual phase-out achieved once a project with approved phase-out quantities is completed, noting that entering zero or leaving the field blank can distort performance indicators. Agencies may also include partial phase-out. On extension requests, agencies may adjust a project's planned completion date to reflect a more realistic schedule, but the Secretariat underlined that a formally approved extension is required before the officially approved completion date changes. The Secretariat flagged that it would monitor extension requests closely in the period ahead, with particular attention to projects under decision 91/66, and will consult agencies before making recommendations on any of these cases.

(b) Projects with specific reporting requirements

15. The Secretariat reminded agencies that reports on projects subject to specific reporting requirements, the list for which circulated at the end of July, are due by 28 September 2026. On energy efficiency-related projects, agencies provided updates on the status of those whose completion dates have passed or are approaching. The Secretariat referred to the template developed for comprehensive reporting on these projects, covering financial progress, activities undertaken, implementation challenges, results achieved, and lessons learned, rather than summary updates, and agencies that had used the template reported no concerns. The Secretariat reiterated the importance of the projects results, particularly those under decisions 91/65 and 89/6, and asked agencies to ensure that measurable energy savings, technology performance, implementation barriers, and conditions for replication are all clearly documented rather than left implicit in narrative accounts. **(ACTION: Agencies to submit reports on projects with specific reporting requirements by 28 September.)**

(c) End-user incentive schemes and demonstration projects

16. The Secretariat outlined the background to the Fund's approach to end-user activities. Decision 92/36 distinguished between technology demonstrations and leakage-reduction activities, which may be supported as technical assistance under specified conditions, and incentive schemes, which remain subject to additional conditions. Since then, more than 50 end-user demonstration activities have been approved through HPMPs, KIPs, and energy-efficiency pilot projects, spanning chiller and air-conditioning replacement, supermarket and industrial refrigeration demonstrations, ammonia systems, and R-290 air-conditioner incentive schemes.

17. To support consistency in how results from this portfolio are captured, the Secretariat described a new tracking system built around a short questionnaire that will collect both narrative and quantitative information including baseline and replacement technologies, HCFC or HFC phased out, energy saved, results achieved, conditions needed for sustainability, replicability potential and barriers to scaling, challenges encountered, and lessons learned. Responses will feed into a central spreadsheet that can be updated after initial submission.

18. Agencies discussed the practical difference between a demonstration, which tests and documents technology at a limited number of sites, and an incentive programme, which requires an established delivery mechanism, a suitable national or subnational partner, defined technical criteria, financing, and institutional capacity to administer at scale. Agencies noted that environment ministries and national ozone units (NOUs) are typically not positioned to run incentive programmes themselves, since this role more often falls to finance ministries or private-sector partners, and that building this kind of institutional capacity requires upfront investment distinct from the Fund's compliance-based mechanisms. On analytical approach, agencies recommended comparing replacement technologies against the actual baseline equipment being displaced, rather than comparing candidate technologies against one another in isolation,

and considering payback periods, efficiency gains, cost, market conditions, refrigerant choice, and replication potential while remaining neutral among specific technology options.

19. On how pilots can lead to sustained uptake, agencies pointed to a range of possible pathways, including establishing incentives programmes, co-financing, green procurement, and partnerships with institutions capable of administering larger programmes, and suggested that relevant lessons might be drawn from experience with energy-efficient programmes, while acknowledging that comparable experience specific to the cooling sector remains more limited. The Secretariat encouraged agencies to document projects from the point of design onward rather than only at completion, capturing beneficiary selection, technology choices, co-financing arrangements, expected impact in HCFC/HFC phase out and energy savings, and implementation processes as they occur, on the view that this kind of early documentation makes it easier to understand why some interventions prove sustainable and replicable while others do not.

20. Agencies were also reminded that, pursuant to decision 92/36(f), the Secretariat is to present an updated report on end-user incentive schemes to the 102nd meeting, which will serve as one of the sources informing options for financial modalities and institutional arrangements for supporting end users, aimed at assisting market transformation and sustained HFC phase-down under future KIP stages requested of the Secretariat under decision 98/61(c) for consideration at the same meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 6: BUSINESS PLANNING

(a) Status of implementation of the 2026-2028 business plan

21. The Secretariat presented the status of implementation of the 2026-2028 business plan. On levels of certainty for the submission of remaining projects from their potential list of submission for the 98th meeting, agencies reconfirmed the majority of the listed projects, with isolated cases flagged as uncertain or requiring further internal confirmation. One agency raised a concern about how forthcoming HFC consumption trends should be interpreted for strategic planning, noting that for a number of LVC countries, high historical baselines make it difficult to assess whether future dips in reported consumption reflect actual phase-down progress. The Secretariat clarified that this analysis was intended to inform its internal strategic understanding of consumption trends rather than to affect individual project review.

22. The Secretariat raised the question of whether agencies, in preparing the stage I KIP submissions for the 99th and future meetings, were discussing with countries the possibility of longer-term targets, given the limited implementation period until 2029 following approval. Agencies noted that countries generally preferred to remain within the established stage I parameters, because of uncertainty over future cost guidelines, limited funding availability, and reluctance to commit to targets whose financial implications could not yet be assessed. The Secretariat recalled that decision 92/44 allows for case-by-case consideration of projects that reduce HFC consumption ahead of Montreal Protocol targets, and that this provision remained underutilized. Agencies observed that while a small number of countries had submitted projects with targets beyond 2029, most countries continued to opt for conservative, shorter-term approaches, reflecting institutional caution, a lack of clarity on the funding consequences of more ambitious targets and risks of non-approvals at Executive Committee meetings.

23. Agencies further highlighted the importance of finalizing cost guidelines for stage II, noting that delays in this regard could constrain the ability of countries to design more strategic, longer-term plans and could increase compliance risks. Concern was also expressed that declining or fluctuating HFC consumption trends in some LVC countries, if not properly understood, could be misinterpreted as indicating reduced funding need, when in fact the underlying drivers of these trends required further analysis. The Secretariat noted that it was undertaking internal analysis of consumption data to better understand these trends and their implications for future programming.

24. Upon a request for clarification, the Secretariat reiterated that any new preparatory funding requests for energy-efficiency pilot projects under decision 91/65 would need to allow realistic time for project submissions to the 100th meeting, the final meeting under that funding window.

(b) 2027-2029 consolidated business plan of the Multilateral Fund

25. The Secretariat reminded agencies of the timeline for the 2027–2029 consolidated business plan. Agencies were introduced to the revised Excel template, which is aligned with the KMS's master data conventions and includes drop-down fields for predefined sectors, subsectors, and clusters. The Secretariat asked agencies to use these drop-down lists so that information can be incorporated consistently. New subsectors not yet on the list can still be entered manually, fields may be left blank if information is unavailable, and the project title field is mandatory to allow future matching against actual submissions.

26. Agencies raised a practical question on how to record, within the template that generally allows one primary sector entry per line, a project that combines more than one sector, within the same enterprise. The Secretariat clarified that agencies should select the more prominent sector as the primary entry and capture the remaining scope through the subsector field or the project title, and that entries should only be split into separate lines where the underlying components are distinct projects.

27. On whether preparatory funding for stage II of KIPs should be included in the business plans, one agency indicated its intention to reinstate the entries which had been removed from the previous business plan and to raise the matter as a policy issue in its narrative, pending the Secretariat's forthcoming proposal on stage II preparatory activities. Other agencies raised concerns about the administrative burden of repeatedly adding and removing such entries and suggested the Secretariat give guidance whether these entries should be included at all in the business plans pending an Executive Committee decision, given the sensitivity of engaging governments on an unsettled matter.

28. On energy efficiency, agencies sought guidance on how to reflect potential additional projects under decision 91/65 in their business plans, given the limited remaining balance in that funding window and its scheduled closure at the 100th meeting. The Secretariat confirmed that projects not included in the business plan but submitted may be considered, that values for 2027 may be included since the 100th meeting falls within that year, but that any value entered for 2028 would need to be removed. The Secretariat added that it will not adjust the values agencies submit but will draw the Executive Committee's attention if the aggregate submission value exceeds the remaining balance. **(ACTION: Secretariat to send comments on business plan tables as soon as the review is completed and agencies to submit the complete business plans including narratives and revised tables by 12 October 2026.)**

AGENDA ITEM 7: ISSUES RELATING TO PROJECT SUBMISSION/REVIEW

(a) Funding withheld pending fulfilment of certain conditions

29. The Secretariat reviewed the list of countries for which the Executive Committee had approved funding at previous meetings but instructed the Treasurer to withhold disbursement pending fulfilment of specified conditions, including HPMP stage II tranches for Benin, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nigeria and Qatar, KIP stage I tranches for Albania and Mexico (foam), and HPMP stage III tranches for the Dominican Republic and Panama,² and invited agencies to provide updates on each.

30. The Secretariat informed that for most of the above listed cases, conditions have now been met and verification reports have been received and cleared, and that the Secretariat has requested the Treasurer to release the corresponding funds. Two cases remained outstanding: for Mexico, UNDP informed that the

² Excluding those countries which have met the conditions after the 98th meeting and do not require to provide an update at the IACM.

conditions have been fulfilled and the corresponding report is expected around October 2026, in time to report to the Executive Committee; for Qatar, UNEP indicated that it requires further follow-up with specific questions before the status can be confirmed.

(b) General observations on projects (also with online participation)

31. The Chief Officer thanked the many colleagues joining from different time zones. The Secretariat presented an overview of project submissions expected for the 99th meeting, reporting that some 60 per cent of planned projects had been or were expected to be received, lower than the 75 to 80 per cent typically seen, with the shortfall concentrated in new HPMP final stages, KIPs and energy-efficiency pilot projects under decision 91/65. Agencies attributed the gap in projects under decision 91/65 to factors including limited remaining scope for new activities in countries that had already used related HPMP energy-efficiency funding (decision 89/6) for enabling-environment activities, difficulty securing end-user cofinancing for higher-cost technologies, overlapping agency offers to the same country, and limited buy-in from energy-sector ministries, as well as, in some cases, rising equipment costs requiring adjustments to project scope. Delays on the KIP side included one country awaiting a decision on a change of implementing agency, and another being delayed by political transition or a natural disaster.

32. On general project design, the Secretariat asked that proposals be presented holistically and supported a common strategy: with KIPs and HPMPs explaining their relationship and that to any separately approved projects, such as those under decision 91/65, and linking proposed activities to a country's sector-specific HFC consumption. Wherever possible, KIPs should include bans on manufacturing and/or import of HFC-based equipment where low-GWP alternatives exist, or at minimum an interim import permit restriction. Licensing and quota systems should be revisited and strengthened for HFCs, and project submissions should always include the current and next year import quotas. Agencies noted that analyzing consumption trends to support target design has become more feasible, given the additional years of data now available, but cautioned that interpretation remains complex: a decline in CO₂-equivalent consumption can mask underlying growth in metric tonnes where a shift to lower-GWP refrigerants is already under way, and in LVC countries, import patterns can be distorted by currency constraints, stockpiling, or shipment timing, making single-year figures potentially misleading. Agencies also underlined the importance of government guidance in identifying which subsectors are ready for early regulatory measures, noting the flammability, toxicity, or high-pressure considerations of newer alternative technologies.

33. On documentation, the Secretariat reiterated the need to include in all submissions complete supporting materials, including endorsement letters and verification reports, as late submissions of these documents have previously caused difficulty, while acknowledging some flexibility where a project is otherwise fully cleared and requiring only a few days more for signature. Specifically, regarding second tranches of KIPs, the Secretariat reminded agencies that there are 28 countries that were requested to submit an analysis of their HFC consumption trends during baseline years (i.e., the so called “Cambodia text” included by the Executive Committee in their KIPs approval decision). Agencies sought clarification on the specific elements expected in these analyses. The Secretariat noted that the appropriate approach varies by country circumstance, citing examples involving cross-checking of import and export data, interviews with importers and distributors, and identification of currency-driven or stockpiling-related import cycles, and offered to compile a list of the 28 countries concerned to facilitate tracking. One agency suggested that Secretariat guidance on these issues, and more broadly on the rationale behind reduction targets, be communicated more systematically to NOUs, including through regional network meetings, noting that guidance not reflected in a formal decision can be difficult to convey to governments.

34. The Secretariat noted it is continuing to simplify submission guides and formats to align with online submission and encouraged agencies to consult them ahead of formal submission. Agencies were also encouraged to flag promptly when they need more time to respond to the Secretariat's comments on projects, and were reminded that partial responses, with remaining items followed up separately, are an acceptable way to keep the process moving. One agency suggested that, with the KMS now in place, some

standard clarifying questions could be incorporated directly into the submission checklist, so that routine information needs are addressed at the point of submission and the overall volume of review questions is reduced. The Secretariat welcomed the suggestion and agreed to examine which recurring questions could be standardized in this way.

35. On defining outputs, the Secretariat asked that activities be quantified wherever possible, to support clearer budgeting and review, and these outputs should include anticipated female participation.

36. The Secretariat also reminded the agencies that they are expected to complete the necessary due diligence and clearly demonstrate enterprise/activity eligibility. For each enterprise in an investment project, agencies are expected to verify and include Article 5 ownership; start and capacity-installation dates; exports to non-Article 5 countries; baseline equipment; type of equipment manufactured, annual manufacturing output; and HFC consumption by refrigerant for the past three to five years.

37. Agencies were reminded to proactively identify and inform any other funding source used or requested for the same or similar activities supported by the Multilateral Fund. Identify potential funding duplication and/or explain how these funds complement Fund assistance without duplication. Agencies were also reminded to mention any co-financing for every submission, including HPMPs, KIPs and energy-efficiency projects.

38. In closing this part of the discussion, the Secretariat acknowledged the diversity in the length and quality of project documents received and the volume of review questions this can generate. While ensuring efforts to streamline the number and improve clarity of questions to agencies, the Secretariat encouraged agencies to keep proposals clear and concise and aligned with the Secretariat's guides to facilitate a smoother review. Agencies were also reminded to guide countries on what is eligible under current rules and procedures and avoid the submission of proposals known to fall outside the guidelines.

(c) Preparation of stage II of KIPs

39. The Secretariat introduced the preparation of guidelines on preparatory funding for stage II of KIPs, noting that the Executive Committee had asked for a brief document on this matter, to be informed by agencies' experience with stage I preparation. The Secretariat invited agencies to reflect on what had been missing or insufficiently covered during stage I preparation, and on how stage II preparation is likely to differ.

40. Agencies noted that stage I data collection had been complicated by the COVID-19 pandemic and associated market fluctuations, which made it difficult to establish reliable baseline-year consumption figures, and asked whether consumption patterns are likely to have stabilised by the time stage II preparation begins, potentially easing data analysis, while flagging a parallel need to identify sectors where HFC consumption has newly emerged or, conversely, disappeared since stage I.

41. UNDP suggested that one useful input would be an assessment of the effectiveness of RRR centres for HFC management, given the increasingly complex mix of pure substances and blends now in circulation, including their technical and economic viability, the availability of sufficient volumes of individual refrigerants for cost-effective operation, and lessons for possible additional investment or regulatory measures in stage II. The Secretariat noted this connects with the Fund's ongoing evaluation of RRR activities and with the parallel work on LRM and undertook to explore whether findings from that evaluation could usefully inform stage II preparation.

42. UNEP further highlighted the importance of a policy and legislation gap analysis to assess whether measures committed to under stage I have been implemented and whether legislative or regulatory adjustments are still needed, an issue it considers particularly relevant in several countries. On consumption trends, UNEP noted that in-depth country-level analytical work already completed for a small number of

countries provides a model that could, at a lighter level of detail, usefully be extended to other countries preparing for their second tranche, to better understand how consumption is tracking against baselines ahead of stage II design. It was also suggested that stage II should look more deeply at sectors not substantially addressed under stage I, including the mobile air-conditioning sector in countries where it was previously a lower priority. UNEP also called for closer, more strategic coordination among cooperating agencies in shared countries than had been possible under the faster-paced preparation of stage I.

43. The Secretariat noted that the Executive Committee has repeatedly asked why stage I plans have not included more manufacturing sector activities in manufacturing countries, as most stage I activity has concentrated on the servicing sector, and suggested stage II will need to address manufacturing more substantially. Some countries had deferred addressing large commercial RAC manufacturing pending clearer information, and others had reported these subsectors as dominated by non-eligible enterprises. Agencies agreed this was necessary, citing countries not yet ready to adopt newer technologies for stakeholder and market readiness reasons, and noted that current policy does not incentivise prioritisation of higher-GWP refrigerants for earlier phase-down, unlike frameworks already used in some non-Article 5 countries; agencies suggested the forthcoming policy paper could usefully address this, alongside differences across countries in how HFC import quotas are calculated (metric tonnes versus CO₂-equivalent).

44. UNIDO stated that stage I surveys will generally need to be strengthened under stage II, partly to reflect the pandemic's effect on consumption patterns in some regions and confirmed this should give a clearer picture of previously under-surveyed subsectors, including mobile air-conditioning, and of growing attention to commercial refrigeration, where some countries remain cautious about alternative technologies. UNIDO further suggested that stage II guidance should clarify how to categorize local assembly and installation distinctly from manufacturing and servicing, noting inconsistent treatment across countries, and supported closer coordination among agencies working in the same countries.

45. On the local assembly and installation subsector specifically, the Secretariat pointed agencies to guidance already approved at the 92nd meeting, which defines the subsector and characterises the types of equipment and companies typically involved, and noted this should help agencies identify relevant companies and applications for stage II, particularly as countries move from the smaller standalone systems mostly addressed under stage I toward larger centralised commercial refrigeration systems, which are more often assembled on-site and correspondingly harder to survey.

46. Agencies also flagged a number of newer or previously overlooked applications warranting attention in stage II, including heat-pump water heaters, the fire-protection sector, and refrigerant use in cosmetic and hair-removal devices, the latter described as a common but largely unrecognised source of fully emissive refrigerant use. One agency cited an example from India of specialised water-cooling equipment for hospitals as a further niche application meriting consideration. In closing the item, the Secretariat raised, without expecting an immediate answer, the broader question of how stage II can achieve meaningful transition traction in sub-sectors increasingly dominated by multinational or otherwise non-eligible enterprises, drawing a parallel with similar eligibility constraints observed in other sectors.

(d) Guides and submission forms for project submissions

47. The Secretariat gave a brief update on this item, noting that no new guides or submission forms had been issued for this meeting, and that the roll-out of the KMS online project submission had gone well. The Secretariat is planning to update tranche submission forms for the next meeting as part of a broader effort to align them with the KMS, streamline requirements, and reduce the volume of information agencies need to provide.

AGENDA ITEM 8: TRANSITION IN SERVICING/NON-MANUFACTURING SECTOR ACTIVITIES (also with online participation)

48. The Secretariat introduced the servicing-sector discussion as an early, preliminary contribution to a policy document being prepared for the 100th meeting, following on from the strategic-approaches discussion at the 98th meeting, and indicated that more extensive consultations with agencies would follow in the coming months. The discussion was structured around three elements: assessing the servicing sector during project preparation; capacity-building through technician training and certification; and the treatment of RRR within the broader concept of LRM, the last of which connects closely to a separate agenda item.

49. On sector assessment, the Secretariat noted that reasonably good data exist on technician headcounts and servicing workshops from past surveys, but that significant gaps remain regarding segregation of technicians/workshops count versus. refrigeration, air-conditioning and heat-pump (RACHP) sub-sector, methodologies to best estimate bank of equipment and leakage rates, the informal sector, and country survey sample sizes. Agencies discussed the difficulty of surveying the local installation and assembly subsector, and the practical challenge, especially for smaller countries with limited personnel, of maintaining survey databases over time. One agency noted the inherent difficulty of separating technician activity cleanly across subsectors given the fact that many technicians work in the informal sector, while another observed that collecting fully granular equipment data is not realistic, suggesting instead best estimates and a broader, umbrella-level approach.

50. One agency drew on field experience to stress the practical value of engaging established institutions such as RAC associations and, separately, national manufacturers' associations, since the servicing and manufacturing communities often do not wish to be grouped together, and encouraged working with governments to support both bodies distinctly. Other ideas were expressed in relation to informal technicians, particularly numerous in LVC countries, are inherently difficult to identify since many are unregistered and outside the banking system, suggestions also offered that community-level engagement, including with local health or community bodies who may be familiar with informal technicians in their area, together with partnership with national statistical offices, and experience of some countries in building sustained databases through licensing of technicians and workshops; all could support a more sustainable long-term strategy for RAC sector data collection.

51. An agency shared a further suggestion for the assessment work: collecting refrigerant consumption data directly from end users as a way of better estimating leakage rates and servicing demand, complementing technician- and workshop-based data collection. Work under energy-efficiency projects under decision 91/65 offered such through assessment but cannot cover thoroughly all end users.

52. On capacity building, the Secretariat reported that some 95 per cent of recent relevant projects had included a technician-certification component, though the ones reported as mandatory schemes are around only 27 per cent while independence and effectiveness of the bodies conducting evaluations varies considerably across countries. One agency emphasised that community-level awareness is as important as the training itself, particularly in parts of Africa, where informal technicians and informal household practices are widespread, arguing that raising public awareness of the need to use certified technicians can create a second layer of market-driven enforcement alongside formal regulation, and recommended greater investment in this kind of awareness activity in future programming while the difficulty of building market-driven technical and vocational education and training programmes was also raised by one agency. Agencies also noted that practical incentives for technicians, such as training on higher-value repair skills, can support continued use of certified technicians by expanding the services they can credibly offer, and agreed on the value of sharing successful certification and awareness models across countries and agencies.

53. On RRR as an element of LRM, the Secretariat noted that most HPMPs and KIPs already reference recovery and recycling activities, with roughly half also addressing reclamation, but that the share of projects addressing supporting conditions, such as adequate penalties to deter venting, or attention to the purity of reclaimed refrigerant, falls away further down that chain. It also noted the few good projects that had comprehensive feasibility studies and suggested an overarching model that tackle six areas in

addressing the RRR schemes. Agencies' views referred to key barriers in advancing such schemes including logistical challenge for normal technicians which limits business to large end users and service companies, the difficulty in building reclamation schemes in small countries especially in Africa, limited economy of scale, the need to assess the impact of expanding the use of drop-ins with future unwanted quantities or limited reclamation capacities.

54. The online session closed with the Secretariat thanking participants for the extended discussion, acknowledging the late hour for colleagues joining from other time zones, and confirming that fuller, more structured consultations on the servicing sector policy paper would follow.

AGENDA ITEM 9: CORE UNIT FUNDING, THE CAP BUDGET AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE COST REGIME

55. The Secretariat introduced the item by recalling that funding for core unit and CAP budgets had been increased by the Executive Committee by a standard amount for the current triennium only. The Secretariat, as part of its broader review of the administrative cost regime, would review this additional funding. The Secretariat had circulated a short questionnaire prior to the meeting seeking information on the operational and financial use of the additional funding and its benefits to LVC countries, on which agencies were invited to elaborate.

56. UNEP reported on the use of the additional funding across several activities: an assessment of licensing and quota system implementation in LVC countries (covering annual and multi-shipment licences, per-shipment permits, and HFC quota management and verification, results from which are being developed as factsheets for Article 5 countries; guidance on second-tranche KIP reporting; and an initiative, piloted in Zimbabwe, to strengthen the local installation and assembly sector for commercial refrigeration, to be showcased at a side event during the upcoming Meeting of the Parties.

57. UNEP added that a more recently launched initiative addresses safe and sustainable cooling in Africa, piloted in Cabo Verde, with a focus on operational safety in the RAC sector. UNEP noted that utilization of the funding was slower than expected in 2024 owing to initial uncertainty over permissible uses, resulting in some funds being returned for that year, but that utilization for 2025–2026 is well on track.

58. UNDP reported that around 90 per cent of additional funding had gone toward additional capacity through part-time and fixed-term contract staff in different regions with a focus on Africa, with smaller amounts for financial and technical consultants and in-country travel. UNDP said the funding had been essential to sustaining its support to Article 5 countries amid growing workload and recommended that similar support continue into the next triennium.

59. UNIDO reported that the funding had allowed it to extend support to a growing number of LVC countries, mainly to strengthen institutional capacity and policy and regulatory frameworks and to help countries prepare projects under different funding windows, and likewise recommended continuation into the next triennium.

60. The World Bank described its use of the funding across three areas: programmatic support for HFC phase-down policy, including tools for quota management and monitoring, reporting and verification; technical workshops and expert exchanges linking cooling, Kigali Amendment implementation, and LRM; and technical expertise supporting the development of financial modalities and demonstration projects under the energy-efficiency operational framework.

61. Agencies indicated that feedback from Article 5 countries had generally been positive, while noting that the funding was introduced as a temporary, triennium-specific increase whose continuation would need to be considered as part of the administrative cost regime review. Priorities identified for the next triennium included continued support for energy efficiency as a growing workload driver; for more coordinated and

strategic project implementation given countries' increasingly concurrent project loads; and clearer policy frameworks for stage II KIPs, and further work on a shared strategy for LRM, which remains unresolved.

AGENDA ITEM 10: REFRIGERATION AND AIR-CONDITIONING MANUFACTURING LINES THAT HAD COMPLETED CONVERSION UNDER HCFC PHASE-OUT OR HFC PHASE-DOWN PROJECTS, IN THE CONTEXT OF FUNDING ELIGIBILITY RELATING TO ENERGY-EFFICIENCY PROJECTS UNDER DECISION 94/60

62. The Secretariat indicated that reports of the first set of energy efficiency projects under decision 94/60 have been received and it is reviewing the underlying methodology with a view to presenting an update to the operational framework at the 100th meeting. It noted that consultants engaged by agencies have in some cases made adjustments to the methodology without clear explanation, contributing to delays in reviewing the projects. Agencies were invited to flag the issues they consider most pressing for the methodology's revision.

63. UNDP noted that the extent of data required for decision 94/60 projects had initially been underestimated, and that gathering this data has proved difficult given the number of stakeholders, including industry and multiple government departments, that need to be engaged, thus extending timelines for their engagement; the agency's team is adapting to these challenges. The Secretariat underlined the importance of communicating the methodology's requirements clearly to NOUs and industry from the outset and offered to provide presentations or webinars to support this. It also stressed the importance of coordination among agencies working on energy-efficiency projects in the same countries, to keep this work aligned with broader HFC phase-down policy.

64. On the related question of manufacturing lines that have already completed conversion to lower or low-GWP alternatives, the Secretariat indicated that in response to decision 98/24, it has initiated work to collect such information from various sources and asked whether agencies hold further sectoral or industry-level analysis that could inform the Executive Committee's consideration of the issue, and to share any additional information that could help build a factual case.

AGENDA ITEM 11: REGIONAL THEMATIC CENTRES FOR SUSTAINABLE COOLING

65. The Secretariat provided an update on work under way since decision 97/87, on two fronts requested by the Executive Committee: gathering more detailed information on existing centres of excellence that support the RACHP sub-sector, including their services, operating models and financing; and consulting regional groups on their priorities, needs and possible governance arrangements. This work has been coordinated with the Ozone Secretariat's parallel exercise under decision XXXVII/5 on regional initiatives and has drawn on UNEP's OzonAction networks to reach governments, supplemented by a dedicated questionnaire. The Secretariat also acknowledged UNIDO's Sustainable Cooling Forum and a session with the African Group as further consultation channels.

66. The Secretariat reported that close to 90 government responses had been received to the questionnaire, sufficient to identify broad priority themes, principally the servicing sector, LRM, and the cold chain, with growing mentions of marine and fisheries applications and, for some countries, data centres, though it was considered it too early to draw conclusions on specific regional setups. Consultations with governments were structured around five questions: the specific thematic focus a centre should have since a single centre cannot cover all aspects of sustainable cooling; what services would be needed beyond those already funded through KIPs, HPMPs or other funding windows, to avoid duplication; which institution or country might host a centre, a question to follow rather than precede agreement on need and services, noting competitive interest among countries in hosting; and, throughout, what business model

would allow the centre to become financially self-sustaining, given that seed funding would likely need to be matched by co-financing.

67. The Secretariat added that feedback so far suggests the most viable candidates for a regional centre are regions that already have a working coordination mechanism, since without that kind of pre-existing cooperation and mutual recognition of expertise, a centre is unlikely to be used regardless of how it is designed. One agency suggested the regional centres associated with the Basel or Stockholm Conventions as a possible reference model, typically built around existing, already-recognised institutions such as universities or government-owned bodies rather than newly created structures; while acknowledging the idea, the Secretariat cautioned against a single ‘umbrella’ body that duplicates what is already functioning well elsewhere. The analysis and options would be presented in a policy document for the next meeting, once further regional consultations, already scheduled in the coming weeks, are complete.

AGENDA ITEM 12: LIFE-CYCLE REFRIGERANT MANAGEMENT

68. The Secretariat recalled that two documents on LRM are under preparation: one for the 99th meeting and a more policy-oriented one for the 100th meeting, intended to give the Executive Committee a sufficient basis to consider a possible dedicated funding window, should it decide to pursue this in response to the Parties' request. While individual elements of LRM, such as recovery, recycling, technician certification, some reclamation, have long been funded, the 99th meeting document aims to help the Committee understand remaining gaps on the issue.

69. The Secretariat reported that, of 127³ countries with approved projects under decision 91/66 to prepare national inventories of banks of used or unwanted controlled substances and plans, four reports from completed projects have been received to date, with about four more expected imminently and up to six further reports hoped for by October 2026. The Secretariat requested agencies to submit as many reports as possible by March 2027 for the 23 projects due for completion by December 2026, to guide the document for the 100th meeting. The Secretariat recalled decision 97/89(b), encouraging agencies to intensify efforts to finalise these projects, and noted that a request to extend a further 36 projects had been received and would be presented to the 99th meeting, and asked agencies to flag if further extensions are likely, while emphasizing the need for high-quality reports.

70. Asked about the main difficulties in preparing these inventories and plans, agencies pointed consistently to human-resource capacity constraints at the national and regional levels, rather than data collection or analysis methods. The Secretariat suggested that the timelines should be respected and added the importance of thorough, well-prepared submissions that would assist in the preparation of the policy document to be presented at the 100th meeting and could make a stronger case to the Executive Committee for further discussions on the issue of LRM.

AGENDA ITEM 13: IMPORT AND EXPORT OF PROHIBITED COOLING EQUIPMENT

71. The Secretariat recalled that the issue of the risk to compliance posed by imports of prohibited cooling equipment had been raised at the 98th meeting, referencing Parties' decision XXXV/13. The Executive Committee had subsequently adopted decision 98/63, reminding implementing and bilateral agencies, as well as Article 5 countries that were concerned about potential non-compliance caused by the import of prohibited cooling equipment, that they could include activities within new stages of KIPs or HPMPs to strengthen capacities to prevent such imports; and requesting the Secretariat to discuss with

agencies how such activities had been implemented to date and what the relevant challenges were to address, taking into account the potential for regional coordination.

72. The Secretariat presented a brief analysis of HPMPs and KIPs approved over the last three years, which found that most projects include some plan, whether established, under development or simply envisaged, addressing at least one category of equipment using controlled substances, more often HCFC-related than HFC-related, since HFC-focused work has only recently begun, and that around a quarter of projects include provisions on second-hand equipment specifically. However, only around 30 per cent of projects explicitly flagged the compliance risk associated with prohibited imports. Looking more closely, the Secretariat noted that HCFC-related equipment bans, while included in most relevant projects, are often implemented with delay, raising a concern that by the time some bans take effect, markets may already have moved on, reducing their intended impact. HFC-related measures identified so far mainly cover domestic and light commercial applications, with a smaller number of more advanced proposals extending bans to specific equipment classes, such as larger commercial air-conditioning units above a certain capacity. Supporting measures beyond outright bans, such as green procurement requirements and restrictions on the trade of used HCFC-containing equipment, also feature in a number of projects.

73. The Secretariat asked agencies to reflect on three points: how far the timing of these regulatory measures actually supports compliance objectives, recognising that manufacturing and non-manufacturing countries face different circumstances; whether current enforcement and implementation modalities are adequate, since establishing a ban is not, by itself, sufficient without effective enforcement; and whether current levels of support from the CAP and under HPMPs and KIPs are sufficient for the training and capacity-building this issue requires.

74. Agencies observed that the underlying concern of equipment being "dumped" into certain markets reflects a broader concern among some countries that lack sufficient capacity to control this trade themselves. UNEP noted that network meeting discussions with countries have so far focused mainly on strengthening import controls, such as customs and HS codes, since this lies within the countries' own control, and confirmed it has offered to help facilitate informal dialogue with governments in exporting countries. Several agencies flagged the importance of second-hand equipment to many small economies, hence difficult to ban or control. Discussion also touched base on the importance of exploring establishing market surveillance programmes, whether within KIPs or energy-efficiency projects, as customs control cannot fully control the flow of unwanted equipment to local markets. Agencies confirmed their commitment to continue discussing the issue through network meetings and indicated openness to a dedicated thematic session, while noting that addressing it more substantively within individual projects would need to be demand-driven by the countries themselves.

AGENDA ITEM 14: OTHER MATTERS — POSSIBLE COMMEMORATIVE ELEMENTS FOR THE 100th MEETING

75. Following up on the discussion which begun at the previous IACM, for which agencies had already nominated focal points, the Secretariat explained that it had not yet contacted them because it wished to first settle on a clearer plan for the commemoration. It reported that a logo and a commemorative theme or slogan reflecting the Fund's impact were being designed, and that focal points would be contacted once these were finalised. The Secretariat asked agencies to identify successful projects that could be showcased, supported by a short-written explanation and photos or videos; to contribute photographs, videos and other material from past meetings and projects and to help disseminate the resulting material through their own communication channels, including by sharing their own plans for marking the milestone. The Secretariat

expected to confirm the commemoration concept and slogan within the following month and thanked agencies for their enthusiastic engagement.

AGENDA ITEM 15: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (KMS)

76. The Secretariat provided an update on the KMS, recalling that the online project submission module was launched at the 98th meeting, initially piloted internally by the Secretariat before roll-out, and that both general and agency-specific training sessions have since been delivered. Feedback has generally been positive, though a few user-access issues remain, and the Secretariat continues to provide ongoing support as they arise.

77. The Secretariat reported that the annual progress report module has also been launched and is being tested collaboratively with agencies, with validation and summary tables targeted for completion by late September or early October 2026. With the business plan, project submission, and progress report modules now in place, the project cycle within the KMS is nearing completion, and work continues on the completion report and evaluation module.

78. On data, the Secretariat reported that more than 10,600 records have been migrated into the system with enriched fields to support improved dashboards. An issue limiting agencies to viewing only their own data inventories has since been resolved, and agencies are now able to download the full inventory of projects. Three dashboards are in development: two public-facing web dashboards, a country profile page and a project and impact page, expected to be ready by the 99th meeting; and a more complex business intelligence tool for deeper dynamic analysis, which remains in progress.

79. Agencies welcomed the training provided by the Secretariat and the system's functionality. The Secretariat noted that access mapping for different colleagues within agencies is still being worked out in some cases and confirmed that this is being addressed. Agencies and the Secretariat agreed on the continued value of maintaining parallel validation tools, such as Excel-based summary tables, alongside the KMS until full confidence in the new system is established. The Secretariat clarified access arrangements for bilateral and cooperating agencies: bilateral agencies acting as lead agency on a project receive full system credentials, while cooperating agencies may be granted view-only access on request.

80. The Secretariat reiterated that, notwithstanding this progress, agencies and the Secretariat alike should continue to exercise a degree of caution in fully relying on the system's outputs until it has been in steady use for longer.

AGENDA ITEM 16: CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

81. On behalf of the Secretariat, the Chief Officer expressed her appreciation to the participating agencies. She also affirmed the importance of online participation of colleagues in the regions in the discussions relating to projects, allowing a useful exchange. She thanked everyone especially for their active participation and confirmed that follow-up on issues raised during the meeting would be communicated to agencies in the weeks ahead. She looked forward to seeing everyone again at the 99th meeting.

Annex I
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

GERMANY

Ms. Isabel Airas
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
P.O. Box 5180
65726 Eschborn
Germany
E-mail: isabel.airas@giz.de

UNDP

Ms. Xiaofang Zhou
Director
Montreal Protocol/ Cooling, Circularity and Pollution Prevention (C2P)
Planet Hub / Bureau for Policy and Programme Support
United Nations Development Programme
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1, 53113, Bonn, Germany
E-mail: xiaofang.zhou@undp.org

Ms. Monica Gaba Kapadia
Global Programme Specialist
Montreal Protocol/ Cooling, Circularity and Pollution Prevention (C2P)
Planet Hub / Bureau for Policy and Programme Support
United Nations Development Programme
304 East, 45th Street, 9th Floor, Room 984
New York, NY 10017
United States of America
E-mail: monica.kapadia@undp.org

Ms. Paloma Somohano
Programme Specialist
Montreal Protocol/ Cooling, Circularity and Pollution Prevention (C2P)
Planet Hub / Bureau for Policy and Programme Support
United Nations Development Programme
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1, 53113, Bonn, Germany
E-mail: paloma.somohano@undp.org

UNEP

Mr. James Curlin
Head, OzonAction
UN Environment Programme Law Division
1 rue Miollis, Building VII
75015 Paris
France
E-mail: jim.curlin@un.org

Mr. Mikheil Tushishvili
Programme Officer – ExCom Coordinator
OzonAction
UN Environment Programme Law Division
1 rue Miollis, Building VII
75015 Paris
France
E-mail: mikheil.tushishvili@un.org

Mr. Dominic Kinyumu Makau
Associate Finance and Budget Officer
OzonAction
UN Environment Programme Law Division
NOF2 North Wing
Nairobi
Kenya
E-mail: dominic.kinyumu@un.org

UNIDO

Ms. Liazzat Rabbiosi
Chief
Montreal Protocol Unit
UNIDO
Vienna
Austria
E-mail: l.rabbiosi@unido.org

Mr. Oluyomi Banjo
Industrial Development Officer
Technical Cooperation and Sustainable
Industrial Development (TCS)
Division of Climate Innovation and
Montreal Protocol (TCS/MP)
UNIDO
Vienna
Austria
E-mail: O.Banjo@unido.org

WORLD BANK

Mr. Thanavat Junchaya
Senior Environmental Engineer
Montreal Protocol Operations
Environment, Natural Resources and Blue Economy
The World Bank
1818 H Street NW, MC 10-1018
Washington, D.C. 20433
United States of America
E-mail: tjunchaya@worldbank.org

Ms. Jaeeun Koo
Junior Professional Officer
Montreal Protocol Operations
Global Environment Department
The World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433
United States of America
E-mail: jkool@worldbank.org

SECRETARIAT

Ms. Tina Birmbili
Chief Officer
E-mail: tina.birmbili@un.org

Ms. Rossana Silva Repetto
Deputy Chief Officer
E-mail: rossana.silva-repetto@un.org

Mr. Fadi Abou Elias
Chief of Administration
E-mail: fadi.abouelias@un.org

Mr. Adnan Atwa
Senior Evaluation Officer
E-mail: adnan.atwa@un.org

Mr. Rony Salim Aoun
Programme Management Officer
E-mail: aounr@un.org

Ms. Laura Duong
Programme Management Officer
E-mail: laura.duong@un.org

Mr. Ayman Eltalouny
Senior Programme Management Officer
E-mail: ayman.eltalouny@un.org

Ms. Kata Koppel
Information Management Officer
E-mail: koppelk@un.org

Mr. Federico San Martini
Senior Programme Management Officer
E-mail: federico.sanmartini@un.org

Mr. Balaji Natarajan
Senior Programme Management Officer
E-mail : balaji.natarajan@un.org

Mr. Alejandro Ramirez Pabon
Senior Programme Management Officer
E-mail: alejandro.ramirez-pabon@un.org

Ms. Elisa Rim
Programme Management Officer
E-mail: elisa.rim@un.org

Ms. Manisha Vipul Sanghani
Programme Management Officer
E-mail: manisha.sanghani@un.org

Ms. Xiaojuan Wang
Programme Management Officer
E-mail: xiaojuan.wang@un.org

Ms. Elina Yuen
Programme Management Officer
E-mail: elina.yuen@un.org

Online support:

Mr. Michael Huang
Ms. Nicole Romero

Online participants:

France:

Diane Menard

GIZ:

Philipp Denzinger
Guntram Glasbrenner
Nils Hansen
Mairin Herm

Italy:

Alessandro Peru

UNDP:

Anderson Alves
Joel Ayim Darkwah
Xin He
Carlos Andres Hernandez
Isroiljon Khasanov
Kasper Koefoed
Jie Pan

UNEP:

Kherlenzaya Ariunbold
Florence Asher
Moussa Barry
Khaled Klaly
Andrea Ossi Perretta
Marco Pinzon
Pipat Poopeerasupong
Vika Rogers
Mohamed Saad Bouh
Mary Melissa Ssentongo
Tatiana Terekhova
Denis Toichiev
Sonja Wagner

UNIDO:

Valeria Arroyave Cardozo
Sergia De Souza Oliveira
Nafissa Elsouri
Marcela Gonzalez Nolzco
Daniel Hopkins
David Fernando Marcucci Pico
Alois Mhlanga
Elena Miceva
Gentjan Sema
Jude Sentongo Kafeero
Luka Solic
Benoit Wuetelet

United Kingdom:

Charlotte Dunn

World Bank:

Mary-Ellen Foley
Eun Joo Allison Yi