



Distr.: Limited
10 October 2016

Original: English



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

**Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to
the Montreal Protocol on Substances
that Deplete the Ozone Layer**
Kigali, 10–14 October 2016

Draft report of the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

Introduction

1. The Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol was held at the Radisson Blu Hotel and Convention Centre in Kigali from 10 to 14 October 2016.

Part one: preparatory segment (10–12 October 2016)

I. Opening of the preparatory segment

2. The preparatory segment was opened by its co-chairs, Mr. Paul Krajnik (Austria) and Mr. Leslie Smith (Grenada), at 10 a.m. on Monday, 10 October 2016.

3. Opening remarks were delivered by Mr. Vincent Biruta, Minister of Natural Resources of Rwanda, and Ms. Tina Birmpili, Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat.

A. Statement by the representative of the Government of Rwanda

4. In his remarks, Mr. Biruta welcomed the parties to Kigali and expressed gratitude to the Ozone Secretariat for its tireless efforts to ensure the success of the meeting.

5. The achievements of the Montreal Protocol were widely recognized; built on an exceptional level of international collaboration and commitment, it had brought about the virtually complete phase-out of many ozone-depleting substances. The parties should be proud of their collective efforts, which would have a positive impact on the lives of current and future generations and the very future of humankind. Almost 30 years after the signing of the Protocol, the parties had come together once again, in Kigali, in the spirit of partnership and goodwill that had characterized their work under the Protocol, with the aim of passing an ambitious amendment to the Montreal Protocol to phase out hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). Doing so would make it possible to avoid some 0.5 degrees Celsius of global warming by the end of the century; and combining such an amendment with strong steps to promote energy efficiency could result in double the climate benefits, avoiding more than 1 degree Celsius of global warming. The case for an amendment was clear, and that clarity was a consequence of unflagging efforts by the parties over previous years. Their ground-breaking work on the Dubai pathway had afforded the parties an opportunity to make history once again, this time in tackling climate change, which, no longer an issue looming on the horizon but an urgent one, had become a reality of daily life with a wide variety of deleterious effects around the globe. He expressed confidence that the parties would apply thoughtful analysis and their collective wisdom to finding solutions to the few remaining outstanding issues in order to reach consensus on an amendment that would be agreeable to all the parties.

6. The adoption in December 2015 of the Paris Agreement on climate change, which was expected to enter into force in November 2016, had demonstrated a political will and global momentum to address climate change. Similarly, by agreeing on an amendment to the Montreal Protocol, the parties would send an important signal that Governments were serious about taking action to protect the future of their citizens. In striving to achieve the targets of the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular Goal 13 on climate action, they would show that saving lives and protecting the environment were inextricably linked. An HFC amendment would also build momentum towards the twenty-second session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, to be held in Marrakech, Morocco, in November 2016, as well as ensuring the prosperity of current and future generations of humankind.

7. In closing, he urged the parties to seize the opportunity of the current meeting to protect the climate and secure a brighter future for their citizens. Amending the Montreal Protocol rested on an unshakeable moral obligation and would serve as a building block to consolidate recent gains in addressing climate change. He therefore encouraged all parties to take part in the negotiations in the positive spirit of commitment and collaboration for which the Montreal Protocol had become known.

B. Statement by the representative(s) of the United Nations Environment Programme

8. In her opening remarks, Ms. Birmpilistressed the importance of the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties in relation to the negotiations on the adoption of an amendment to the Montreal Protocol to phase down HFCs. She thanked the Government of Rwanda on behalf of all the parties for hosting the event. In spite of the differing priorities and challenges of individual countries, focusing on what parties had in common rather than their differences could create an incredible force for positive change. There was a clear shared understanding of the need to move forward at the current meeting, turning the progress made at the resumed thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group into a framework for action and putting the world on a path towards reducing HFCs under the Montreal Protocol. It was a historic moment, long in the making, providing an opportunity to act to protect the global environment, leaving no country behind.

9. The parties would consider the third and final report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel's task force on decision XXVII/4, which provided an up-to-date manual of alternatives to ozone-depleting substances covering all major sectors. Also to be considered was a report by the Panel in response to decision Ex.III/1, on the climate benefits and costs of reducing HFCs, which would serve as a starting point for a more refined outcome to accompany a decision on an HFC phasedown. The parties at the current meeting would also finalize the terms of reference for a study on the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol for the period 2018–2021. Given the negotiations on phasing down high-global-warming-potential HFCs, she suggested that the parties might wish to define terms of reference for the study that encompassed an HFC phasedown.

10. She expressed her sincere appreciation to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel for responding to the parties' requests for information in the face of very short deadlines, and to the Scientific Assessment Panel and the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel for their contributions; the three panels would report during the high-level segment of the current meeting on the progress achieved in their work. The Technology and Economic Assessment Panel would also present its final assessment of the few nominations by parties of critical uses of methyl bromide. She noted in that regard that 99 per cent of controlled uses of methyl bromide – formerly one of the most important chemicals used to control pests and pathogens in agriculture, commodities and structures – had been replaced with effective alternatives that were safer for the ozone layer.

11. She congratulated the parties on another important milestone achieved in 2016, namely, the final phase-out of chlorofluorocarbons, including in metered-dose inhalers, representing a remarkable achievement resulting from over twenty years of coordinated activity with stakeholders including the pharmaceutical industry, healthcare regulators and providers, and patients.

12. In closing she paid tribute, leading a round of applause, to Ms. Amina Mohamed of Malaysia and Mr. Blaise Horisberger of Switzerland, both of whom were participating in a meeting of the parties for the last time, thanking them for their tireless efforts as representatives of their countries to further the objectives of the Montreal Protocol. She urged representatives to make the most of the current meeting, uniting and investing in the social, economic and environmental well-being of global citizens through collective action. By turning good intentions into concrete action through the adoption of an amendment to the Protocol, the parties would take a profoundly important step towards a healthier planet and healthier people, balancing global and national goals on the basis of evolving and sometimes imperfect knowledge to deliver effective solutions that were agreeable to all parties.

II. Organizational matters

A. Attendance

13. [To be completed]

B. Officers

14. The preparatory segment of the meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Krajnik and Mr. Smith.

C. Adoption of the agenda of the preparatory segment

15. The following agenda for the preparatory segment was adopted on the basis of the provisional agenda contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/1:

1. Opening of the preparatory segment:
 - (a) Statements by representative(s) of the Government of Rwanda;
 - (b) Statements by representative(s) of the United Nations Environment Programme.
2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Adoption of the agenda of the preparatory segment;
 - (b) Organization of work.
3. Administrative matters:
 - (a) Consideration of membership of Montreal Protocol bodies for 2017;
 - (b) Financial report of the trust fund and budgets for the Montreal Protocol.
4. Report by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on updated and new information on alternatives to ozone-depleting substances (decision XXVII/4).
5. Report by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on assessment of the climate benefits and the financial implications for the Multilateral Fund of the hydrofluorocarbon phasedown schedules in the amendment proposals (decision Ex.III/1).
6. Dubai pathway on hydrofluorocarbons (decision XXVII/1).
7. Issues related to exemptions under Articles 2A–2I of the Montreal Protocol:
 - (a) Nominations for essential-use exemptions for 2017;
 - (b) Nominations for critical-use exemptions for 2017 and 2018.
8. Terms of reference for the study on the 2018–2020 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol.
9. Report by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and the Scientific Assessment Panel on analysis of the discrepancies between observed atmospheric concentrations of and reported data on carbon tetrachloride (decision XXVII/7).
10. Proposal to establish an ad hoc standards coordination group (UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.1/38/8, para. 92).
11. Compliance and data reporting issues: presentation on and consideration of the work and recommended decisions of the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol.
12. Membership of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel.
13. Issues related to the phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (decision XXVII/5).
14. Availability of recovered, recycled or reclaimed halons (decision XXVI/7).
15. Other matters.

D. Organization of work

16. The parties agreed to follow their customary procedure and establish contact groups as necessary, endeavouring to limit the number of groups operating simultaneously to ensure the

effective participation of small delegations with the exception of the budget committee, which would convene as necessary.

III. Administrative matters

A. Consideration of membership of Montreal Protocol bodies for 2017

17. The Co-Chair requested regional groups to submit nominations to the Secretariat for positions in various bodies under the Montreal Protocol, including officers of the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties, the co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group and the members of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund and the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure of the Montreal Protocol for 2017.

18. [To be completed]

B. Financial report of the trust fund and budgets for the Montreal Protocol

19. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair drew attention to the note by the secretariat on the proposed revision to the approved budget for 2016 and proposed budgets for 2017 and 2018 for the Trust Fund of the Montreal Protocol (UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/4) and the corrigendum (UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/4/Corr.1) and addendum (UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/4/Add.1) thereto. He noted that it had been the practice of the parties at past meetings to establish a budget committee to review budget-related documents and prepare one or more draft decisions on budgetary matters. In accordance with that practice, the parties agreed to establish an open-ended budget committee, coordinated by Mr Ives Enrique Gomez Salas (Mexico) and Ms Jean Clarke (Ireland), to agree on budgets for the Montreal Protocol trust fund and to prepare draft decisions on financial matters for the Protocol.

20. [To be completed]

IV. Report by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on updated and new information on alternatives to ozone-depleting substances (decision XXVII/4)

21. Introducing the item 4, the Co-Chair recalled that in decision XXVII/4 the Meeting of the Parties had requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to prepare a report for consideration by the Open-ended Working Group and an updated version of that report for consideration by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties. A task force established by the Panel had presented its initial report at the thirty-seventh meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, in April 2016, and a revised report at the Working Group's thirty-eighth meeting, in July. The task force had then prepared a further update of the report, taking into account comments received at and after those meetings, for consideration by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties. The executive summary of the report was set out in an addendum to the note by the Secretariat on the matters for discussion at the current meeting (OzL.Pro.28/2/Add.1).

22. Ms. Bella Maranion, on behalf of the decision XXVII/4 task force and the other task force co-chairs, Mr. Lambert Kuijpers and Mr. Roberto Peixoto, and Mr. Fabio Polonara, Mr. Ashley Woodcock and Ms. Helen Tope, members of the task force, gave a presentation on the update report, which they said responded to comments made at the thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group on high-ambient-temperature criteria and the mitigation scenarios and provided further information related to total, new manufacturing, and servicing demand and the availability of alternatives for foam-blowing, metered-dose inhalers and aerosols. A summary of the presentation, prepared by the presenters, is set out in annex [] to the present report.

23. The presentation was followed by a question and answer period on matters highlighted during the presentation or discussed in the report.

24. A number of representatives expressed a desire to see information on volumes of HFC consumption and production in countries, in addition to the aggregated data for Article 5 and non-Article 5 parties already provided by the report, particularly given that a very small number of countries were responsible for a high proportion of HFC production and consumption. Responding on behalf of the task force, Mr. Lambert Kuijpers, Co-Chair of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, explained that such information was not available and that even the aggregated data for Article 5 and non-Article 5 parties were subject to a degree of uncertainty. He also confirmed that the task force, in projecting future demand, had taken into account regulations in force in the United States and the European Union but had not considered regulations in any other country.

25. Responding to several questions about the cost and availability of alternatives, he explained that because so many of the alternatives to high-GWP HFCs had been developed only recently, and since many were still being further developed, their prices had not yet settled in the market. Some production capacity for some alternatives had been constructed, but it was still expanding and was also dependent of the rate of adoption of such alternatives. The situation was changing very rapidly, and although the range of prices for some alternatives was narrowing, prices were still not stable and it was very difficult to predict future developments with any degree of precision. He also confirmed that the costs of intellectual property rights had not been taken into account in the report; as with other issues, it was impossible to obtain accurate data on such costs. Similarly, the report did not provide details on the availability of alternatives in various regions; that information was in general not available, although he was aware that HFC surveys had been undertaken that others were under way in a number of developing countries. The report of the task force used the assumption that alternatives would be equally available in all countries, although the situation would be different in reality.

26. Mr. Woodcock added, in response to a question about the availability of alternatives for foams, that it was difficult to predict future developments. HFOs were currently more expensive than either HFCs or HCFCs, but it was quite likely that new blends would be developed that would offer improved performance at lower prices.

27. A number of representatives observed that while large companies were already adopting alternatives such as cyclopentane for foam-blowing, that option was not suitable for small and medium-sized enterprises, which were the bulk of companies in developing countries; that, they said, was a matter of considerable concern for the companies' economic viability. Mr. Kuijpers, expressing agreement and noting that flammability was also a concern for small and medium-sized enterprises, said in response that while HFOs were not yet affordable it was very likely that prices would fall in the future. In response to another question he said that it should be possible for technicians from different sectors, such as refrigeration and air-conditioning and foams, to be trained together in the application of alternatives.

28. Responding to a question about the availability of HFC-32, he confirmed that the substance was commercially available and was being widely considered and applied as an alternative to high-GWP HFCs. It was impossible, however, for the task force to comment on the availability of the substance and equipment that could use it in specific countries or regions because that depended on too many factors on which the task force had no information.

29. In response to a question about impediments to the adoption of alternatives to HFC-using metered-dose inhalers in developing countries, as mentioned in the report, Ms. Tope clarified that multi-dose dry-powder inhalers were more expensive than HFC-using metered-dose inhalers. Single-dose dry-powder inhalers, however, were cheaper and could be affordable even for low-income patients.

30. In response to a question about the feasibility of mitigation scenario 3 in the report, Mr. Kuijpers explained that the scenario had set 2020 as the date at which manufacturing of HFCs would begin to be converted; it was not a date for total phase-out of HFCs. It, like other scenarios, was designed to illustrate the impact of setting 2020 as the start of the conversion process, plus various timescales for completing the process. With regard to some requested clarifications related to the business-as-usual and other scenarios in the report, he suggested that bilateral discussion with the commenting party might be helpful.

31. Responding to a question about whether the report took account of HFC leakage rates, he explained that the figures had been calculated on the assumption that all HFCs produced would eventually be released into the atmosphere. He agreed, however, that the reduction of leakage through a variety of measures was important and should be looked at further.

32. Responding to a question about the publication of new standards by international organizations, he confirmed that the process was a time-consuming one. Three years should be regarded as the absolute minimum time required, but the process could take up to five years. In response to another question, he said that the Panel could not comment meaningfully on the sale in countries of air-conditioners that did not meet international standards; enforcing such standards was a matter for the importing and exporting countries.

33. In response to a question about the extent of the redesign needed to adapt equipment for use in high-ambient-temperature settings, he explained that it would involve some re-engineering and the use of some new or modified components; it was difficult to generalize, however, as the necessary redesign would vary from product to product. It was also difficult to estimate the impact of redesign

on prices because it would vary by product and sub-sector and market volume; producing estimates would have required more time than had been available to the task force.

34. Ms. Marañon observed in conclusion that, while she understood parties' desire for comprehensive information before they made decisions, the Meeting of the Parties had historically of necessity adopted decisions based on only partial information and then adjusted the course as more information became available. In the current case, she noted, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel could continue to update its reports on alternatives and their cost and availability, and the amendment proposals included provisions for the regular review of developing technologies.

35. Following the question-and-answer period one representative said that some alternatives to high-GWP HFCs did not function well in tropical conditions, and he expressed the hope that the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel would be able to help Parties choose suitable alternatives. Another representative said that, while the mitigation scenarios presented in the report were very helpful and gave parties a clear idea of the kind of actions that would need to be taken, the lack of information on the cost and availability of alternatives, particularly for specific sub-sectors and regions, was a concern.

36. Another representative welcomed the new information contained in the report, particularly on foams and aerosols. While the adoption of hydrocarbons as foam-blowing agents presented challenges, he said, they also served as a good example of the potential for leapfrogging from HCFCs to non-HFC alternatives without using HFCs in the interim. Similarly, not-in-kind and low-GWP alternatives to HFC-using metered-dose inhalers were available, although they too posed challenges in some circumstances. Welcoming the information in the report on international standards processes, he added that there was a clear need to update standards to ensure that climate-friendly and economically viable alternatives, including flammable refrigerants, could be adopted more widely in all sectors in both non-Article 5 and Article 5 parties.

37. Another representative expressed the hope that in its future work the Panel would undertake research on the leakage of HFCs during manufacturing and maintenance, saying that it represented an important source of emissions. He also said that the Panel should look more closely at situations in which HFOs were the most appropriate and environmentally friendly alternatives to high-GWP HFCs, including their economic impact, particularly in developing countries.

38. The parties took note of the information presented, and it was agreed that interested parties would consult informally on the matter during the current meeting.

V. Report by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel on assessment of the climate benefits and the financial implications for the Multilateral Fund of the hydrofluorocarbon phasedown schedules in the amendment proposals (decision Ex.III/1)

39. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that in decision Ex.III/1 the Third Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties had requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to prepare a report, for consideration by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties, assessing the climate benefits and financial implications for the Multilateral Fund of the schedules for phasing down the use of HFCs included in the proposals to amend the Protocol in respect of HFCs. The Panel had established a working group on the issue, which had produced the report, the executive summary of which was reproduced in the addendum to the note by the Secretariat on the matters for discussion at the current meeting (OzL.Pro.28/2/Add.1).

40. Ms. Bella Marañon and Mr. Lambert Kuijpers, co-chairs of the working group, then gave a presentation on the report, saying that it aimed to provide a clear definition of terms, to build on the accepted methodology used by the Panel in previous assessments for the business-as-usual and mitigation scenarios across various use sectors, and to provide an initial assessment of the potential benefits and costs of the amendment proposals. A summary of the presentation, prepared by the presenters, is set out in annex [] to the present report.

41. The presentation was followed by a question-and-answer period on matters highlighted during the presentation or discussed in the report.

42. Responding to a question, Mr. Kuijpers confirmed that the scenarios in the report assumed that all HFCs produced would eventually be emitted to the atmosphere. While it would be beneficial to develop various scenarios incorporating assumptions about rates of recovery and reuse, it would be complicated, requiring information about the capacity of individual parties to recover used HFCs.

43. In response to a question about the difference between “demand” and “consumption” in the report, he said that the Panel had used a bottom-up definition of demand, calculating the volume of HFCs likely to be needed to supply the volume of equipment projected to be in operation in each sector, which in turn would be influenced by estimates of growth in GDP and population. Consumption, as defined in the Montreal Protocol, would be greater because it would include among other things produced, used and stockpiled HFCs and any HFCs that leaked between production and use, but it was impossible for the Panel to estimate figures that included such factors. In general the Panel had used the assumptions set out in its earlier reports on HFCs. Responding to a further question, he said that he thought the report's estimate of 2014 demand was accurate but that the Panel could look into it further.

44. Ms. Maranion confirmed, in response to questions, that the Panel had not taken into account the climate benefits of addressing the inadvertent production of HFC-23, acknowledging that several reports suggested that they might be significant. The Panel had also not included any estimates of the impact of an exemption for high-ambient-temperature countries, given that the details of any such exemption were still being discussed by Parties. She also said, as suggested by one representative, that early action on the part of non-Article 5 parties would be helpful in promoting the development and uptake of climate-friendly alternatives to high-GWP HFCs. She also noted that the Panel had not considered the potential impact of countries increasing their production of HFCs in order to raise their baselines; as Mr. Kuijpers had explained, the Panel's calculations were based only on bottom-up estimates of demand.

45. In response to a question about the relatively small differences between the climate benefits of the non-Article 5 party phasedown schedules in the amendment proposals, Mr. Kuijpers said that it a result of the scenarios running to 2050, well beyond the final phasedown date in all of the proposed amendments. The differences would be greater if a shorter time horizon were chosen.

46. Responding to a question about a recent report from the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), he said that the Panel was aware of the report, and its much higher estimate of costs, but could not comment on it as it had been produced only very recently; the Panel would, however, study and consider its conclusions. He confirmed that the Panel's estimates of the costs to the Multilateral Fund included three elements: the cost of the conversion of equipment manufacturing, the cost of compensation for the closure of facilities and the cost of the servicing operation for HFC-using equipment. They did not, however, include the cost of disposing of old equipment, as such costs had not previously been financed by the Fund.

47. In response to another question Mr. Kuijpers said that, while it would be helpful to calculate the climate benefits of actions taken in particular regions, it would be an enormous task, requiring detailed information on each country. Ms. Maranion confirmed that in calculating climate benefits the Panel had adopted a relatively narrow definition that took into account only the reduction in demand for HFCs following from each of the amendment proposals, comparing it to a business-as-usual scenario.

48. Following the question-and-answer period several representatives said that while the report was valuable, the parties should be cautious in considering its projections of future demand, given the uncertainties over future developments.

49. One representative said that there was a major difference in the cumulative climate benefits of the four amendment proposals, amounting to more than 50 gigatonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent, and that the difference depended primarily on when the proposed phasedowns were to begin. In addition, he said, the report's treatment of the Indian proposal, which assumed that no interim phasedown steps for Article 5 parties would be agreed on before 2050, was perhaps unrealistic because the intention was to agree to interim reduction steps; had such steps been taken into account, the projected climate benefits flowing from the proposal would have been higher. He also said that, while the estimates of costs to the Multilateral Fund were very helpful, other cost categories such as capacity-building, institutional strengthening and project preparation also needed to be taken into account. In addition, he said, any projection spanning 30 or 40 years was uncertain, but once an amendment had been adopted, costs would be re-evaluated every three years in the context of the replenishment of the Fund. Suggestions, in the recent IIASA report, that cumulative costs were higher than the Panel had estimated were not necessarily correct; although the environmental benefits clearly were cumulative, much of the costs would be in the form of one-off capital costs of conversion. He looked forward, he said, to discussing the issue further.

50. The representative of the European Union said that the Panel's report underestimated the climate benefits of his party's proposed amendment, and overestimated the costs, by assuming that no interim phasedown steps for Article 5 parties would be agreed and that all of the phasedown would be

accomplished in the last year, before 2050. The proposal was clear that interim steps would be agreed and would start no later than 2020. In addition, the basket approach of the proposed amendment would encourage leapfrogging of technologies. More broadly, he said, a long conversion period would result in higher demand for HFCs and a long servicing tail. A delay of five years in starting the phasedown would double the climate impact by 2030. Had these matters been taken into account in the report, it would have predicted greater climate benefits and lower costs flowing from the amendment proposed by the European Union.

51. Several representatives, while thanking the Panel for its hard work, said that the report was not comprehensive enough to allow the Parties to reach firm decisions. By focusing only on the climate benefits and costs to the Multilateral Fund, it ignored elements such as the cost, effectiveness, availability and safety of alternatives, which were crucial issues that had to be taken into account, particularly for developing countries with fragile economies.

52. One representative said that the cost-effectiveness figures used by the Panel, which were based on those adopted by the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the second stage of the HCFC phase-out, were not necessarily applicable to the first stage of HFC phasedown. Even the figures used for HCFC phase-out had been shown to underestimate the real costs faced by companies converting to alternatives. It was essential to have detailed information on the costs of the alternatives to high-GWP HFCs, on a regional basis, before parties could understand the impacts of the amendment proposals on their own economies and on the Fund.

53. Other representatives drew attention to the importance of issues such as the costs of disposal of HFCs and of HFC-using equipment that would need to be replaced, the impact of HFC phasedown on small and medium-sized enterprises, energy efficiency, the costs faced by countries importing alternatives, and the needs and concerns of low-volume-consuming countries. The process of replacing high-GWP HFCs had to be sustainable for industry in developing countries as well as for the environment.

54. Other representatives, however, argued that the report provided sufficient information at the current stage to allow the amendment proposals to be discussed in full. Most significantly, the report made clear that an early freeze date with reasonable baselines would increase the climate benefits of an amendment while reducing its costs to the Multilateral Fund. The costs to the Fund of the amendment proposals differed by a factor of three, with the amendments with later phasedown start dates costing more. While full information on the costs of alternatives was of course important, the figures included in the report covered all the key sectors and provided enough detail for a broad understanding of the impacts and costs of each amendment proposal. Further information on the alternatives would emerge as non-Article 5 parties began to phase down high-GWP HFCs and as the Executive Committee started to prepare guidelines, but the report provided an adequate starting point.

55. The parties took note of the information presented.

VI. Dubai pathway on hydrofluorocarbons (decision XXVII/1)

56. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair of the Open-Ended Working Group recalled that in accordance with paragraph 4 of decision XXVII/1, on the Dubai pathway, a series of Open-ended Working Group meetings and an Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties had been convened “to work to an HFC amendment in 2016 by first resolving challenges by generating solutions in the contact group on the feasibility and ways of managing HFCs”. The thirty-seventh, the resumed thirty-seventh and the thirty-eighth meetings of the Open-Ended Working Group had culminated in decisions by the Third Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties, in Vienna in July 2016, while the resumed thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group had been held immediately prior to the current meeting.

57. At the suggestion of the Co-Chair, the Meeting of the Parties decided to reconvene the previously established contact group on the feasibility and ways of managing HFCs, which would continue to be co-chaired by Mr. Patrick McInerney (Australia) and Mr. Xia Yingxian (China).

58. [To be completed]

VII. Issues related to exemptions under Articles 2A–2I of the Montreal Protocol

A. Nominations for essential-use exemptions for 2017

59. Introducing the sub-item, the Co-Chair recalled that in 2016 only one party, China, had submitted an essential-use exemption nomination for 2017, which related to the use of 65 tonnes of

carbon tetrachloride for the testing of oil, grease and total petroleum hydrocarbons in water. The Open-ended Working Group at its thirty-eighth meeting had heard a presentation from the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its Medical and Chemical Technical Options Committee in which the Panel had recommended approval of China's nomination. At the same meeting, China had submitted a draft decision on the nomination, which it had subsequently revised taking into account plenary and informal discussions during the meeting of the Working Group. The revised draft decision (UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/3, sect. II, draft decision XXVIII/[A]) was before the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties for its consideration.

60. Following that introduction the parties approved the draft decision for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

B. Nominations for critical-use exemptions for 2017 and 2018

61. Introducing the sub-item, the Co-Chair recalled that in 2016 five parties had submitted eight nominations for critical-use exemptions for methyl bromide for 2017 and 2018. He further recalled that the Open-ended Working Group, at its thirty-eighth meeting, had heard a presentation from the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee on their initial evaluation of, and interim recommendations regarding, the nominations. Since that time, the Committee had received additional information from, and held bilateral discussions with, some of the nominating parties, and had finalized its report and recommendations on the basis of those discussions and information.

62. Mr. Ian Porter, Mr. Mohammed Besri and Ms. Marta Pizano, co-chairs of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee, gave a presentation on the Committee's final recommendations for critical-use nominations for methyl bromide, as well as two emergency-use nominations for the chemical submitted by Israel and Jamaica, respectively. A summary of the presentation prepared by the presenters is set out in annex [] to the present report.

63. Following the presentation, representatives requested clarification on certain issues and made statements in respect of the recommendations and the continued use of methyl bromide in accordance with critical-use exemptions. All who spoke expressed appreciation to the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee for the presentation and its evaluation of critical-use exemptions submitted in 2016 and in previous years.

64. Expressing concern that a number of parties, in particular those not operating under Article 5, continued to use methyl bromide for soil treatment and that emergency uses might be subject to abuse by parties, one representative queried whether the Committee had a sense of when parties would stop using methyl bromide and whether uses could be limited to quarantine and pre-shipment applications only.

65. Mr. Porter responded that while it was very hard for the Committee to make such a prediction, all the nominating parties had indicated their desire to phase out the use of methyl bromide, and it was the Committee's hope that that could be achieved within the following few years. Asked whether the Committee's evaluation was based solely on the availability of alternatives or had also taken into account the concerns of farmers, Mr. Porter said that the Committee had taken account of technical and socio-economic issues, including the needs of farmers and relevant industries, that the nominating parties had referred to in their nominations.

66. One representative asked whether quarantine and pre-shipment uses of methyl bromide should not be eliminated, saying that it was his understanding that such applications could be classified as critical-use exemptions and thus created an opportunity for parties to increase their consumption of methyl bromide. Ms. Pizano said in response that the Committee had in past years reviewed alternatives to methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment uses and had found that approximately 35 to 40 percent of such uses could be replaced.

67. Two representatives commended those parties that had not submitted critical-use nominations or that had requested exemptions for reduced amounts of methyl bromide in 2016.

68. The representative of South Africa recalled that his country's nomination for a critical-use exemption for methyl bromide for structures and mills for 2017 was only its second and that, as had been the case in 2016, the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee had recommended that South Africa be granted exemptions for smaller amounts than it had sought. He expressed appreciation to the Committee, however, for revising upward the amounts recommended in its interim report in view of additional information submitted by South Africa after the thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. While the situation had not changed since 2016, the Ministry of Agriculture was working with industry to expedite the registration of sulfur fluoride and other

alternatives to methyl bromide despite continued challenges associated with obtaining all the information needed to complete such registrations. South Africa was also working to implement the Committee's recommendations regarding dosage and frequency of methyl bromide applications but faced a number of difficulties associated with its climatic and socio-economic circumstances, including that most of its mills were very old and had wooden floors, which made them prone to pests. In summary, even though they might jeopardize its economy and food security, South Africa had accepted and would work to implement the Committee's recommendations but might need to submit critical-use nominations for structures and mills for 2018.

69. The representative of Canada said that during the thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group representatives of Canada had met with members of the Committee to clarify a number of issues regarding the country's research programme on alternatives to methyl bromide and, following the meeting, had also provided additional information to the Committee regarding its nomination. Canada would continue to provide information to the Committee on its research programme, which was moving forward, and would continue its efforts to eliminate critical uses of methyl bromide.

70. The representative of Australia expressed appreciation to the Committee for its final recommendation on Australia's nomination for 2018; Australia accepted the Committee's conclusion that alternatives to methyl bromide for the production of strawberry runner nucleus and foundation stocks were available and would implement them by 2018. He also said that Australia's research programme was comprehensive and was making good progress in finding alternatives with the aim of delivering healthy and disease-free strawberry runners; provided that the programme was successful, the country would phase out methyl bromide in its strawberry runner industry in 2019.

71. Two representatives, including one speaking on behalf of a group of parties, commended Australia for its commitment to phasing out methyl bromide for strawberry runners by 2019. Drawing attention to the report of the Committee and to statements by some of the nominating parties, the representative speaking on behalf of a group of parties said that those countries were pleased to learn that work would continue in Canada on the development of alternatives to methyl bromide, including through trials that, it was hoped, would eliminate the need for future critical-use exemptions, and that the country would share the results of that work with the Committee; that 2018 would be last year that China would submit a critical-use nomination for methyl bromide and that the country had submitted a national management plan to the Committee, which other Article 5 parties were invited to do as soon as possible; and that South Africa was working to fast-track the registration of alternatives to methyl bromide.

72. The other representative requested additional information on the need for South Africa's use of methyl bromide in structures and mills, saying that many alternatives were available for such applications.

73. Regarding quarantine and pre-shipment uses, one representative, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, expressed satisfaction that, as indicated in the note by the Secretariat on the matters for discussion at the current meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/2/Add.1), India planned to start reporting on its use of methyl bromide in quarantine and pre-shipment applications. The parties, he said, must further examine alternatives to methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment applications if they were to get the substance fully under control under the Montreal Protocol.

74. Following the discussion, the Co-Chair suggested that the representative of Cameroon present a proposal on the elimination of the use of methyl bromide in quarantine and pre-shipment applications for consideration by the Meeting of the Parties at a future meeting.

75. The parties agreed to establish an informal group of interested parties to further discuss the critical-use nominations and the recommendations of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee with a view to producing a draft decision on the nominations for consideration by the Meeting of the Parties. It was also understood that interested parties might consult informally regarding the nominations.

76. Subsequently the representative of Australia, speaking also on behalf of Argentina, Canada, China and South Africa, introduced a draft decision reflecting the outcome of the informal consultations.

77. [To be completed]

VIII. Terms of reference for the study on the 2018–2020 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

78. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair said that in accordance with the three-year funding cycle of the Multilateral Fund the parties needed, during the current year, to develop and adopt terms of reference for a study designed to estimate the funds necessary to enable Article 5 parties to achieve compliance during the 2018–2020 replenishment period. He recalled that, at the thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, a contact group, co-chaired by Mr. Philippe Chemouny (Canada) and Mr. Obed Baloyi (South Africa), had been established to develop those terms of reference. The current text of the terms of reference was set out in the annex to document UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/2.

79. The parties decided that the contact group established at the thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group would reconvene to continue the discussion of the matter at the current meeting.

80. [To be completed]

IX. Report by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and the Scientific Assessment Panel on analysis of the discrepancies between observed atmospheric concentrations of and reported data on carbon tetrachloride (decision XXVII/7)

81. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that by decision XXVII/7 the Parties had reiterated their concern about the observed discrepancies between atmospheric concentrations and reported data on carbon tetrachloride and had requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and the Scientific Assessment Panel to continue their analysis of the matter and to present a report on their findings at the current meeting. As had been agreed at the thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, that report would take into account a recent report by the World Climate Research Programme under its Stratosphere-Troposphere Processes and Their Role in Climate (SPARC) project, entitled “The mystery of carbon tetrachloride”. The report of the assessment panels had been issued as volume 4 of the September 2016 report of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel.

82. Mr. Paul A. Newman, co-chair of the Scientific Assessment Panel, and Ms. Helen Tope, co-chair of the Medical and Chemical Technical Options Committee, gave a presentation on the report. Mr. Newman said that the decline in carbon tetrachloride emissions resulting from control measures instituted following the ratification of the Montreal Protocol had been less than projected, leading to the conclusion that additional emissions had been occurring. The SPARC report had identified four main emission pathways: legacy emissions, for example from landfills containing discarded carbon tetrachloride; unreported inadvertent emissions from other sources; unreported non-feedstock emissions; and fugitive emissions from incineration, feedstock uses and process agent uses. The new emissions estimates for those pathways in the report had assisted in narrowing the discrepancy between bottom-up estimates and top-down emission calculations for carbon tetrachloride. Continuing the presentation, Ms. Tope said that further research was needed in order to tighten observation-derived top-down emissions estimates and that there was a need to develop improved methodologies for estimating bottom-up carbon tetrachloride emissions. In conclusion, she presented several recommendations, including the establishment of a working group or the holding of a workshop under the aegis of the assessment panels to further investigate the matter; and forwarding the “research direction suggestions” of the SPARC report to the Ozone Research Managers of the Vienna Convention for their consideration and evaluation.

83. In the ensuing discussion a number of representatives welcomed the report of the assessment panels. One representative, speaking on behalf of a group of parties, said that the report suffered from gaps, for example with regard to leakage of carbon tetrachloride that might occur during transport and storage or as a consequence of the diversion of the chemical from feedstock, process agent or laboratory and analytical uses to other uses. Another representative expressed concern that carbon tetrachloride emissions remained a large contributor to the destruction of the ozone layer. Several representatives welcomed the suggestion that the Ozone Secretariat forward research suggestions from the SPARC report to the Ozone Research Managers, although one said that, given current budgetary limitations, additional activities should be undertaken only if they did not have significant budgetary implications.

84. Responding to the matters raised, Mr. Newman said that the estimates in the report did in fact take into account leakage from transport and storage, which had been estimated at 4 to 5 per cent of the estimated amount being transported. They did not, however, include the diversion of carbon tetrachloride from feedstock, process agent or laboratory and analytical uses to other uses, because there were no available data on that. Available data, from observations at disparate sites around the globe used to measure broad regional values, indicated that most emissions came from industrial regions rather than population centres, but it was not possible to identify specific emissions sources.

85. The parties took note of the information presented.

X. Proposal to establish an ad hoc standards coordination group (UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.1/38/8, para. 92)

86. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that at the thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, China had introduced a conference room paper containing a draft decision on the establishment of an ad hoc standards coordination group, with the aim of improving coordination with relevant international and regional standards bodies on the revision and updating of international safety standards relevant to the use of alternative substances. The Working Group had agreed to forward the revised draft decision for consideration by the Meeting of the Parties at the current meeting. The draft decision was set out in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/2 (draft decision XXVIII/[B].)

87. The representative of China said that several parties had indicated they would discuss the matter with standards organizations in their own countries and provide feedback at the current meeting. Several representatives, including one speaking on behalf of a group of countries, said that the issue was an important one of relevance to the discussions on the proposed amendment to the Protocol and that they wished to discuss it further.

88. It was agreed that interested parties would meet to discuss the matter informally and report to the Meeting of the Parties on the outcome of their discussions.

89. [To be completed]

XI. Compliance and data reporting issues: presentation on and consideration of the work and recommended decisions of the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol

90. The President of the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol, Mr. Iftikhar Ul-Hassan Shah (Pakistan), presented a report on the outcomes of the fifty-sixth and fifty-seventh meetings of the Committee, providing an overview of the three draft decisions that the Committee had approved for consideration by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties. He observed that the work of the Committee at the two meetings had been lighter than in the recent past, which was attributable to the high level of compliance by parties with their obligations under the Montreal Protocol.

91. Turning to the draft decisions, he said that the first related to Israel's non-compliance with its data and information reporting obligations in respect of its use of ozone-depleting substances as process agents in 2014 and 2015, as required under paragraph 4 (a) of decision X/14, as updated by decision XXIII/7, and the measures it had in place to avoid the diversion to unauthorized uses of 17.3 ODP-tonnes of excess production of bromochloromethane stockpiled in 2014, as required by paragraph 3 of decision XXII/20. The party had not responded to the Committee's recommendations that it provide the outstanding information and was requested in the decision to do by 31 March 2017.

92. The second draft decision, on data and information provided by the parties in accordance with Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, addressed the key obligation to report annual production and consumption data of ozone-depleting substances under article 7 of the Protocol. Of 197 parties, 8 had not reported such data for 2015 by the time the Committee had considered the issue at its fifty-seventh meeting and by the deadline of 30 September 2016. Hungary, Latvia and Romania, however, had subsequently submitted their data. Thus, 192 of 197 parties had by the time of the current meeting reported their production and consumption data for 2015, a figure comparable to the 193 parties that had reported their data for the previous year by the time of the Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Parties. The draft decision urged the seven parties that had not submitted their data – Central African Republic, Iceland, Israel, Latvia, Romania, Uzbekistan and Yemen – to report it and thereby return to compliance. He also reported that, in accordance with decision XV/15, 119 parties had reported their

2015 data by 30 June 2016, representing a significant improvement on the 84 that had done so by the same date for the previous year. The Committee had therefore been able to review the compliance status of those parties early, completing a significant portion of its work at the fifty-sixth meeting. During the two meetings, the Committee had also reviewed the situation of non-compliance with data-reporting obligations by the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominica, Somalia and Yemen, which had not reported article 7 data for 2014 by the time of the Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Parties. In accordance with decision XXVII/9, those parties had since submitted their outstanding data and were therefore in compliance with the control measures for 2014.

93. The third decision related to Guatemala's non-compliance with its commitment – in its plan of action in decision XXVI/16 – to reduce its consumption of HCFCs to no more than 4.35 ODP-tonnes in 2014; its 2014 consumption of 4.74 ODP-tonnes placed it in non-compliance, but the party had returned to compliance in 2015. The draft decision noted that fact with appreciation and urged the party to work with the relevant implementing agencies to implement the remainder of its plan of action in decision XXVI/16.

94. He also noted that the Committee had continued to closely monitor the return to compliance of parties previously found to be in non-compliance, and he reported that all save one had complied with their obligations for 2015. In response to decision XXIV/14, in which parties were requested to specify zero quantities in their Article 7 data reporting forms rather than leaving cells blank, all parties failing to do so for 2014 had responded to the secretariat's request for clarification on the matter, while for 2015 a small number of parties had yet to provide such clarification. The practice of leaving cells blank raised questions with regard to data, and the Committee therefore urged all parties to enter a number in each cell in data reporting forms rather than leaving them blank. The Committee would continue to keep the matter under review.

95. At its fifty-sixth meeting, he added, the Committee had also considered the establishment of a licensing system by South Sudan. The Committee had noted with appreciation the party's efforts to that end and congratulated it on the establishment and operation of such a system. Lastly, Fiji had recently submitted a request for a change in its baseline data for HCFC consumption. The Committee had noted with appreciation the participation by the representative of the party at its fifty-seventh meeting to provide information, but in view of the late submission of the request and the large volume of information to be considered, the Committee had agreed to defer consideration of the matter to its fifty-eighth meeting.

96. In closing, he reiterated the observations of many of his predecessors that the ozone community had built a compliance regime that was widely respected and regarded as a model to be emulated. While 2015 had been expected to be a challenging year – with a 10 per cent step-down target for Article 5 parties and a 90 per cent target for non-Article 5 parties – the small number of cases of non-compliance testified to the commitment of parties to meet their obligations under the Protocol. He expressed confidence that with the support of the parties, the Committee would continue to provide the necessary support, noting that its work was greatly assisted by the participation of representatives of the Multilateral Fund and the implementing agencies, whose hard work with Article 5 parties to ensure they remained compliant was deeply appreciated. He also expressed appreciation to the Ozone Secretariat and all his colleagues in the Committee.

97. The parties agreed to forward the draft decisions from the Implementation Committee for consideration and adoption during the high-level segment.

XII. Membership of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel

98. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair said that information on the membership of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its technical options committees had been included in volume 1 of the Panel's June 2016 progress report. An updated table listing the co-chairs and members whose membership would expire in 2016 was set out in the addendum to the note by the secretariat on matters for discussion at the current meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/2/Add.1, annex III), and the parties needed to elect their successors taking into account the expertise required and the need for gender and geographical balance. Nominations had so far been received from two parties: Brazil had nominated Mr. Paulo Altoé, currently a member of the Flexible and Rigid Foams Technical Options Committee, to serve as the committee's co-chair and as a member of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel, and India had nominated Mr. Rajendra Shende to serve as a senior expert member of the Panel. He requested parties, led by India and Brazil, to discuss the matter in the margins of the current meeting and to submit a draft decision for consideration and possible adoption by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties.

99. [To be completed]

XIII. Issues related to the phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (decision XXVII/5)

100. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that at the thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel had presented a report that responded to decision XXVII/5, concluding that there was some uncertainty about the need for HCFCs for essential uses after 2020, for servicing existing refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment by non-Article 5 parties and for production to cover the basic domestic needs of Article 5 parties. The Working Group had requested the Panel to continue its work on the matter and had agreed that any interested parties that had developed relevant proposals could submit them for consideration at the current meeting.

101. In the ensuing discussion, one representative said that a small group of interested parties had discussed the matter informally at the thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and intersessionally and intended to submit a conference room paper requesting the Panel to provide additional information to the parties on the need for HCFCs for the uses identified. Another representative said that discussions at the thirty-eighth meeting on the linkages between the HCFC phase-out and the HFC phasedown had resulted in an agreed text of relevance to the calculation of future HCFC needs, and that the agreed text should be reflected in any future report on the matter.

102. Subsequently, the representative of Canada presented a draft decision submitted by Australia, Canada, Japan and the United States of America. She recalled that by paragraphs 12–14 of decision XIX/6 the Meeting of the Parties had agreed to continue consideration of whether there was a continuing need for HCFCs for essential uses after 2020, for servicing existing refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment by non-Article 5 parties and for production to cover the basic domestic needs of Article 5 parties and that by decision XXVII/5 it had requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel to provide information to the parties on those issues. The draft decision requested the Panel to continue to consider those issues and to report on the matter to the Open-ended Working Group in 2017.

103. In the ensuing discussion, a number of parties asked for clarification on certain aspects of the proposed draft decision. One representative, supported by others, asked whether non-Article 5 parties would need to continue production of HCFCs after 2020 or whether basic domestic needs could be met by HCFCs produced in Article 5 parties. Several representatives said that greater clarity was needed in the terminology used in the draft decision, for example with regard to the monitoring of HCFC production by the Panel. One representative said that it was important to take the necessary regulatory measures to ensure a continued supply of ozone-depleting substances for laboratory and analytical uses.

104. Responding to the issues raised, the representative of Australia said that the draft decision merely continued the activities called for in decision XXVII/5, in which the Meeting of the Parties had requested the Panel to undertake the work outlined in the draft decision. The draft decision simply aimed to provide for the gathering of information to guide the parties in their further decision-making about the continued need for HCFCs for essential uses for non-Article 5 parties, as well as servicing requirements other than in the air-conditioning and refrigeration sectors for non-Article 5 parties and to meet the basic domestic needs of Article 5 parties after 2020.

105. The parties agreed that interested parties would discuss the matter informally and report to the Meeting of the Parties on the outcome of those discussions.

106. [To be completed]

XIV. Availability of recovered, recycled or reclaimed halons (decision XXVI/7)

107. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair recalled that the availability of recovered, recycled or reclaimed halons had been discussed at the thirty-eighth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, as summarized in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/2. No specific proposals on the matter, however, had been submitted by parties.

108. In the absence of any proposals at the current meeting, the item was not considered further.

XV. Other matters

Financial and technical assistance for the phasedown of HFCs

109. The representative of the United Arab Emirates reported that his country would introduce a draft decision for discussion at Montreal Protocol meetings in 2017. His country, he said, had been among the first to ratify the Vienna Convention and Montreal Protocol, had been active in timely phasing out ozone-depleting substances and had ratified all the amendments to the Protocol. It had achieved all that without receiving financial or technical assistance from the Multilateral Fund, despite being eligible under Articles 5 and 10 of the Protocol. The party was proud to have hosted the Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Parties, at which the Dubai pathway had been adopted. It fully supported the phasedown of HFCs but feared that such a phasedown would pose additional challenges beyond the original scope of the Montreal Protocol and that it, as a high-ambient-temperature country, would be particularly affected. His country would be unable to meet those challenges by itself, and he therefore wished to discuss its eligibility for technical and financial assistance during the meetings in 2017.

110. A number of other representatives said that the issue was an important one affecting other members of the Gulf Cooperation Council.

111. It was agreed that the statement of the representative of the United Arab Emirates would be reflected in the present report and that the matter would be included on the agenda for the next meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group.

Part two: High-level segment (13 and 14 October 2016)

I. Opening of the high-level segment

112. [To be completed]

A. Statements by the representative(s) of the Government of Rwanda

113. [To be completed]

B. Statement(s) by representative(s) of the United Nations Environment Programme

114. [To be completed]

C. Statement by the President of the Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

115. [To be completed]

II. Organizational matters

A. Election of officers of the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

116. [To be completed]

B. Adoption of the agenda of the high-level segment of the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

117. [To be completed]

C. Organization of work

118. [To be completed]

D. Credentials of representatives

119. [To be completed]

III. Presentations by the assessment panels on progress in their work and any emerging issues

120. [To be completed]

IV. Presentation by the Chair of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation on the work of the Executive Committee, the Multilateral Fund secretariat and the Fund's implementing agencies

121. [To be completed]

V. Statements by heads of delegation and discussion on key topics

122. [To be completed]

VI. Report by the co-chairs of the preparatory segment and consideration of the decisions recommended for adoption by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties

123. [To be completed]

VII. Dates and venues for the Twenty-Ninth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

124. [To be completed]

VIII. Other matters

125. [To be completed]

IX. Adoption of decisions by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol

126. [To be completed]

X. Adoption of the report

127. [To be completed]

XI. Closure of the meeting

128. [To be completed]
