



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.: General
29 July 2026

Original: English

General Assembly

Eighty-first session

Item 130 of the provisional agenda*

International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

Security Council

Eighty-first year

International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

Note by the Secretary-General

The Secretary-General has the honour to transmit to the members of the General Assembly and of the Security Council the fourteenth annual report of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, submitted by the President of the Mechanism in accordance with article 32 (1) of the statute of the Mechanism (see Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), annex 1).

* [A/81/150](#).



Letter of transmittal

Letter dated 29 July 2026 from the President of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals addressed to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to submit the fourteenth annual report of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, dated 29 July 2026, to the General Assembly and to the Security Council, pursuant to article 32 (1) of the statute of the Mechanism.

(Signed) Graciela **Gatti Santana**
President

Summary

Fourteenth annual report of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

The present report outlines the activities of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals from 1 July 2025 to 30 June 2026.

The reporting period included the Security Council's sixth review of the progress of the work of the Mechanism. To facilitate this process, the Council received three key inputs: (a) the Secretary-General's reports on options for the transfer of three long-term functions of the Mechanism; (b) the evaluation of the Mechanism's methods and work by the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS); and (c) the sixth review report of the Mechanism, including a comprehensive strategic plan providing options for the transfer or completion of the Mechanism's functions.

As detailed in the present report, the inputs from the Secretary-General, OIOS and the Mechanism reflect the continuing relevance and necessity of certain functions of the Mechanism. They highlight that the Security Council may take decisions to transfer and complete certain Mechanism functions and make changes to the Mechanism's mandated architecture that would radically reduce its activities and resource requirements. The Mechanism stands ready to implement any decision taken by the Council and to facilitate the responsible conclusion of the justice cycle.

In parallel to contributing to activities aimed at assisting the Security Council in its sixth review, the Mechanism's President, the Chambers, the Office of the Prosecutor and the Registry continued to effectively implement their respective mandates in relation to residual judicial work, supervision of sentence enforcement, witness protection, management of the archives and assistance to national jurisdictions.

On 30 June 2026, the Secretary-General reappointed the President, judges and Registrar for a two-year term, subject to any future decisions of the Security Council regarding the Mechanism and the availability of funding. In the absence of a Council decision appointing the Prosecutor, the Prosecutor's powers and duties have been assumed by the officer-in-charge of the Office of the Prosecutor at each branch of the Mechanism. The Mechanism continues to fulfil all its statutory obligations.

I. Introduction

1. During the period from 1 July 2025 to 30 June 2026, the Mechanism continued to discharge its mandated functions. At the same time, a key focus of this period was identifying options for transferring and completing functions of the Mechanism, as well as evaluating the Mechanism's overall alignment with the Security Council's vision of a small, temporary and efficient structure, whose functions and size will diminish over time, with a small number of staff commensurate with its reduced functions (see section III of the present report).
2. The Mechanism's judicial work continued apace during the reporting period. The President and judges issued a total of 182 decisions and orders, addressing matters related to access to confidential information and witness protection, supervision of sentence enforcement, contempt of court and ancillary matters in the case of *Prosecutor v. Félicien Kabuga*. The Mechanism also continued to monitor two referred cases and disposed of judicial and administrative matters related to the acquitted and released persons in the Niger.
3. The Prosecution sustained its support to national jurisdictions pursuing accountability for international crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, while also performing residual prosecutorial functions in connection with certain judicial matters.
4. The Registry continued to provide administrative and operational support for the Mechanism's core mandated activities, including managing the Mechanism's archives and those of the ad hoc Tribunals and implementing witness protection measures. The Registry also ensured timely and effective quality services for the Mechanism and engaged in measures to cultivate staff development and morale.
5. On 15 June 2026, the Secretary-General appointed Judge Joyce Kavuma (Uganda) to a vacant position on the Mechanism's judicial roster. According to Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), which established the Mechanism, the Mechanism shall continue to operate for subsequent periods of two years following each review, unless the Council decides otherwise. Consequently, and as provided for by the statute of the Mechanism, on 30 June 2026, the Secretary-General reappointed all 25 judges on the Mechanism's judicial roster, including the President, and also reappointed the Registrar. All reappointments are for a two-year term subject to any future decisions of the Security Council regarding the Mechanism and the availability of funding.
6. The Secretary-General also informed the Security Council that, pending a decision by the Council on the appointment of the Prosecutor, the Prosecutor's powers and duties would continue to be discharged through the relevant officer-in-charge of the Office of the Prosecutor at each branch of the Mechanism, in accordance with the Mechanism's statute and applicable rules.

II. Organization

7. The Mechanism was established by Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#) and began operations on 1 July 2012. The Mechanism comprises two branches: one in Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, and another in The Hague, Kingdom of the Netherlands. It operates through three organs – the Chambers, the Office of the Prosecutor and the Registry – each led by a full-time Principal. During the reporting period, the Principals were the President, Graciela Gatti Santana, the Prosecutor, Serge Brammertz, and the Registrar, Abubacarr M. Tambadou.

8. The statute provides that the Mechanism shall have a roster of 25 independent judges who shall, insofar as possible and as decided by the President, exercise their functions remotely. The judges are not remunerated for being on the judicial roster but receive compensation only for the days on which they exercise their functions, as assigned by the President.

9. The Mechanism's current judicial roster comprises (in order of precedence): Judge Graciela Gatti Santana, President (Uruguay), Judge Jean-Claude Antonetti (France), Judge Joseph E. Chiondo Masanche (United Republic of Tanzania), Judge William H. Sekule (United Republic of Tanzania), Judge Lee G. Muthoga (Kenya), Judge Carmel Agius (Malta), Judge Alphons Orie (Netherlands), Judge Burton Hall (Bahamas), Judge Florence Rita Arrey (Cameroon), Judge Vagn Prüsse Joensen (Denmark), Judge Liu Daqun (China), Judge Prisca Matimba Nyambe (Zambia), Judge Aminatta Lois Runeni N'gum (Gambia/Zimbabwe), Judge Seon Ki Park (Republic of Korea), Judge José Ricardo de Prada Solaesa (Spain), Judge Ivo Nelson de Caires Batista Rosa (Portugal), Judge Seymour Panton (Jamaica), Judge Yusuf Aksar (Türkiye), Judge Mustapha El Baaj (Morocco), Judge Claudia Hoefer (Germany), Judge Iain Bonomy (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Judge Fatimata Sanou Touré (Burkina Faso), Judge Margaret M. deGuzman (United States of America), Judge René José Andriatianarivelo (Madagascar) and Judge Joyce Kavuma (Uganda).

10. In September 2025, the President convened the Mechanism's third virtual plenary, with judges in attendance from 18 countries.

III. Planning for the future

11. The Mechanism engaged in several parallel processes during the reporting period to facilitate the Security Council's sixth review of the progress of its work. This included: (a) continuing to support the Secretary-General in the preparation of two reports – requested by the Council in its resolution 2740 (2024) – that assess options for the transfer of three key ongoing functions of the Mechanism; (b) supporting the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) in its evaluation of the Mechanism's methods and work; and (c) submitting the Mechanism's sixth review report, including a strategic plan outlining options for the transfer or completion of the Mechanism's functions. Relatedly, the Mechanism engaged in a comprehensive civilian staffing review, conducted by the Human Resources Services Division of the Department of Operational Support.

12. Specifically, and following extensive collaboration among the Mechanism, the Office of Legal Affairs and the Secretary-General, the Secretary-General issued two reports on 1 December 2025 (S/2025/785 and S/2025/786). The reports focus on assessing options for transferring functions that would allow for significant reductions in the size and activities of the Mechanism, while ensuring that the legitimacy and credibility of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism are upheld. The reports propose transferring the technical functions related to the Prosecution's assistance to national jurisdictions and the management of the archives to the United Nations Secretariat. The Secretary-General further recommends that, where appropriate, the day-to-day supervision of conditions of imprisonment be transferred to enforcement States, which already oversee convicted persons on a daily basis.

13. By contrast, the Secretary-General considers that the judicial authority to order the transfer of prisoners, designate enforcement States and decide on applications for pardon, commutation of sentence or early release should remain at the international level, with the continued involvement of the President, the Mechanism judges and

essential support staff. This preserves fair and consistent treatment of prisoners irrespective of their location.

14. Following the issuance of the Secretary-General's reports, OIOS finalized its evaluation of the Mechanism's methods and work and issued its report on 27 February 2026 ([S/2026/100](#)). OIOS observed that Member States and other stakeholders largely affirmed the continued relevance of the Mechanism's mandated activities, as implemented across five core modalities, namely: (a) judicial activities; (b) supervision of enforcement of sentences; (c) protection of victims and witnesses; (d) archives management; and (e) assistance to national jurisdictions. OIOS highlighted that the Mechanism continued to effectively execute its mandate despite sustained downsizing and resource reductions since 2021 that represented a decline in budget appropriations of more than 40 per cent and in staffing of more than 43 per cent.

15. At the same time, OIOS noted that the Mechanism's ability to evolve into and function as a "small, temporary and efficient structure", as envisioned by the Security Council, was hampered by its mandated architecture and organization. The statute provides for three organs across two branches, which has limited the Mechanism's ability to reallocate resources in response to changing workloads and constrained opportunities for consolidation and cost savings.

16. Building upon the reports of the Secretary-General and the OIOS evaluation, the Mechanism submitted to the Security Council on 12 May 2026 its sixth review report,¹ which includes a strategic plan that presents the unified vision of the Principals for the future of the Mechanism and its functions. The strategic plan envisages changes to the Mechanism's mandate, which could lead to the completion and transfer of several of its most resource-intensive functions, and significant streamlining through organizational restructuring and physical consolidation. Through the proposed changes, the strategic plan provides that, by 1 July 2028, the Mechanism would be able to reduce staffing levels by approximately 87–89 per cent compared with 31 December 2026 and achieve corresponding and significant cost savings. This significantly reduced Mechanism would continue to support a limited number of judicial functions recommended to remain at the international level as the Mechanism moves towards closure.

17. In parallel to these planning efforts, the Mechanism engaged with the Human Resources Services Division, which completed its comprehensive civilian staffing review of the Mechanism in March 2026. The scope of the staffing review was to ascertain whether the Mechanism's staffing, in terms of number of posts, functions and structure, is commensurate with its residual functions and aligned with its mandate and strategic priorities. The staffing review also sought to provide a road map for achieving further efficiencies and staff reductions. The Division proposed various scenarios aimed at organizational restructuring as well as streamlining operations and reporting lines, while orienting staffing resources to support the Mechanism's core functions.

18. The Mechanism is grateful for the support received from the Office of Legal Affairs, the Secretary-General, OIOS and the Human Resources Services Division and remains committed to expeditiously implementing any decision taken by the Security Council in relation to its mandate.

¹ [S/2026/496](#).

IV. Relocation of acquitted or released persons

19. Despite the Mechanism's sustained diplomatic efforts, the situation of the four acquitted or released persons relocated to the Niger since 2021 remains unresolved, continuing to affect the rights and freedom of the individuals concerned.

20. The President continued to raise this issue in bilateral meetings with Member States, the Security Council and its Informal Working Group on International Tribunals, and the General Assembly, calling for tangible support.

21. In parallel, the Registrar led efforts to identify possible resettlement options for the relocated persons, monitor their situation to ensure respect for fundamental rights, and engage with the national authorities in the Niger regarding the regularization of their stay. Moreover, the Registrar continued to implement judicial orders related to the relocated persons. This includes filing regular reports to the President on the steps taken to find a solution to the matter, covering the cost of the lease for the relocated persons' accommodation, and paying a yearly lump sum to support their daily living expenses.

22. On 21 November 2025, a single judge determined that, after 31 December 2026, the Mechanism no longer has a legal and judicial obligation to provide financial assistance to the relocated persons, while they remain in the Niger, as part of its general duty of care towards them. Pursuant to this decision, the Registry will continue to provide financial support to the acquitted and released persons and monitor their situation in the Niger until 31 December 2026.²

23. The situation of the relocated persons, however, cannot be resolved by the Mechanism alone. With the forthcoming conclusion of the Mechanism's duty of care in relation to the relocated persons, continued cooperation by Member States is required to secure a durable solution.

V. Activities of the President and the Chambers

A. Principal activities of the President

24. The President is the institutional head and highest authority of the Mechanism, responsible for the overall execution of its mandate. Pursuant to the statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, she coordinates the work of the Chambers, presides over the Appeals Chamber, supervises the activities of the Registry, and carries out other functions specified in the Mechanism's legal framework. The President represents the Mechanism before the Security Council and the General Assembly and performs other representational functions vis-à-vis Member States, United Nations entities and other external stakeholders. The President is supported by a small team of legal and administrative staff at both branches.

25. The President continued to focus on the Security Council's call, in resolution [2740 \(2024\)](#), for the expeditious completion and possible transfer of the Mechanism's residual functions. To promote effective governance, the President continued to encourage close collaboration among the Principals and senior management. She chaired the Mechanism Coordination Council and other meetings on strategic and cross-cutting issues, including future planning and budgetary matters. She held frequent bilateral consultations with the Registrar to address areas of shared

² *In the Matter of François-Xavier Nzuwonemeye et al.*, Case No. MICT-22-124, Decision in Relation to the Order to Show Cause and Motions for an Order for Additional Subsistence Funds, 21 November 2025.

responsibility. These efforts culminated most notably in the above-mentioned strategic plan.

26. In an effort to further reduce activities and expenditure, the President proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure and Evidence aimed at limiting the likelihood of certain resource-intensive proceedings, while ensuring full respect for fair trial rights and the protection of victims and witnesses. The Mechanism's judges adopted amendments based on these proposals during their virtual plenary in September 2025.

27. To facilitate the eventual closure of the United Nations Detention Unit, the President also secured the agreement of two current enforcement States to consider providing contingency detention arrangements on a case-by-case basis should the need arise in the future.

28. In addition, the President reduced staffing levels in her Office and the Chambers Legal Support Section by a combined 23 per cent for 2026. Nevertheless, by adapting working methods in line with principles of the UN80 Initiative, the reduced teams continued to manage a workload that has remained steady and, in some areas, has even increased.

29. Demonstrating commitment to transparent leadership, the President, together with the other two Principals, held a virtual town hall for all staff in February 2026, engaged regularly with the Staff Union and kept staff informed of key developments through internal communications.

30. The President attaches great importance to safeguarding the Mechanism's legacy, disseminating information about the work of the Mechanism and the ad hoc Tribunals, and ensuring maximum accessibility to their public judicial records. In July 2025, she participated in several formal events marking the thirtieth commemoration of the 1995 genocide in Srebrenica, including the official ceremony in Potočari. Relatedly, in November 2025, the President spoke at an international conference entitled "Srebrenica: three decades fighting for the truth, justice and the future". The President also participated in relevant panel discussions and continued to endorse educational activities undertaken by the Mechanism's Information Programme for Affected Communities, funded by the European Union.

31. Pursuant to article 32 of the statute, the President reported to the Security Council and the General Assembly. She submitted the Mechanism's thirteenth annual report to the General Assembly and the Security Council in July 2025 ([A/80/275-S/2025/491](#)) and briefed the Assembly in October 2025. The twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth reports on the Mechanism's progress were submitted to the Council in November 2025 ([S/2025/749](#)) and May 2026 ([S/2026/421](#)). The President submitted the Mechanism's sixth review report in May 2026. The President briefed the Council and its Working Group in December 2025 and June 2026.

32. Turning to the President's judicial activity, supervising the enforcement of sentences and matters of release remained central activities. Having consulted with other judges, as required by rule 150 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, the President issued 10 decisions on applications for early release, 1 decision on an application for provisional release of a convicted person who remains in the United Nations Detention Unit, and 28 related orders and decisions. The President also issued one decision on sentence remission and three decisions on the transfer of convicted persons for medical and other reasons. As at 30 June 2026, the President had nine pending applications deriving from her responsibility to supervise the enforcement of sentences.

B. Trials, appeals and review proceedings

33. During its final hearing on 20 May 2026, the Trial Chamber terminated the proceedings in the *Kabuga* case, following Mr. Kabuga's death on 16 May 2026 while hospitalized in the custody of the Mechanism in The Hague. Prior to that, the case remained indefinitely stayed, with the Trial Chamber focused on matters relating to monitoring his health, considering his possible release and exploring the recovery of legal aid funds expended in connection with his defence. The Trial Chamber held two status conferences – on 25 September and 17 December 2025 – to discuss these issues and enquire into Mr. Kabuga's conditions of detention.

34. Throughout the reporting period, the Trial Chamber issued a total of 15 related orders and decisions, including in relation to Mr. Kabuga's ability to travel safely to Rwanda. After considering expert evidence, the Trial Chamber determined on 14 November 2025 that Mr. Kabuga was not fit to fly to Rwanda and requested nearby European States, especially those where he had sought provisional release, to reconsider accepting him based on his medical situation. The Prosecution appealed this decision and sought alternative relief, which the Appeals Chamber dismissed on 28 April 2026.

C. Other judicial activities

35. The Mechanism's contempt matters concerning the former Yugoslavia are limited to the case against Petar Jojić and Vjerica Radeta. Serbia continues to refuse to arrest and surrender the accused to the Mechanism.

36. In relation to Rwanda, on 7 November 2025, a single judge referred the criminal contempt case against Peter Robinson to the United States of America for disciplinary proceedings. The Appeals Chamber is currently seized of an appeal against the referral of the case.

37. In relation to fugitives of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, on 14 August and 2 September 2025, respectively, Fulgence Kayishema filed before the Mechanism requests for the revocation of the referral of his case to Rwanda and for the assignment of counsel remunerated under the Mechanism's legal aid system. In decisions issued on 29 October and 24 December 2025, the Trial Chamber dismissed Mr. Kayishema's requests in their entirety. On 8 January 2026, Mr. Kayishema filed an appeal and, on 24 March 2026, the Appeals Chamber dismissed the appeal in its entirety.

38. As to further activities of single judges, 15 were assigned to applications arising at either branch. Those applications concerned requests for variation of witness protection measures and access to confidential material for the purpose of assisting national jurisdictions, allegations of contempt, changes in the classification of filings, requests for assistance and relocation of acquitted or released persons. Collectively, 70 decisions and orders were issued by single judges during the reporting period. As at 30 June 2026, there were no matters pending before single judges.

39. Overall, the Appeals Chamber issued six decisions and orders during the reporting period.

VI. Activities of the Office of the Prosecutor³

A. Introduction

40. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor focused its efforts on two primary priorities. First, the Office continued to fulfil its statutory mandates, particularly by assisting national jurisdictions prosecuting international crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda and effectively litigating mandated residual matters before the Mechanism. Second, the Office planned and prepared options and information for the Security Council regarding the completion or transfer of residual functions as part of steps towards the Mechanism's orderly closure.

41. During the reporting period, the Office litigated matters in the *Kabuga* case and the case of *Prosecutor v. Fulgence Kayishema*. The Office also provided extensive support and assistance to national authorities investigating and prosecuting international crimes committed in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. As reported by OIOS in its most recent assessment,⁴ Member State representatives interviewed consistently underscored the practical indispensability of the Office of the Prosecutor in supporting domestic proceedings.

42. The Office also made significant progress in planning for the Mechanism's future and providing relevant information to the Security Council. OIOS assessed that the Office had provided clear and detailed proposals for the transfer of the assistance to national jurisdictions function and reported that Member States recognized the importance of assistance for prosecution and accountability at the national level and supported the retention of the assistance to national jurisdictions function within the United Nations. As the Office has previously noted, its assistance to national jurisdictions function is a technical function that involves complex operational engagement with Member State clients. Providing technical assistance and operational support to Member States are core activities of the United Nations Secretariat, with which the assistance to national jurisdictions function naturally and seamlessly aligns. As OIOS reported, Member States said that even if the Mechanism were to close in the next few years, the function should remain within a United Nations entity, highlighting that the services provided by the Office required vast amounts of knowledge and evidence that would otherwise be unobtainable to national jurisdictions. The Office also provided information to the Council regarding the transfer or completion of other residual functions.

43. In managing its work, the Office is guided by the views and requests of the Security Council as set forth in resolutions [2256 \(2015\)](#), [2529 \(2020\)](#), [2637 \(2022\)](#) and [2740 \(2024\)](#), among others. The Office continued to implement the "one office" policy to further streamline operations and reduce costs. Between November 2021 and December 2026, the Office will have reduced its staffing by 55 per cent.

B. Residual prosecutorial functions

44. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor litigated and addressed some residual matters.

45. With respect to the *Kabuga* case, which was indefinitely stayed on 8 September 2023, the Office continued to make submissions in relation to the Trial Chamber's consideration of the potential provisional release of Mr. Kabuga. The Office took the position that the only country willing and able to accept Mr. Kabuga was Rwanda, his

³ The present section reflects the views of the Prosecutor of the Mechanism.

⁴ [S/2026/100](#).

country of origin. Mr. Kabuga passed away on 16 May 2026 and the proceedings against him were terminated on 20 May 2026.

46. With respect to the referred case of *Prosecutor v. Fulgence Kayishema*, which is to be tried in Rwanda, Mr. Kayishema was arrested on 24 May 2023 but remains in South African custody. The Office is concerned that Mr. Kayishema continues to litigate matters before the Mechanism without submitting to its jurisdiction by surrendering to the Mechanism's custody. At the same time, he seeks to prevent execution of the Mechanism's arrest warrant and manufacture a standstill in the separate proceedings before the Mechanism and before South African courts by playing the two jurisdictions against each other. The Office calls on South Africa to immediately surrender Mr. Kayishema to the Mechanism.

47. On 14 August 2025, Mr. Kayishema filed his request for revocation of the referral of his case to Rwanda for trial, which the Office opposed. On 29 October 2025, the Trial Chamber issued its decision denying three of the four grounds raised by Mr. Kayishema. On 24 December 2025, the Trial Chamber issued its decision denying the remaining ground. On 8 January 2026, Mr. Kayishema filed his notice of appeal against the Trial Chamber's decisions. On 24 March 2026, the Appeals Chamber issued its decision dismissing Mr. Kayishema's appeal.

48. Mr. Kayishema also continued to delay proceedings in South Africa by playing the Mechanism and South African courts against each other. Mr. Kayishema was first brought before a South African court on 15 August 2023. In October 2024, Mr. Kayishema requested a delay in the South African proceedings so that he could request the Mechanism to revoke the referral of his case to Rwanda for trial. This request was granted and the South African court imposed a deadline of 28 February 2025 to file the revocation request before the Mechanism, which Mr. Kayishema did not disclose to the Mechanism. After Mr. Kayishema failed to meet this deadline, he requested a further delay in the South African proceedings until 26 March 2026, which was granted. On 26 March 2026, the South African proceedings were delayed again until 18 June 2026, and then postponed again.

49. With respect to applications by convicted persons for early release, the Office, during the reporting period, provided comments and information in relation to three such applications.

C. Assistance to national jurisdictions

50. National prosecutions remain essential to achieving greater justice for the victims of war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide committed in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. In line with the completion strategies of the ad hoc Tribunals, Security Council resolutions [1966 \(2010\)](#) and [2256 \(2015\)](#), and the statute, the Office of the Prosecutor is mandated to assist and support national prosecutions of those crimes. In the affected countries, the effective prosecution of the crimes committed is fundamental to building and sustaining the rule of law, establishing the truth of what occurred and promoting reconciliation. Third-party States are also undertaking prosecutions against suspects who are present in their territories for crimes committed in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia.

51. While progress has been made at the domestic level in recent years, particularly with the Office's assistance, national prosecutors still face a large backlog of cases to process. There are more than 1,000 fugitive Rwandan *génocidaires* to be located and prosecuted. Likewise, thousands of war crimes suspects throughout the countries of the former Yugoslavia remain to be prosecuted. The Office supports this work by responding to requests for assistance from national judiciaries.

52. Following its evaluation of the Office's support to national jurisdictions, OIOS concluded that Member States considered the continuation of the national assistance function to be important for five key reasons: (a) irreplaceable institutional memory, as the Office of the Prosecutor retains long-standing knowledge of cases, their historical context and cross-jurisdictional linkages; (b) unique evidence handling, given the Office's centralized databases and records, which provide access to large volumes of material maintained under established standards that support integrity and reliability; (c) specialized operational skills, including expertise in fugitive tracking, investigative strategy, multi-jurisdictional coordination and mentoring of national teams; (d) perceived international authority and trust, as few other national institutions are seen as having comparable credibility and authority; and (e) time-sensitive expertise, as delays caused by transferring responsibilities risk compromising ongoing prosecutions and weakening prospects for accountability as time passes.⁵ OIOS further found that the Office took specific measures to ensure its efforts had high value and impact, and concluded that the Office embedded case and strategic prioritization within delivery, through sustained partnerships with national prosecutors in Rwanda and the Western Balkans, and through cooperation with European Union member States and other States.⁶

53. During the reporting period, the Office continued to receive a high volume of requests for assistance, totalling 373 requests. In relation to Rwanda, the Office received and processed 53 requests for assistance from nine Member States. This included responding to 26 requests for direct case assistance. As part of this work, the Office assisted the Prosecutor General of Rwanda to collect, collate and analyse information and confirm the whereabouts and status of three fugitives. In relation to the former Yugoslavia, the Office received 320 requests for assistance from 10 Member States and two international organizations. In total, the Office handed over more than 6,000 documents, comprising 209,160 pages, and 171 audiovisual records. The Office responded to 43 direct case assistance requests from six Member States. This work entailed the preparation of 17 legal and analytical memorandums and reports, as well as the holding of 15 operational meetings with national prosecution offices. Upon the request of Member States, the Office also used its good offices and held two meetings with witnesses to secure their cooperation for national proceedings. Lastly, the Office filed submissions in relation to access by national authorities to the evidence of 25 judicially protected witnesses.

54. The Office is grateful to OIOS and Member States for the positive assessment of the Office's work assisting national accountability efforts. The continued high volume of requests from Member States for assistance demonstrates the importance of the support provided by the Office to national prosecutions. The Office recognizes that significant change at the Mechanism is urgently needed and that the Mechanism's activities should be brought to an orderly closure. Transferring the assistance to national jurisdictions function to the United Nations Secretariat responsibly addresses both Member States' continuing needs and the strategic imperative for the transformation of the Mechanism.

VII. Activities of the Registry

55. Pursuant to rule 31 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, the Registrar, under the authority of the President, is responsible for the administration and servicing of

⁵ S/2026/100, para. 55.

⁶ Ibid., para. 48.

the Mechanism, including judicial support services, as well as other administrative, budgetary, legal, policy and diplomatic support to Mechanism operations.

A. Budget, administration, staffing and facilities

56. By its resolution [80/239](#), the General Assembly appropriated to the special account for the Mechanism a total amount of \$56,126,600 gross (\$51,268,200 net) for 2026.

57. The 2026 budget reflects significant reductions in post and non-post resources and the realization of efficiency measures. The Mechanism implemented the decision of the General Assembly⁷ regarding a reduction of \$107,700 in travel resources and continues to actively limit its overall expenditure. The process of preparing the Mechanism's 2027 budget submission may be impacted by a decision of the Security Council on the Mechanism's future.

58. On 30 June 2026, the Mechanism had a total of 199 staff on continuous posts and in general temporary assistance positions: 116 at the Hague branch and 83 at the Arusha branch, including 9 staff members of the Office of the Prosecutor located in Kigali. The Mechanism's staff comprises nationals of 50 Member States. At the Professional level and above, 54 per cent are women and 46 per cent are men, consistent with the Secretary-General's gender parity goals. When General Service and Field Service staff are taken into account, the average percentage of female staff is lower. The Mechanism remains committed to gender balance and equitable geographical representation, despite downsizing constraints.

59. The Mechanism continued to treat staff support as a matter of priority. The Mechanism provided access to professional staff counselling services through the Joint Medical Service at the United Nations Office at Nairobi. Furthermore, staff members were offered the possibility to utilize up to 10 working days of study leave for professional or personal development courses or to prepare for, and participate in, job interviews. A career transition event, organized by the gender focal points, was well received by staff across both branches.

60. Regarding the Arusha premises, the Mechanism remains committed to engaging with the host State in resolving a contractual dispute submitted by the general contractor.

61. Concerning the Hague branch, the host State and the Mechanism remain engaged in discussions regarding tenancy in the Churchillplein 1 premises. The host State and the Mechanism are working together to find appropriate housing solutions that align with the needs of the host State and the Mechanism's anticipated future operations in The Hague.

62. The Mechanism is deeply grateful to its host States, the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United Republic of Tanzania, for their long-standing commitment and invaluable support.

B. Support for judicial activities

63. The Registry continued to provide support to the Mechanism's residual judicial operations.

⁷ In its resolution [80/239](#), the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to this effect (see [A/80/570](#)).

64. The Registry supported ongoing and final judicial matters in the *Kabuga* case, including two status conferences and a hearing confirming termination of proceedings following the passing of Mr. Kabuga. In addition, in collaboration with the Trial Chamber, the Registry persisted in its efforts towards recovering legal aid funds provided to Mr. Kabuga, further to the Registrar's decision of non-indigence issued in October 2023.

65. Upon the passing of Mr. Kabuga, the Registry provided comprehensive support to the judge assigned to conduct an inquiry into the circumstances surrounding Mr. Kabuga's death while in custody of the United Nations Detention Unit.

66. During the reporting period, the Judicial Records Unit processed 1,464 judicial filings, amounting to 10,525 pages. The Unit also assessed all restricted-access records from the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism. The records had been maintained outside the judicial records databases due to their heightened sensitivity and subject to a decision by the President on their status.

67. As at 30 June 2026, over 381,772 public judicial records were available through the Unified Court Records database, which was accessed over 39,000 times during the reporting period.

68. The Language Support Services continued providing translation and interpretation services and made substantial headway in the translation of judgments and documents between English, French, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Kinyarwanda and other languages, as required. Four appeal judgments of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and one Mechanism review judgment were translated into Kinyarwanda. One appeal judgment of the Mechanism was translated into French.

69. In addition, the Registry provided administrative assistance to an average of 51 remunerated and pro bono defence and amici curiae teams, comprising a total of approximately 70 team members.

70. The Mechanism's only remaining courtroom in The Hague was decommissioned in December 2025, following the Registry's conversion of a conference room into a simplified courtroom.

C. Support for other mandated activities

1. Witness support and protection

71. Approximately 3,200 witnesses who appeared before the ad hoc Tribunals or the Mechanism currently benefit from protective measures. The Witness Support and Protection Unit at both branches ensures that these measures remain effective through threat assessments and security coordination with national jurisdictions, including for relocated witnesses. In support of national proceedings, the Unit implemented 32 judicial orders of variations of protective measures regarding 34 witnesses and handled one request to rescind protective measures. The Unit also provided witness-related information to the President concerning two early release applications impacting 212 witnesses.

72. In Arusha, the Witness Support and Protection Unit maintained close relations with the Rwandan authorities responsible for the provision of support to victims and witnesses, including medical assistance, ensuring that support was always available. The Unit also liaised with Rwandan authorities to facilitate meetings with detained witnesses.

73. At the Hague branch, the Witness Support and Protection Unit coordinated the appearance of a relocated witness before a national court on a cost-neutral basis and

assisted another jurisdiction in the withdrawal of relocation services that were no longer required for a witness. In addition, the Unit continued to liaise with national counterparts in the countries of the former Yugoslavia, to support local prosecutions and monitor the strategies implemented following the closure of the Sarajevo field office to ensure effective and continuous support of witnesses. One relocation request was submitted for a witness to be reunited with their relocated family.

2. Detention facilities

74. As at 30 June 2026, the United Nations Detention Unit in The Hague housed two convicted persons: Ratko Mladić, who remained in the Detention Unit pending the designation of an enforcement State; and Mićo Stanišić, who was returned temporarily from an enforcement State. During the reporting period, Jovica Stanišić was transferred to Germany to serve his sentence. Félicien Kabuga, who was detained pending the identification of a State for his provisional release, passed away on 16 May 2026 while hospitalized in the custody of the Mechanism in The Hague.

3. Enforcement of sentences

75. The Mechanism relies significantly on the cooperation of States in the enforcement of sentences. As at 30 June 2026, the Mechanism was overseeing the enforcement of the sentences of 36 individuals in eight enforcement States: 23 persons convicted based on indictments deriving from the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda were serving their sentences in two States, while 13 persons convicted on the basis of indictments issued by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia were serving their sentences in six States. The Mechanism is grateful for the ongoing support of the enforcement States, which is critical to the Mechanism's fulfilment of its mandate.

76. As at 30 June 2026, Ratko Mladić and Mićo Stanišić remain incarcerated in the United Nations Detention Unit. While considerable progress has been made with respect to the transfer of Mićo Stanišić, a willing enforcement State continues to be required for Ratko Mladić.

4. Assistance to national jurisdictions

77. During the reporting period, the Registry provided 1,117 records in response to 38 requests for assistance by national authorities or parties to national proceedings related to the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda or the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia.

5. Monitoring of referred cases

78. The Mechanism continued to monitor two contempt cases pursuant to article 6 (5) of the statute: the *Šešelj et al.* case, referred to Serbia on 29 February 2024, and the *François Ngirabatware* case, referred to Belgium on 17 September 2024.

79. Both referred cases are monitored by Mechanism staff members appointed by the Registrar in consultation with the President. During the reporting period, four monitoring reports were filed in the *François Ngirabatware* case and six monitoring reports were filed in the *Šešelj et al.* case.

80. In relation to the *Kayishema* case, the monitoring function will start once Mr. Kayishema is transferred to Rwanda.

6. Archives and records management

81. The Mechanism Archives and Records Section manages approximately 4,400 linear metres of physical records and approximately 2.7 petabytes of digital records generated by the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism.

82. During the reporting period, the Section continued its preservation activities, ingesting 31.2 terabytes of digital records across branches into the digital preservation system. The total volume of ingested digital records increased to 416.3 terabytes, which included 437,776 files in various formats. The Section also preserved audiovisual recordings on obsolete and analogue media. Across the branches, 2,417 analogue recordings were digitized, raising the total digitization rate to 99 per cent in The Hague and 88 per cent in Arusha.

83. At the Hague branch, over 315,000 digital audiovisual records were registered in the Document Management System, and digital content was migrated from 2,800 optical carriers to more robust storage. At the Arusha branch, 367 physical audiovisual records were assessed for their preservation needs, and digital content was migrated from 653 optical carriers to more robust storage. Furthermore, 20,500 physical exhibits of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda were assessed, of which 2,781 were digitized, and 39 physical items received conservation treatment. To centralize archival materials in controlled storage, the Section accessioned over 124.5 linear metres of physical records and approximately 4,020,000 digital records from Mechanism offices.

84. The Section responded to 156 enquiries and requests for access to the archives and delivered close to 1,600 hours of audiovisual recordings of hearings and 178 transcripts. In addition, the publicly accessible catalogue of archive descriptions was expanded with over 4,100 new entries. The Section continued efforts to secure extrabudgetary funding for archival projects.

7. Communications

85. Communications and outreach functions continued to be carried out within the existing capacities of the Mechanism's three organs, with emphasis on preserving the legacy and promoting the work of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism.

86. The Mechanism supported outreach and public information through various activities, including targeted social media campaigns, the facilitation of access to court hearings and the organization of visits. During the reporting period, 599 individuals visited the Arusha branch premises.

87. At the Hague branch, the Mechanism's Information Programme for Affected Communities, supported by the European Union, delivered educational workshops, conducted outreach across the territory of the former Yugoslavia and ensured continued public access to the records of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the Mechanism.

VIII. Conclusion

88. The Mechanism is pleased that, according to OIOS, Member States and other stakeholders continue to view its activities as relevant and acknowledge their effective and efficient execution despite the institution's substantial resource reductions in recent years. The Mechanism also remains grateful for the support of Member States and calls for increased engagement to assist in resolving long-standing issues related to sentence enforcement and finding a durable solution for the persons relocated to the Niger.

89. The Mechanism continues to deliver on its statutory obligations. Changes to the Mechanism's mandate and organization can lead to a significantly reduced Mechanism that would continue to uphold Member States' substantial contributions to decades of international justice and bring the institution and the justice cycle to a responsible closure. The Mechanism stands ready to faithfully implement any decisions taken by the Security Council.
