

**Security Council**

Distr.: General
17 November 2025

Original: English

**Letter dated 17 November 2025 from the President of the
International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals
addressed to the President of the Security Council**

I am pleased to submit herewith the assessments of the President (see annex I) and of the Prosecutor (see annex II) of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, pursuant to paragraph 16 of Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#).

I would be grateful if you could transmit the present letter and its annexes to the members of the Security Council.

(Signed) Graciela **Gatti Santana**
President



**Annex I to the letter dated 17 November 2025 from the President
of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals
addressed to the President of the Security Council**

[Original: English and French]

**Assessment and progress report of the President of the
International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, Judge
Graciela Gatti Santana, for the period from 16 May to
15 November 2025**

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	3
II. Organization of the Mechanism	4
A. Organs and principals	4
B. Branches	5
III. President and Chambers	5
A. President	5
B. Judges	7
IV. Judicial activities	8
V. Future planning	11
VI. Assistance to national jurisdictions	12
VII. Cases referred to national jurisdictions	13
VIII. Enforcement of sentences	13
IX. Relocated persons	15
X. Cooperation and information dissemination	16
XI. Registry support to Mechanism activities	18
A. Judicial support services	18
B. Victims and witnesses	19
C. Detention facilities	19
D. Archives and records	20
E. Budget, staffing and administration	22
XII. Reports of the Office of Internal Oversight Services	24
XIII. Conclusion	24

1. The present report, the twenty-seventh in a series, is submitted pursuant to Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), by which the Council established the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals.¹ The reporting requirement set out in paragraph 16 of that resolution is contained in article 32 (2) of the statute of the Mechanism (resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), annex 1). The information contained in the report takes into account the parameters set out in paragraphs 13 and 14 of resolution [2740 \(2024\)](#), including the views and recommendations of the Council's Informal Working Group on International Tribunals. The report covers the progress made by the Mechanism during the period from 16 May to 15 November 2025.

I. Introduction

2. The Mechanism was created in 2010 to carry out a number of essential residual functions of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, which closed in 2015 and 2017, respectively.

3. The Security Council established the Mechanism to operate as a small, temporary and efficient structure, whose functions and size would diminish over time, with a small number of staff commensurate with its reduced functions. The Mechanism remained a fully operational court until late 2023. Having inherited the active caseloads of its predecessor Tribunals, and with a unique structure spanning two continents, the Mechanism's in-court activity and other mandated responsibilities far eclipsed those of other international residual institutions in their scope and volume. Only after the conclusion of the final active core crimes trials and appeals was the Mechanism able to dedicate itself to fulfilling its truly residual functions and make substantial reductions in staff and non-staff resources.

4. As demonstrated in the present report, the Mechanism remains committed to further aligning itself with the vision of the Security Council. Its judges and staff are working diligently towards the expeditious and fair completion or transfer of the Mechanism's mandated activities, namely adjudicating residual judicial matters, supervising the enforcement of sentences, responding to requests for assistance from national jurisdictions, monitoring referred cases and managing its archives and those of the ad hoc Tribunals. At the same time, the leadership continues to systematically plan for the future and streamline internal operations, identifying further efficiencies wherever possible.

5. Pursuant to resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), the Mechanism was established for an initial four-year period, and for subsequent two-year periods, following reviews of the progress of its work, unless the Security Council decided otherwise. The Council's fifth such review (see [S/2024/308](#), annex; see also [S/PRST/2024/1](#)) culminated in the adoption of resolution [2740 \(2024\)](#), in which the Council requested the Secretary-General to present by 31 December 2025 an updated report regarding options for possible locations of the archives, along with a report on options for transfer of the functions of supervision of sentence enforcement and assistance to national jurisdictions on prosecutions. The Mechanism has provided comprehensive inputs in support of those reports and eagerly awaits the final recommendations of the Secretary-General, which will inform the Council's sixth review of the Mechanism's progress of work in 2026.

6. In this context, the Mechanism took substantial steps during the reporting period to facilitate the expeditious, yet responsible, drawdown of its activities in light of any decision by the Security Council to transfer or terminate functions of the Mechanism.

¹ Unless otherwise specified, figures set out in the present report are accurate as at 15 November 2025.

It engaged extensively with the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on its ongoing evaluation of the Mechanism's methods and work, which is focused on the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and coherence of the Mechanism's approach to fulfilling its ongoing continuous activities. In addition, the Mechanism collaborated closely with the Human Resources Services Division of the Department of Operational Support on a comprehensive staffing review, and partnered with the Department's Division for Special Activities to begin to develop plans for the future closure and liquidation of the Mechanism.

7. The Mechanism is acutely aware that the cycle of justice that began with the ad hoc Tribunals must be responsibly concluded, and the significant legacy of those Tribunals and the Mechanism protected. Its residual functions play a critical role in furthering these aims. In relation to continuous judicial activities, for example, Mechanism judges adjudicated numerous requests during the reporting period for access to confidential evidence and protected witness information for use in national investigations and trials, thereby supporting domestic jurisdictions in their own accountability efforts. Moreover, the President dealt extensively with matters relating to sentence enforcement, helping to ensure the integrity of the sentences imposed and the fair and equal application of the law for convicted persons within the Mechanism's purview. Separately, the Trial Chamber seized of the case of *Prosecutor v. Félicien Kabuga* continued to closely monitor Mr. Kabuga's health and take steps to identify a State willing to accept him for release, in line with the Mechanism's duty of care. Lastly, a single judge referred a contempt matter to the United States of America for disciplinary proceedings, adhering to statutory instruction aimed at pre-empting international proceedings when it is in the interests of justice and expediency. Comprehensive information on these and other mandated functions is set out below.

8. The Mechanism once more enjoyed strong support from Member States and other key stakeholders during the reporting period, including the eight States that currently enforce sentences imposed by the ad hoc Tribunals or the Mechanism. Nevertheless, to advance an expeditious drawdown of activities and resources, the Mechanism requires affirmative assistance from States, particularly in relation to activities that cannot be transferred and that have ongoing human rights implications. The most immediate examples are: (a) Ratko Mladić and Mićo Stanišić, who have been convicted but remain in the United Nations Detention Unit pending designation of enforcement States; (b) Mr. Kabuga, who has been ordered to be released but also remains in the Unit pending identification of a State to which he can safely travel and that is willing to receive him; and (c) the acquitted and released persons in the Niger, whose guaranteed freedoms have yet to be implemented by the Niger and to whom, as a consequence, the Mechanism provides financial support. The Mechanism will rely on assistance from Member States in these and other areas as it fulfils the vital mission entrusted to it by the international community.

II. Organization of the Mechanism

A. Organs and principals

9. The Mechanism consists of three organs: (a) the Chambers; (b) the Prosecutor; and (c) the Registry. The work of the Chambers and the Registry is discussed in the present annex, while annex II details the activities of the Office of the Prosecutor.

10. Each organ is led by a full-time principal who exercises responsibility over both Mechanism branches. The President is the institutional head and highest authority of the Mechanism and is responsible for the overall execution of its mandate, presiding over the Appeals Chamber, assigning judges to cases and carrying out other functions

as specified in the statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.² The Prosecutor is responsible for the investigation and prosecution of persons covered by article 1 of the statute, while the Registrar is responsible for the administration and servicing of the institution, under the authority of the President.

11. The President, Graciela Gatti Santana (Uruguay), is based in The Hague, Kingdom of the Netherlands, while the Prosecutor, Serge Brammertz (Belgium), and the Registrar, Abubacarr M. Tambaou (Gambia), are based in Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania. The current terms of all three principals run until 30 June 2026.

B. Branches

12. In line with its statute, the Mechanism has two branches located on different continents. Its branch in Arusha commenced operations on 1 July 2012, assuming functions derived from the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, while its branch in The Hague commenced operations on 1 July 2013, assuming functions derived from the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Despite its structure, the Mechanism functions as a single, unified institution.

13. The Mechanism continues to benefit from excellent cooperation with both host States and is grateful for their ongoing support and engagement in accordance with the respective headquarters agreements.

14. In The Hague, the host State has now informed the Mechanism that it has revised its planning and, in order to accommodate its requirement to refurbish the ageing building, would like the Mechanism to move from the current premises at the latest by 31 December 2026. In conformity with this request, the Mechanism is actively engaged with the host State to explore possible suitable premises that would support both the host State's needs and the Mechanism's requirements to further reduce its staffing and budget. Separately, the Mechanism continues to accommodate staff of the Residual Special Court for Sierra Leone at its branch in The Hague.

15. In Arusha, the Mechanism's Lakilaki premises are situated on land made available by the United Republic of Tanzania. The premises also provide public access to the Mechanism's well-resourced library on international law, which features, in particular, materials on international humanitarian law and international criminal justice. The Arusha branch continues to accommodate three staff members of the World Food Programme and, in a more recent development, now also accommodates five project staff from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Efforts are ongoing to attract other United Nations entities.

III. President and Chambers

A. President

16. The President continued to lead the institution while advancing the three main priorities of her presidency, namely: (a) to continue to evaluate the work and operations of the Mechanism as a truly residual institution, in order to ensure alignment with the Security Council's vision of the Mechanism as a small, temporary and efficient structure; (b) to promote effective leadership and good governance in the performance of mandated functions and residual activities; and (c) to continue

² Available at www.irmct.org/en/documents/rules-procedure-and-evidence.

consolidating the legacy of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism and working closely with all main stakeholders.

17. In furtherance of her first priority, the President spearheaded additional measures to streamline the Mechanism's operations and ensure its ongoing responsiveness to resolution [2740 \(2024\)](#). In May 2025, she proposed for consideration by the Mechanism's Rules Committee a number of amendments to the Rules of Procedure and Evidence designed to restrict the likelihood of certain in-court proceedings, while ensuring full respect for fair trial rights and the protection of victims and witnesses. Amendments based on these proposals were ultimately adopted by the Mechanism's judges during their virtual plenary in September 2025. In addition, following revisions to the Practice Direction on early release in July 2024 and the Practice Direction on the designation of enforcement States in May 2025, the President engaged extensively with States on enforcement issues during the reporting period, resulting in more timely communications and dynamic processes. The President continued to lead by example in terms of resource management. For example, she reduced staffing levels in her own Office and the Chambers Legal Support Section by 23 per cent collectively for 2026, by planning to adapt working methods in line with the UN80 Initiative principles in order to effectively support an anticipated workload in 2026 that is expected to remain steady or increase.

18. Regarding her second priority, the President again encouraged close, transparent cooperation among the principals and senior management on cross-cutting institutional matters. At her initiative, the principals held numerous discussions on the Mechanism's budget and one meeting of the Coordination Council. Separately, the President and the Registrar met regularly to discuss areas of shared responsibility, particularly in the area of supervision of sentence enforcement. The cross-organ working group continued to explore options for the transfer of certain functions and for further reductions in resources, including by seeking the advice of the Human Resources Services Division on a staffing review. The President likewise welcomed the engagement of OIOS, the Board of Auditors and the Division for Special Activities during the reporting period. Lastly, the President continued to emphasize open communication with staff members, who bear the brunt of downsizing and uncertainty. She met regularly with the staff union and, in her additional capacity as International Gender Champion, supported the activities of the Mechanism's focal points for gender.

19. The President remains equally committed to her third priority and to making the public judicial records of the Mechanism and the ad hoc Tribunals widely accessible and available. She continued to endorse educational activities undertaken by the Mechanism Information Programme for Affected Communities, funded by the European Union. She launched the latest cycle of the Programme's video lecture series earlier in November, focusing her intervention on the creation, jurisdiction and mandate of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. In combination with her visit to the region to participate in the thirtieth commemoration of the 1995 genocide in Srebrenica, she also engaged in person with young lawyers and law students from across Bosnia and Herzegovina on issues related to accountability for international crimes, as part of a powerful "Dialogue Days" event organized by Association "PRAVNIK". The President remains hopeful that talks on the establishment of information centres in Croatia and Rwanda, in line with resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), will resume in the coming period. In addition, the President supported a request by the Srebrenica Memorial Centre for copies of public judicial records relating to the 1995 genocide in Srebrenica, which were delivered to the Centre in time for the thirtieth commemoration. The President is convinced that such initiatives can play a powerful role in safeguarding the legacy of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism and promoting the truth.

20. With regard to her representational function, the President presented the Mechanism's twenty-sixth progress report to the Security Council in June 2025, and also gave a briefing to the Council's Informal Working Group on International Tribunals on that occasion. In October 2025, she presented the Mechanism's thirteenth annual report to the General Assembly and met separately with the President of the Assembly. During both missions, the President of the Mechanism, held bilateral meetings with representatives of Member States and high-level officials of the United Nations. In July 2025, she participated, together with the Prosecutor and the Registrar, in formal events marking the thirtieth commemoration of the 1995 genocide in Srebrenica, a moment of deep significance for the local, regional and international communities. In her remarks at the official commemoration ceremony, she urged national authorities, civil society, international and regional organizations and the academic community to use the judicial findings to combat denial and work towards preventing future conflicts. In November 2025, the President and the Prosecutor will represent the Mechanism at an international conference entitled "Srebrenica: three decades fighting for the truth, justice and the future", organized by the Association of Victims and Witnesses of Genocide and the Association of Mothers of the Srebrenica and Žepa Enclaves.

B. Judges

21. Article 8 (1) of the statute provides that the Mechanism has a roster of 25 independent judges. According to article 8 (3), the judges are to be present at the seat of the Mechanism's branches only when necessary, as requested by the President, and will otherwise carry out their functions remotely. In line with article 8 (4), judges of the Mechanism are not remunerated for being on the judicial roster but receive compensation only for the days on which they exercise their functions.

22. At present, the Mechanism has 24 judges on its judicial roster, following the resignation of a judge earlier in 2025. The 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 M. M. Orie (Kingdom of the 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 (Zimbabwe/Gambia), 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 Hoefler (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) and Judge René José Andriatianarivelo (Madagascar).

23. The President continued to assign on an alternating basis Judges Masanche, Sekule and Joensen as duty judge at the Mechanism's Arusha branch. As previously reported, the decision to assign judges who are resident in the United Republic of Tanzania maximizes efficiency, and their assignment is remunerated only to the extent that they are authorized by the President to exercise functions in this capacity.

24. On 3 and 4 September, the President convened the third virtual plenary of Mechanism judges. This successful online event enabled judges from 18 countries and numerous time zones to participate thanks to the efforts of staff from the Information Technology Services Section and other sections. The judges addressed

several matters of judicial and institutional importance, including proposed changes to the Rules of Procedure and Evidence. The proposals were aimed at limiting the prospect of resource-intensive future investigations concerning contempt and false testimony, and the possibility of costly in-court proceedings for contempt, false testimony or any authorized review hearing, while also preserving fair trial rights and protecting victims and witnesses. Following extensive discussions, the judges decided to adopt amendments to rules 90 (C) and (D), 108 (B) and 147 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence. The President promptly informed the President of the Security Council, and the amendments were published on the Mechanism's website.

IV. Judicial activities

25. During the reporting period, the President and judges issued a total of 76 decisions and orders. Of these, 67 (or approximately 9 in 10) related to the Mechanism's continuous judicial functions, including matters pertaining to the protection of victims and witnesses, assistance to national jurisdictions, the enforcement of sentences, the referral of contempt proceedings and the management of the work of Chambers.

26. The leadership of the Chambers Legal Support Section, which supports the judges in their work, continued to employ streamlined working methods and processes, in collaboration with other sections of the Mechanism, and to draw on resources at both branches to address the judicial workload wherever arising.

27. In addition to supporting the judges with their judicial work, the Chambers Legal Support Section maintains the Mechanism's Case Law Database, which provides the public with direct access to extracts and full-text versions of key judgments and decisions rendered by the Appeals Chambers of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism. During the reporting period, the Section continued in its efforts to ensure that the Case Law Database was up to date and to make this valuable resource accessible to researchers, practitioners and judges.

1. Proceedings related to core crimes

28. With respect to cases relating to the core crimes incorporated into the statute of the Mechanism, the judges, whose individual legal backgrounds are roughly evenly split between civil and common law, worked primarily on ongoing matters in one trial case, in which proceedings are indefinitely stayed.

(a) Trial proceedings

29. The trial proceedings in the *Kabuga* case remain indefinitely stayed, following the Trial Chamber's order of 8 September 2023. During the reporting period, the Trial Chamber focused on matters relating to monitoring Mr. Kabuga's health, consideration of his possible release and the recovery of legal aid funds expended in connection with his defence. The Trial Chamber held a status conference on 26 September 2025 to discuss these issues and to enquire into Mr. Kabuga's current conditions of detention. In a decision issued on 14 November 2025, the Trial Chamber determined that Mr. Kabuga was not fit to fly to Rwanda. After considering submissions, medical evidence from four independent experts and the regular reports of the Medical Officer at the United Nations Detention Unit, the Trial Chamber concluded that the evidence before it demonstrated that flying to Rwanda would pose a clear and substantial risk to Mr. Kabuga's life. The Trial Chamber further requested European States, especially those that are close to the Kingdom of the Netherlands and where Mr. Kabuga has made applications for provisional release, to reconsider accepting him onto their territories based on his current medical condition.

30. The Trial Chamber, composed of Judges Bonomy, presiding, El Baaj and deGuzman, continues to work remotely and its judges are being remunerated only on a limited basis each month. Status conferences, which are required to be held within 120 days of the preceding conference, are conducted in person by the presiding judge, with the other members of the bench participating by videoconference link.

(b) Proceedings related to fugitives

31. As previously reported, Fulgence Kayishema was arrested in South Africa on 24 May 2023, having been a fugitive for more than 20 years. He was originally indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in 2001, with his case later referred for trial in Rwanda in February 2012. Mr. Kayishema continues to be subject to domestic criminal proceedings in South Africa, which have recently been further delayed. On 14 August 2025, he filed before the Mechanism a request for revocation of the referral of his case to Rwanda. On 29 October 2025, the Trial Chamber dismissed the second to fourth grounds on which Mr. Kayishema sought revocation, while remaining seized of the matter pending the filing of any submissions by the Government of South Africa in relation to the first ground. In the same decision, the Trial Chamber rejected a request filed on 2 September 2025 by Mr. Kayishema, who is represented by pro bono counsel, for the assignment of counsel remunerated under the Mechanism's legal aid system pursuant to rule 46 the Rules of Procedure and Evidence. Mr. Kayishema filed a notice of appeal against the decision on 13 November 2025.

2. Continuous judicial activities

32. The Mechanism remains mandated to perform ongoing judicial functions that are key to the end of the justice cycle. Many of these matters are discrete and are not the subject of regular litigation. In addition, they require less administrative, operational and financial support as they are adjudicated principally based on written submissions rather than relying on in-court proceedings, and are adjudicated by judges who work remotely and are remunerated based on the number of pre-authorized days utilized to complete an assignment.

3. Judicial activity of the President

33. The President's continuous judicial responsibilities relate mainly to the supervision of the enforcement of sentences and judicial review of administrative decisions. The President is also mandated to assign judges to cases.

34. During the reporting period, the President issued a total of 43 decisions and orders. These included 26 decisions and orders relating to enforcement matters and 12 orders relating to the assignment of judges. Of the latter, nine orders pertained to witness protection matters falling under rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.

35. In connection with the enforcement of sentences, the President issued decisions on six applications for early release and one decision on an application for provisional release of a convicted person who remains in the United Nations Detention Unit awaiting transfer to an enforcement State. The President granted conditional early release on compelling humanitarian grounds in one decision, and in another decision granted conditional early release on the basis of, inter alia, the convicted person having demonstrated sufficient rehabilitation warranting a release less than two years in advance of the completion of his 20-year sentence. The President also issued one decision on sentence remission. Three new applications for early release and one application for provisional release of a convicted person were filed during the

reporting period, and the President is currently seized of four pending applications for early release.

36. Alongside her enforcement-related judicial activity, the President dealt with a diverse range of other substantive matters during the reporting period. These included the situation of the acquitted and released persons relocated to the Niger, in relation to which the President issued two decisions and one order, and the *Kayishema* case, in which the President issued two decisions and one order on motions for the assignment of a trial chamber and for the reclassification of a related decision.

37. Lastly, in her role as presiding judge of the Appeals Chamber, the President presided over a matter in which the Appeals Chamber issued one decision.

4. Judicial activities of single judges/benches

38. Other continuous judicial functions for which the Mechanism retains responsibility include the adjudication of applications for information on or the rescission, variation or augmentation of protective measures, as provided for in rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence; requests for the assistance of the Mechanism in obtaining testimony of a person under the Mechanism's authority, in line with rule 87 of the Rules; issues pertaining to the *non bis in idem* principle, as enshrined in article 7 of the statute and rule 16 of the Rules; submissions seeking the reclassification of judicial filings for reasons of transparency or, conversely, reasons of security; the determination of various matters arising from contempt investigations and cases, including referral to national authorities in accordance with article 6 (2) of the statute; and financial assistance and relocation of acquitted and released persons. Notwithstanding the scope of matters that fall within the Mechanism's ongoing jurisdiction, the summary of activities below reflects that many are not the subject of regular litigation.

39. On average, the Chambers adjudicate 20 to 30 applications pursuant to rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence a year. During the reporting period, 19 orders and decisions were issued concerning applications for information on or the variation of protective measures, with over 80 per cent of such applications granted in full or in part. All were issued by single judges. In doing so, the Mechanism discharged its residual functions in relation to both the protection of victims and witnesses, in line with article 20 of the statute, and responding to requests for assistance from national authorities, as set out in article 28 (3) of the statute.

40. Turning to matters related to contempt and false testimony under articles 1 (4) (a) and (b) of the statute, respectively, there are currently no active false testimony or contempt cases before the Mechanism. Pursuant to the statute, before proceeding to try any person alleged to be responsible for contempt or false testimony, the Mechanism shall consider referring the case to the authorities of a State and such consideration is to take into account the interests of justice and expediency.

41. On 7 November 2025, a single judge referred the contempt case against Peter Robinson to the United States for disciplinary proceedings before the California State Bar. This case concerns allegations of witness interference during the review proceedings in the case of *Prosecutor v. Augustin Ngirabatware*.

42. Separately, Serbia continues to refuse to execute arrest warrants and orders for transfer of the accused in the contempt case against Petar Jojić and Vjerica Radeta, despite multiple referrals to the Security Council of its failure to cooperate with the Mechanism.

43. Lastly, the situation of the acquitted and released persons relocated to the Niger gave rise to further litigation before a single judge of the Mechanism. The single judge

is presently considering whether the relocated persons can safely return to Rwanda in the context of determining the Mechanism's obligations to provide them with continued financial assistance. The single judge is also seized of a request for an order to the Registrar to provide the acquitted and released persons a lump-sum payment to cover their cost of living and the rent of their accommodation for 2026.

V. Future planning

44. During the reporting period, the Mechanism again devoted considerable resources to planning for the future of its operations.

45. As noted above, the Security Council, in its resolution [2740 \(2024\)](#), requested that the Secretary-General present by 31 December 2025 a report on the administrative and budgetary aspects of the options for possible locations of the archives, as well as a report on options for the transfer of the functions of supervision of enforcement of sentences and the pardon or commutation of sentences under articles 25 (2) and 26 of the statute, and assistance to national jurisdictions on prosecutions under article 28 (3) of the statute. The principals and organs continued to collaborate to ensure the Mechanism's timely assistance to the Secretary-General in this context. The cross-organ working group of senior managers worked closely with the Office of Legal Affairs, providing support and information as required.

46. In relation to the sentence supervision function, and at the direction of the Office of Legal Affairs, the President consulted with multiple external stakeholders, including all current enforcement States, on the feasibility of transferring aspects of that function. The Registry also worked with the United Nations Archives and Records Management Section to compile information relevant to the administrative and budgetary aspects of the options for possible locations of the archives.

47. The Mechanism stands ready to provide any further assistance required in relation to the Secretary-General's forthcoming reports. Moreover, it is prepared to facilitate and implement the decisions of the Security Council following its sixth review of the Mechanism's progress of work. In the meantime, the Mechanism is aware that certain of its mandated functions can – and ideally should – be transferred or terminated in the near future, especially the technical functions.

48. In addition, and to facilitate a more holistic assessment of the Mechanism's future operations, the President will present an assessment of the transferability or termination of the Mechanism's continuous judicial functions to the Council's Informal Working Group on International Tribunals before meeting with it in December 2025.

49. Alongside this activity, the cross-organ working group collaborated extensively with entities in the United Nations system to benefit from relevant expertise in evaluating the Mechanism's progress towards completing and transferring its functions.

50. As mentioned above, OIOS continued its ongoing evaluation of the work and methods of the Mechanism, focusing on the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and coherence of the Mechanism's approach to fulfilling its ongoing continuous activities and advancing the completion and/or transfer of its residual functions, in line with its mandated vision as a temporary and efficient structure. During the reporting period, the Mechanism's senior management shared extensive documentation, responded to multiple thematic and workload surveys and participated in interviews to facilitate this process, which will inform decisions taken by the Security Council in June 2026 following the sixth review.

51. Upon a recommendation of the cross-organ working group, the principals agreed to request the assistance of the Human Resources Services Division of the Department of Operational Support in conducting a comprehensive staffing review. The scope of the review is 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. In addition, the staffing review will provide a road map for achieving further efficiencies and staff reductions following a decision by the Security Council for the transfer of certain Mechanism functions. As part of this process, the Mechanism has collaborated closely with the Division, with each section providing detailed workforce assessments, followed by interviews with the principals, section chiefs, members of the cross-organ working group and other senior managers. It is anticipated that the staffing review findings will be completed in time to allow for their consideration alongside the forthcoming OIOS evaluation.

52. In addition, following the recommendation of the cross-organ working group, the administration engaged the Division for Special Activities within the Department of Operational Support to assist the Mechanism in developing plans for the future closure and liquidation of the Mechanism, using the Division's templated approach to entity closure. A first draft of the closure/liquidation plan has been produced, which will allow the Mechanism and the Division to further refine the scope, methodology, duration and expected results of the exercise. This process remains ongoing.

VI. Assistance to national jurisdictions

53. In accordance with article 28 (3) of its statute, the Mechanism continued to receive and process requests from national authorities for access to certified copies of judicial records of the Mechanism and the ad hoc Tribunals. It also processed requests submitted pursuant to rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.

54. Protective measures ordered in respect of a witness in proceedings before the ad hoc Tribunals or the Mechanism remain in force until a subsequent judicial decision is issued, pursuant to rule 86, to rescind, vary or augment those measures. Such a decision is required to enable a witness's testimony in national proceedings or allow access to confidential judicial records in accordance with the existing protective measures.

55. The handling of requests for assistance pursuant to rule 86 is expected to remain steady in the coming years, as domestic prosecutions seek to close the impunity gap in accountability for the most serious crimes under international law. The activity, however, will decline as key individuals – alleged perpetrators and witnesses – die or become otherwise unavailable to participate in domestic trial processes.

56. The Registry processed 28 requests for assistance from national authorities or parties involved in investigations and prosecutions of crimes committed during the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia and the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda, resulting in the transmission of 118,834 documents during the reporting period. The Registry also facilitated the waiver of immunity of former staff members to enable their testimony in domestic proceedings, following requests from the Office of Legal Affairs and consultation with the Office of the President and the Chambers Legal Support Section.

57. The assistance provided to national jurisdictions by the Prosecution is detailed in annex II.

58. The Mechanism remains mindful that the potential transfer of the function of provision of assistance to national jurisdictions on prosecutions is of particular interest to the Security Council, as reflected in resolution [2740 \(2024\)](#). It has provided

extensive information and support in relation to the Secretary-General's forthcoming report on this matter and will share further information with the Council directly. In the meantime, the Mechanism will continue to conscientiously discharge its mandated responsibilities in connection with this function.

VII. Cases referred to national jurisdictions

59. In accordance with its obligation under article 6 (5) of the statute, the Mechanism actively monitored two cases referred to national jurisdictions and is expected to monitor another case, as described below.

60. Regarding the contempt case against Vojislav Šešelj and others, which was referred to Serbia in February 2024, the appointed staff monitor continued to engage with the Serbian authorities – in particular, the Public Prosecutor's Office for War Crimes – regarding the status of the case. To date, six monitoring reports have been submitted by the monitor, which are available as public versions.³

61. In the contempt case against François Ndirabatware, referred to Belgium in September 2024, the second and third reports of the monitor were filed on 17 July 2025 and 11 November 2025, respectively. Both reports are available in their public versions.

62. In relation to the *Kayishema* case, the monitoring function will start as soon as Mr. Kayishema is transferred to Rwanda.

63. As mentioned above, a single judge recently referred the *Peter Robinson* case to the United States for disciplinary proceedings. In the decision, the single judge also requested the relevant authorities to report on the status of the case to the President of the Mechanism every six months until its conclusion.

64. The Mechanism's monitoring responsibilities in these cases are expected to continue for the duration of the proceedings and will be carried out mainly with existing staff resources.

VIII. Enforcement of sentences

65. In accordance with article 25 of the statute, the Mechanism is responsible for supervising the enforcement of sentences imposed by the ad hoc Tribunals or the Mechanism. Sentences are served in States that have entered into enforcement of sentence agreements with the United Nations. The State in which a convicted person is to serve his or her sentence is designated by the President, pursuant to article 25 of the statute, rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence and the relevant Practice Direction.

66. The President's supervisory powers with regard to the enforcement of sentences include addressing complaints on conditions of imprisonment and requests for transfer, interacting with bodies tasked with inspecting conditions of imprisonment and, for the most part, adjudicating applications pertaining to early release, pardon or commutation of sentence, in line with article 26 of the statute and rules 150 and 151 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence. In addition, following revisions to the relevant Practice Directions in 2024 and 2025, the President has assumed a more active role in communicating with current and potential enforcement States, engaging with them directly in relation to early release applications, the designation process and other enforcement matters. In this context, in October 2025, representatives of

³ These and other monitoring reports can be found on the Mechanism's website.

the President and the Registrar undertook a fruitful mission to Benin, where many convicted persons of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda are serving their sentences. During the mission they interacted with authorities and the convicted persons in relation to conditions of imprisonment and other issues. In another initiative, the President engaged with the Government of Serbia to enquire about the possibility of a Serbian embassy, which regularly engages with an enforcement State, providing certain technical assistance on discrete matters that it is well placed to address. The President also met online with the Governor and Deputy Governor of the prison in the United Kingdom where two convicted persons are serving their sentences. The above-mentioned responsibilities remain a central focus for the President and her Office, as demonstrated by her related judicial activity (see paras. 34 and 35).

67. The Registry provides support to the President in the exercise of her supervisory function on enforcement, and plays a critical role in securing the enforcement of the Mechanism's remaining sentences and overall administration thereof. The Registry's functions include providing administrative and financial support to the 24 convicted persons located in Benin and Senegal, concluding necessary agreements, coordinating the transfer of convicted persons to enforcement States and coordinating the transfer of persons who have been granted release. The Registry also supports the President's decision-making on early release applications, including by obtaining relevant information from victims' associations and processing judicial filings and translations of related correspondence.

68. At the end of the reporting period, 38 convicted persons continue to serve their sentences in the territories of eight Member States, under the supervision of the Mechanism.

69. In relation to the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, a total of 24 convicted persons are serving their sentences in two States: Benin (16) and Senegal (8). During the reporting period, one convicted person passed away from natural causes while serving his sentence in an enforcement State. Concerning the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, 14 convicted persons are serving their sentences in six different States: Belgium (1), Estonia (4), France (1), Germany (4), Norway (2) and the United Kingdom (2). Two convicted persons were granted conditional early release during the reporting period, one of whom passed away a short time later.

70. In addition, two convicted persons are currently housed at the United Nations Detention Unit in The Hague (see para. 100): Mr. Mladić, who remains at the Unit following the completion of appeal proceedings, and Mićo Stanišić, who returned to the Unit temporarily in January 2025. In July 2025, Jovica Stanišić was transferred from the Unit to a new enforcement State. Transferring the remaining convicted persons to enforcement States continues to be a top priority for the Mechanism.

71. Four convicted persons granted conditional early release by the Mechanism also remain under its supervision until their sentences have been completed. This brings the total number of convicted individuals under the supervision of the Mechanism to 44.

72. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment continued to serve as independent inspecting bodies and regularly inspect and provide recommendations on the conditions of imprisonment to ensure that they are compatible with international standards of detention. Their recommendations are considered and addressed by the Mechanism, which also coordinates in this respect with relevant national authorities and/or the United Nations Development Programme. At the Arusha branch, the Registry continued to support the ageing convicted persons in Benin and Senegal, in light of their specific vulnerabilities,

including by assessing the potential renovation of specific cells to enhance accessibility for individuals with particular needs.

73. The Mechanism is extremely grateful for the ongoing assistance of the enforcement States. During the reporting period, Germany commenced enforcement of the remainder of Jovica Stanišić's sentence, for which the Mechanism expresses its particular thanks. By taking on the responsibilities of sentence enforcement, these States reaffirm their commitment to international criminal justice and play a key role in allowing the Mechanism to keep fulfilling this critical aspect of its mandate.

74. The Mechanism will continue to rely heavily on the cooperation of enforcement States and encourages other States to provide similar assistance. Cooperation from Member States is crucial to ensure that the Mechanism can adhere to the Security Council's call to work expeditiously towards the completion of its mandate.

75. The fair and effective supervision of sentence enforcement is essential to the conclusion of the justice cycle that the Security Council initiated more than 30 years ago when establishing the ad hoc Tribunals. Supervising the enforcement of sentences is a long-term residual activity of the Mechanism. In this respect, 14 convicted persons are currently serving life sentences, while 16 will complete their sentences between 2030 and 2040, and another 8 after 2040. This function may therefore outlast the Mechanism. The potential transfer of the sentence enforcement function is reflected in resolution [2740 \(2024\)](#) and in rule 128 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, which provides that the Council may designate a body to assist it and to proceed to supervise the sentences after the Mechanism legally ceases to exist. As described above, the Mechanism has actively provided information and engaged extensively with external stakeholders in support of the Secretary-General's assessment of how this function might appropriately be transferred. In the interim, the Mechanism will continue to discharge its mandated responsibilities in connection with the enforcement of sentences.

IX. Relocated persons

76. Despite the Mechanism's intensive diplomatic efforts, the situation of the acquitted and released persons who were relocated to the Niger in December 2021, pursuant to an agreement between the United Nations and the Government of the Niger, remains unresolved, following the issuance of an expulsion order by the Nigerien authorities on 28 December 2021. The situation continues to affect the rights and freedoms of these persons. In August 2025, the Mechanism was informed that one of the relocated persons, Protais Zigiranyirazo, had passed away from natural causes at his residence.

77. Following his high-level mission to the Niger earlier in 2025, the Registrar continued to engage with the national authorities and the relocated persons regarding the regularization of their stay in the Niger, and pursued efforts to identify possible relocation States. In accordance with the relevant OIOS recommendation, the Registry engaged with the broader United Nations system to support the Mechanism's relocation efforts. The Registrar also raised the situation of the acquitted and released persons with Member States in bilateral meetings and other diplomatic engagements, emphasizing the need for durable solutions and continued cooperation.

78. In accordance with the President's order of 19 December 2022 instructing the Registrar to, inter alia, file regular reports on his efforts to find a solution in line with the Mechanism's duty of care towards the relocated persons, the Registrar submitted additional bimonthly reports on 4 July, 2 September and 3 November 2025. In parallel, the Registrar continues to implement the order issued by the single judge on

22 November 2024 concerning the renewal of the lease and the pro rata payment of monthly lump-sum settlements to the relocated persons. The Registry also maintains frequent contact with the focal point designated by the relocated persons, to remain updated on the situation on the ground. Following the Registrar's mission to the Niger earlier in 2025, the relocated persons enjoy greater freedom of movement but their legal status remains uncertain.

79. The President continued to highlight the plight of the relocated persons in her engagements with Member States, the Security Council and the Informal Working Group on International Tribunals, underscoring the vital role of Member States' involvement in resolving this challenge. As noted above, the President and a single judge of the Mechanism also dealt with additional litigation concerning the relocated persons (see paras. 36 and 43).

80. The Mechanism refers once more to Security Council resolution [2740 \(2024\)](#), in which the Council reiterated its call to all States to cooperate with and render all necessary assistance to the Mechanism. As acknowledged in the 2024 evaluation report of OIOS, the situation concerning the acquitted and released persons can only be resolved with the support of Member States. The Mechanism would welcome any such support and assistance in relation to this protracted matter.

X. Cooperation and information dissemination

81. Pursuant to paragraph 23 of Security Council resolution [2256 \(2015\)](#), the Mechanism continued to pursue avenues to enhance its cooperation with the Government of Rwanda. The principals of the Mechanism engaged once again with the Rwandan authorities on key issues, including improved access to the Mechanism's archives and its overall work. Following the closure of the Mechanism's Kigali field office in 2024, which included the cessation of Mechanism-provided medical services, the Rwandan National Public Prosecution Authority and the Ministry of Health continued to oversee the medical care of witnesses who had consented to the transfer. The Mechanism remains appreciative of the support provided by the Rwandan authorities in addressing the medical needs of these witnesses.

82. In its resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), the Security Council requested the Mechanism to cooperate with Rwanda and the countries of the former Yugoslavia to support the creation of information centres. The Mechanism is continuing efforts to establish or re-establish centres in Croatia, in the wider former Yugoslavia and in Rwanda. Such centres can play an important role in countering genocide denial, historical revisionism and the glorification of war criminals by ensuring access to judicial records and information on the mandate, work and legacy of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism. A key example is the centre in Sarajevo. During the reporting period, the Mechanism supported its activities, which included lectures for students on the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and Mechanism, as well as exhibitions and panel discussions.

83. The Mechanism, with support from the European Union, also continued its Information Programme for Affected Communities.⁴ During the reporting period, 30 secondary school history teachers participated in a workshop organized by the Mechanism on using the archives of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the Mechanism. Approximately 600 teachers from the Western Balkans region have now participated in the Programme's workshops. In addition, the Programme published the third volume of its *Guide for History Teachers: How to Use Archival Material of the ICTY and Mechanism in Teaching the History of the 1990s*

⁴ See www.irmct.org/en/mip for further information.

Conflicts, developed in cooperation with the European Association of History Educators and history teachers' associations from across the former Yugoslavia. The Programme also organized an online lecture, delivered presentations at a summer school, hosted law students for training and supported a panel discussion at a reconciliation festival, all held in the region of the former Yugoslavia.

84. The seventh cycle of the video lecture series by the Information Programme for Affected Communities, entitled "International law and facts established before the ICTY", was launched in November 2025 with a lecture by the President of the Mechanism. The series will run over two semesters and feature 12 lectures by Mechanism officials, defence counsel, former staff of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and United Nations experts. The Programme also contributed to several lectures on the legacy of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, hosted by local groups and organizations, which were addressed to young people, journalists and researchers from the region.

85. Overall, the Information Programme for Affected Communities continued to receive a positive response, with its social media campaigns having reached nearly 6,800,000 people since January 2019. The Mechanism expresses sincere gratitude to the European Union and its member States for their ongoing and generous support.

86. During the reporting period, the Mechanism welcomed numerous visitors to its premises. In connection with its judicial activities, visitors were given the opportunity to watch the status conference in the *Kabuga* case on 25 September 2025 in the public gallery in The Hague. Footage of the proceedings was also made available on the Mechanism's website and social media for public access. In total, approximately 1,050 visitors attended the Mechanism's branch in The Hague during the reporting period, including 59 official group visits. The Central Government Real Estate Agency for the Kingdom of the Netherlands has informed the Mechanism that, due to deficiencies in fire safety measures, it is no longer possible to host public gatherings or visits at its premises. The Mechanism hopes that the deficiencies will be addressed quickly and that gatherings and visits may recommence in the near future. It notes in this regard the report issued in September 2025 by the University of Amsterdam, commissioned by the host State and the Central Government Real Estate Agency.⁵ The report highlights, inter alia, the "irreplaceable value" and unique memorial and historical significance of the building as a global symbol of international law, and includes a recommendation that the site be preserved.

87. In Arusha, the Mechanism welcomed 197 visitors to its Lakilaki premises, including representatives of international, national and regional universities, local law firms and international organizations. Among the visitors were students and international researchers, as well as former staff members of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. The Mechanism also hosted a visit of 18 Tanzanian government officials. In addition, the Arusha branch library continued to offer a broad range of services to both internal and external users.

88. The Mechanism continued to disseminate information about its work and judicial developments on its website and social media platforms. The Mechanism is committed to ensuring that its legacy and that of the ad hoc Tribunals remains visible and accessible to the public. During the reporting period, the Mechanism website recorded over 400,000 page views, underscoring the ongoing importance of sharing judicial information, court records, case updates and legacy-related content. In addition, a total of 12 social media campaigns were conducted.

⁵ See <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/105941>.

XI. Registry support to Mechanism activities

A. Judicial support services

89. During the reporting period, the Registry continued to provide support to the Mechanism's judicial activities at both branches.

90. Most of the residual activities of the Mechanism, such as supervising the enforcement of sentences, conducting review and contempt proceedings, handling applications pursuant to rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence and monitoring cases referred to national jurisdictions, require the creation and management of the related judicial records. This service continued to be provided by the Judicial Records Unit at both branches. During the reporting period, the Unit processed and disseminated 678 filings, including 171 Registry legal submissions, totalling 5,279 pages.

91. The Judicial Records Unit at the branch in The Hague provided support for the status conference in the *Kabuga* case held on 25 September 2025, in accordance with rule 69 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence. Furthermore, together with the Office of the Registrar and the Information Technology Services Section, the Unit assisted the Office of the President and the Chambers in developing appropriate simplified solutions for holding future status conferences, as well as any other hearings that might be required.

92. With regard to the *Peter Robinson* case, the Judicial Records Unit provided necessary out-of-court support, mainly related to the administration and distribution of relevant judicial documents.

93. During the reporting period, the Language Support Services at both branches collectively translated approximately 7,000 pages. They also provided interpretation services for 17 conference days and produced approximately 360 pages of transcripts in English and French.

94. The availability of all judgments in languages understood by convicted persons is essential to ensuring fair and transparent judicial proceedings. In this regard, the Language Support Services in Arusha completed the translation into Kinyarwanda of three appeal judgments issued by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. Five appeal judgments of that Tribunal remain to be translated into Kinyarwanda. Meanwhile, to ensure broader access to the jurisprudence of the Mechanism, the Language Support Services in The Hague completed the translation into French of the two remaining appeal judgments. Four judgments of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia still require translation from English to French, one of which is currently in progress. The completion of these remaining translations may be affected by the demands of ongoing functions and the availability of resources.

95. With regard to legal aid matters, the Registry continued to make progress in supporting the Trial Chamber in the recovery of legal aid funds previously provided to Mr. Kabuga, following the Registrar's decision of October 2023, which determined Mr. Kabuga to be non-indigent and capable of fully funding his defence before the Mechanism. Furthermore, the Registry continued to provide financial and administrative assistance as needed to 51 defence and *amicus curiae* teams, comprising a total of approximately 67 team members, most of whom are providing pro bono services in post-conviction proceedings. This included support to the defence team in the *Kabuga* case and to the *amicus curiae* prosecutor and his team in the *Peter Robinson* case, which has now been referred to a national jurisdiction. During the reporting period, Registry staff processed 49 invoices, travel requests and expense reports submitted by defence and *amicus curiae* teams. There are currently

41 counsel on the list who are eligible for assignment to indigent suspects and accused before the Mechanism, and 68 on the roster of prosecutors and investigators eligible for assignment as an *amicus curiae*.

B. Victims and witnesses

96. Article 20 of its statute empowers the Mechanism to establish procedures for the protection of witnesses in relation to proceedings before the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism. Around 3,200 witnesses benefit from judicial and/or extrajudicial protective measures. The Mechanism does not provide physical protection by security personnel beyond what is necessary to facilitate participation in judicial proceedings.

97. With the conclusion of all core crimes trials and appeals, the Mechanism's responsibilities in this area have decreased. Nevertheless, the Witness Support and Protection Unit at both branches continued to facilitate applications related to prosecutions in national jurisdictions that require variations of protective measures pursuant to rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence. During the reporting period, the Unit implemented seven judicial orders involving eight witnesses and served as the point of contact for witnesses regarding modifications to their protective measures or requests for additional assistance. The Unit also liaised with and assisted relevant States, to ensure the ongoing effectiveness of protective measures for victims and witnesses who have been relocated. Lastly, the Unit continued to monitor the general security situation in the regions of the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda and maintained its capacity to respond to requests from victims and witnesses following the closure of the Mechanism's field offices.

98. In relation to the supervision of sentence enforcement, the Witness Support and Protection Unit at the branch in The Hague provided the President with witness-related assessments involving 67 witnesses in connection with one early release request. It also informed protected witnesses of the release of convicted persons in cases in which they testified.

99. While operational expenses are expected to further decrease, the Witness Support and Protection Unit will continue to provide support in line with judicial protection orders, until such orders are rescinded or waived or the functions are otherwise transferred or terminated.

C. Detention facilities

100. During the reporting period, the United Nations Detention Unit in The Hague housed four detainees, three of whom remain there at the date of submission of the present report. In July 2025, Jovica Stanišić was transferred to Germany to serve the remainder of his sentence. Two other convicted persons, Mr. Mladić and Mićo Stanišić, are awaiting transfer to a State, or States, for the enforcement of the remainder of their respective sentences. Mr. Kabuga also continues to be housed at the Unit, pending the identification of a State for his provisional release. Identifying and securing enforcement States for the two convicted persons is a priority for the Mechanism, and it is actively negotiating with potential States to this effect. The Mechanism also provides support to the efforts of Mr. Kabuga's defence team to locate a State for him.

101. Discussions continued with the host State on the Mechanism's residual detention requirements and its intention to close the United Nations Detention Unit. The Kingdom of the Netherlands has now declined to temporarily detain in its own prison facilities the persons who currently remain housed at the Unit and any persons

convicted of core crimes who may be required to return to the custody of the Mechanism, although it has signalled that it may be open to considering temporarily detaining any accused persons in a future contempt case. This is a setback for the Mechanism, as the Registrar continues to focus on the closure of the Unit. In the interim, the Mechanism continues to engage with relevant Dutch authorities to obtain a reduction in the operational costs of the Unit.

102. The United Nations Detention Unit is regularly inspected by ICRC to ensure that the Mechanism's Rules of Detention⁶ are properly applied and that it complies with international standards, which is an issue of great importance to the Mechanism. Bearing in mind the Security Council's particular attention to ensuring that these standards are upheld, the President, with the agreement of ICRC, shared with permanent, current and incoming member of the Council and jurisdiction States a report of the most recent ICRC inspection of the Unit. Relatedly, in October 2025, the President and the Registrar provided representatives of these States with an opportunity to visit the Unit and ask questions. The Commanding Officer provided a comprehensive briefing on the prisoner-centred approach and customized care at the Unit, and attendees were able to tour the premises as well as the newly built, specialized hospital facilities, where two of the Mechanism's detainees spend a majority of their time.

103. The Mechanism remains mindful of paragraph 16 of resolution 2740 (2024), in which the Security Council reiterated the importance of ensuring that the rights of persons detained on the authority of the Mechanism are maintained in accordance with the applicable international standards relating to healthcare, including the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners. The Mechanism's established legal and regulatory framework supports full compliance with its duty of care in this regard, including through the Mechanism's Regulations on the Complaints Procedure for Detainees,⁷ regular status conferences⁸ and the above-mentioned independent inspections.

D. Archives and records

104. The Mechanism Archives and Records Section currently manages approximately 4,700 linear m of physical records and around 3 petabytes of digital records of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism. Effective archive management includes the preservation of and provision of access to both physical and digital records, while ensuring the protection of confidential information. This function is critical to the Mechanism's ability to support other mandated activities, including the provision of assistance to national jurisdictions.

105. Regarding the preservation of digital records, the Archives and Records Section made further progress by ingesting an additional 15.5 terabytes of digital records, comprising 1,705 files, into the Mechanism's digital repository. This brings the total ingested so far to 399.8 terabytes, comprising 309,129 files, which corresponds to 22.2 per cent of the digital archives in the custody of the Section. Concurrently, digital records of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia were migrated from

⁶ Rules Governing the Detention of Persons Awaiting Trial or Appeal Before the Mechanism or Otherwise Detained on the Authority of the Mechanism, 5 November 2018.

⁷ International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals Regulations on the Complaints Procedure for Detainees, MICT/25, 5 December 2018. See also Rules of Detention, rules 91–97; International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals Regulations on the Disciplinary Procedure for Detainees, MICT/24, 5 December 2018, regulations 8 and 10; and International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals Regulations on the Supervision of Visits to and Communications with Detainees, MICT/23, 5 December 2018, regulation 23.

⁸ Rules of Procedure and Evidence, rule 69.

1,740 CDs, DVDs and floppy disks, which are at risk of loss due to material decay, to more robust preservation storage. Over 180,000 records were migrated during the reporting period. Separately, digital records of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in 308,529 folders on shared network drives (11.93 terabytes) were appraised, and 3,185 records were identified for ingestion into the digital preservation system.

106. To ensure the preservation of physical documents and minimize damage caused by pollutants and other environmental factors, the Archives and Records Section transferred over 79.3 linear m of records from Mechanism offices to secure archival storage where temperature and humidity are controlled. In addition, in response to the recommendations from a conservation assessment undertaken in 2024 for the physical archives in Arusha, 48 items have been preserved. Separately, 20,109 exhibits of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda were processed for archiving and 1,900 preservation copies of photographic exhibits created.

107. Regarding audiovisual records, the digitization of the analogue audiovisual recordings of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia continued and is nearly complete, with an additional 900 recordings digitized and only 1.3 per cent remaining. In total, over 44,800 recordings have now been digitized, of which 82 per cent still need to be quality-checked and redacted. Correspondingly, 592 audiovisual recordings of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda were digitized during the reporting period, bringing the cumulative total of records digitized so far to 22,920, with 16.5 per cent remaining to be digitized. Approximately 54 per cent of the digitized recordings remain to be quality-checked and redacted. Efforts are now focused on completing the digitization of audiovisual recordings, quality control and creation of redacted versions.

108. In accordance with General Assembly resolution [79/255](#) on the Mechanism's budget, the Registry continued its efforts to actively pursue strategies to raise voluntary contributions in support of various archival initiatives, including digitization. With a concept note in place, the Registry has moved into the implementation phase of its fundraising strategy. Multiple funding requests have been submitted through written communications and high-level meetings with Member States. Although no contributions have been confirmed to date, efforts remain ongoing to secure support. The Mechanism will continue to update its fundraising and implementation plan and explore ways to leverage partnerships and engage a broader range of potential donors.

109. Over 380,000 judicial records are currently available through the Unified Court Records database, which brings together all public judicial records of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism. During the reporting period, these public judicial records were accessed by 16,765 users. Separately, the Mechanism Archives and Records Section responded to 76 requests for access to records, 53 in The Hague, where requesters were provided with more than 350 hours (288 recordings) of the public audiovisual recordings of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, and 23 in Arusha, where requesters received 113 transcripts of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

110. In addition, the Mechanism Archives and Records Section delivered briefings about the archives to 22 visitors in The Hague and 185 in Arusha. The visitors included members of the public, students and academics, as well as staff from other United Nations offices, law firms, national and regional judicial institutions, archival institutions and non-governmental organizations.

111. The cataloguing of the archives in accordance with international standards also continued, albeit slowly, and 378 new catalogue entries were created during the

reporting period, resulting in a total of over 12,770 descriptions of judicial and non-judicial archives. Separately, the publicly accessible catalogue on the Mechanism's website, which now contains over 4,400 entries, was accessed by 145 new users from across the globe. Along with other long-term archiving work, the cataloguing of the archives is continuing to the extent that resources permit, and will only be completed after all the archives of the ad hoc Tribunals and the different sections and units of the Mechanism have been transferred to the Mechanism Archives and Records Section.

112. Archives are, by definition, records deemed to be of permanent value.⁹ Consequently, their management is an ongoing task that will need to continue for as long as the Mechanism exists, unless a decision is taken by the Security Council to transfer the Mechanism's archiving functions to another body.

E. Budget, staffing and administration

113. In its resolution [79/255](#), the General Assembly appropriated to the special account for the Mechanism a total amount of \$60,963,800 gross (\$56,127,700 net) for 2025. The Mechanism implemented the decision of the Assembly¹⁰ regarding a reduction of \$1,323,600 in non-post resources and continues to ensure the prompt and efficient completion of its remaining work. The Mechanism expects to fully support its continuous residual work in 2025 within the approved budgetary resources. Details and a breakdown of the Mechanism's expenditures in 2025, presented in terms of funds committed, are set forth in enclosure I.

114. As previously reported, the 2025 budget of the Mechanism supports its mandated activities, namely: supervising the enforcement of sentences; fulfilling other residual judicial responsibilities; ensuring ongoing support in connection with protected victims and witnesses; providing assistance to national jurisdictions; managing the archives; and monitoring cases referred to national jurisdictions. Despite the indefinite stay of proceedings in the *Kabuga* case, the budget includes resources to support any ancillary activity arising from this case.

115. In the context of the UN80 Initiative, together with other United Nations entities, the Mechanism was asked to prepare its 2026 budget proposal with a view to maximizing efficiency while reducing costs to ensure that the Organization is more effective and relevant for the future. Specifically, entities were asked to achieve a reduction of 15 to 20 per cent of their budgets for the 2026 and 2025/26 revised estimates proposals. This review process included looking at post abolitions, potential restructuring and other possible efficiency measures. In response, the Mechanism is proposing up to 20 per cent in staffing cuts and around 16 per cent lower non-post requirements for 2026, compared with the base appropriation for 2025.

116. The Mechanism is heading towards completion of its proposed programme budget for 2026 and, as in previous years, it will follow recommendations and suggestions provided by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly during their 2026 budget deliberations. Regarding staffing levels, following the downsizing of general temporary assistance as part of the 2025 budget, a total of 22 positions will be abolished in 2025. There has also been a reduction of five posts. A total of 112 posts will remain on 31 December 2025, as previously reported.

⁹ See [ST/SGB/2007/5](#), sect. 1 (a), in which archives are defined as records to be permanently preserved for their administrative, fiscal, legal, historical or informational value.

¹⁰ In its resolution [79/255](#), the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to this effect (see [A/79/619](#)).

117. As at 1 November 2025, the Mechanism had 105 staff on posts and a further 128 staff on general temporary assistance positions, for a total of 233 staff.¹¹ Details concerning the staffing of the Mechanism by division are provided in enclosure II.

118. The Mechanism's continuous and general temporary assistance positions include nationals of 52 States: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, China, Congo, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Nigeria, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States and Zimbabwe.

119. Female staff members comprised 53 per cent of staff at the Professional level averaged across the two branches. However, the average percentage of female staff remains lower when General Service and Field Services staff are also taken into account, with a total of 47 per cent overall. Despite the constraints imposed by its nature as a downsizing institution, further improving gender parity remains a critical priority for the Mechanism, in line with the Secretary-General's gender parity objectives. The Mechanism's focal points for gender are regularly invited to provide their input for the text of job openings before they are advertised. Moreover, the Mechanism's revised downsizing policy, which requires managers to incorporate a gender perspective into determining operational requirements, was applied in relation to the proposed downsizing of posts in 2026.

120. With the support of the Registrar, the focal points for gender and for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse continued to disseminate information and organize awareness-raising events for Mechanism personnel. Increased focus continued to be placed on raising awareness of standards of conduct through the delivery of in-person training sessions on the topic "Sexual harassment, exploitation, and abuse – victim centred approach" for staff and non-staff personnel at both branches. The focus of the training on a victim-centred approach in addressing allegations of misconduct places the Mechanism at the forefront of United Nations prevention and response efforts.

121. During the reporting period, a staff counsellor from the Staff Counsellor's Office at the United Nations Office at Geneva visited the Mechanism's branch in The Hague, offering a series of presentations and workshops for staff and non-staff personnel over the course of one week. In addition, Mechanism staff were encouraged to participate in online training sessions on resilience and change management offered by the Office in October 2025.

122. The Mechanism's downsizing is uniquely guided by its operational requirements and in accordance with a governing framework and methodology that is periodically assessed and revised by the Mechanism's Joint Negotiating Committee, an advisory body to the Registrar composed of both management and staff union representatives. The Mechanism strives for a transparent and fair downsizing process through the comparative review platform, while affected staff members are able to voice any concerns through internal mechanisms and the United Nations internal justice system.

¹¹ This number does not include staff on posts made available to the Programme Planning and Budget Division or to OIOS.

123. Following the Secretariat's announcement of an early separation programme as part of the UN80 Initiative measures, the Mechanism successfully implemented the programme within the same eligibility framework.

XII. Reports of the Office of Internal Oversight Services

124. Following on from the evaluation it concluded in 2024 (see [S/2024/199](#); see also [S/PRST/2024/1](#)), OIOS commenced a new evaluation of the methods and work of the Mechanism earlier in 2025, which, as mentioned above, is currently ongoing. The Mechanism has been actively engaging with OIOS throughout and is grateful to the evaluation team for its cooperation and insights thus far. The Mechanism looks forward to receiving and responding to the forthcoming evaluation report, and to benefiting from the recommendations made.

125. In the meantime, the Mechanism continued to work diligently towards the full implementation of two outstanding recommendations from the previous OIOS evaluation, which are expected to be submitted for closure soon (see [S/2024/199](#), paras. 42–46).

126. Separately, during the reporting period, OIOS concluded its audit of the Mechanism's management of records and archiving processes. It found that while the classification of sensitive records was adequate, the Mechanism needed to improve declassification procedures, the preservation of judicial and non-judicial records, and records management and retention. To achieve this, OIOS issued nine important recommendations, including on: (a) developing action plans to prepare for the transfer of non-judicial records for disposal or preservation in line with the records retention schedules; (b) ensuring that emergency response and disaster recovery plans are finalized for the Arusha branch and updated for the Hague branch, and tested regularly for effectiveness; and (c) developing and implementing procedures for tracking and declassifying non-judicial records and information in line with [ST/SGB/2012/3](#) and the Mechanism's Rules of Procedure and Evidence.

XIII. Conclusion

127. The Security Council will make crucial decisions about the future of the Mechanism in 2026, informed by the reports of the Secretary-General, the current evaluation by OIOS and the Council's own review of the Mechanism's progress of work.

128. The Mechanism, in the interim, is not passively awaiting the outcome of these processes or the decisions that will be made. On the contrary, it has again taken proactive steps during the reporting period to further align itself with the Security Council's vision of a small, temporary institution, and has advanced in its deliberate, responsible planning for the future. Not only did it provide comprehensive analysis with respect to the forthcoming reports of the Secretary-General, but it also further streamlined its procedures, engaged in extensive internal collaboration and sought external expertise in light of the need to further decrease resources. As a result of these efforts, the Mechanism will be prepared to commence in full the implementation of any decision by the Council to transfer or terminate its mandated activities.

129. Despite devoting significant time and attention to the above-mentioned exercises, the Mechanism, as shown in the present report, was able to make strong progress with respect to its core work, namely the residual functions that the international community entrusted to it on its creation. It is worth recalling that these mandated functions are critical to the proper conclusion of the justice cycle that began

in the 1990s with the establishment of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. Whether it is the Mechanism or other bodies that will be so tasked, the cycle of justice must be seen through to the end in an efficient and fair manner that protects fundamental rights and safeguards the integrity of the judicial process.

130. The Mechanism remains deeply grateful to its judges and staff, whose outstanding commitment enables it to keep fulfilling its responsibilities to the highest standards, even in the face of significant resource constraints and uncertainty about the future. More broadly, the Mechanism extends sincere appreciation to Member States and other stakeholders for their critical support, including in the area of sentence enforcement. This is by no means an easy time for the Mechanism, or for international criminal justice in general. However, the Mechanism is heartened by the meaningful assistance and cooperation it continues to enjoy from those who place value in its work. With such support, the Mechanism will be well positioned to complete and/or transfer its residual functions in a manner befitting the historic legacy of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism itself.

Enclosure I

International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals: approved appropriations and commitments for 2025

Table 1

Approved appropriations for the period from 1 January to 31 December 2025 (net of staff assessment)

(United States dollars)

		<i>Liabilities: pensions of former judges of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and after-service health insurance of former staff of both Tribunals and the</i>					
		<i>Chambers</i>	<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>	
Arusha	Post	–	3 176 700	6 389 800	–	–	9 566 500
	Non-post ¹	101 800	2 206 630	7 380 300	5 488 500	–	15 177 230
	Subtotal	101 800	5 383 330	13 770 100	5 488 500	–	24 743 730
The Hague	Post	–	1 560 300	5 035 200	–	–	6 595 500
	Non-post	657 000	3 422 330	20 095 900	–	–	24 175 230
	Subtotal	657 000	4 982 630	25 131 100	–	–	30 770 730
New York	Post	–	–	215 700	–	–	215 700
	Non-post	–	–	1 500	–	–	1 500
	Subtotal	–	–	217 200	–	–	217 200
Office of Internal Oversight Services	Post	–	–	213 300	–	–	213 300
	Non-post	–	–	182 700	–	–	182 700
	Subtotal	–	–	396 000	–	–	396 000
Overall	Post	–	4 737 000	11 854 000	–	–	16 591 000
	Non-post	758 800	5 628 960	27 660 400	5 488 500	–	39 536 660
	Total	758 800	10 365 960	39 514 400	5 488 500	–	56 127 660

Table 2

Commitments net of staff assessment as at 1 November 2025 (from Umoja)

(United States dollars)

		<i>Liabilities: pensions of former judges of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and after-service health insurance of former staff of both Tribunals and the</i>					
		<i>Chambers</i>	<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>	
Arusha	Post	–	2 626 944	5 731 890	–	–	8 358 834
	Non-post	61 739	1 373 276	5 910 363	4 957 925	–	12 303 303
	Subtotal	61 739	4 000 220	11 642 253	4 957 925	–	20 662 137

¹ The non-post category includes all commitment items other than posts, such as general temporary assistance, travel and rental of premises.

		<i>Liabilities: pensions of former judges of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and after-service health insurance of former staff of both Tribunals and the</i>					
		<i>Chambers</i>	<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>	
The Hague	Post	–	1 403 688	4 395 154	–	5 798 842	
	Non-post	556 222	2 879 432	17 845 879	–	21 281 533	
Subtotal		556 222	4 283 120	22 241 033	–	27 080 375	
New York	Post	–	–	163 208	–	163 208	
	Non-post	–	–	13 463	–	13 463	
Subtotal		–	–	176 671	–	176 671	
Office of Internal Oversight Services	Post	–	–	182 769	–	182 769	
	Non-post	–	–	156 127	–	156 127	
Subtotal		–	–	338 896	–	338 896	
Overall	Post	–	4 030 632	10 473 021	–	14 503 653	
	Non-post	617 961	4 252 708	23 925 832	4 957 925	33 754 426	
Total		617 961	8 283 340	34 398 853	4 957 925	48 258 079	

Table 3
Annual budget committed as at 1 November 2025
 (Percentage)

		<i>Liabilities: pensions of former judges of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and after-service health insurance of former staff of both Tribunals and the</i>					
		<i>Chambers</i>	<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>	
Arusha	Post	–	82.7	89.7	–	87.4	
	Non-post	60.6	62.2	80.1	90.3	81.1	
Subtotal		60.6	74.3	84.5	90.3	83.5	
The Hague	Post	–	90.0	87.3	–	87.9	
	Non-post	84.7	84.1	88.8	–	88.0	
Subtotal		84.7	86.0	86.9	–	88.0	
New York	Post	–	–	75.7	–	75.7	
	Non-post	–	–	897.6	–	897.6	
Subtotal		–	–	81.3	–	81.3	
Office of Internal Oversight Services	Post	–	–	85.7	–	85.7	
	Non-post	–	–	85.5	–	85.5	
Subtotal		–	–	85.6	–	85.6	
Overall	Post	–	85.1	88.4	–	87.4	
	Non-post	81.4	75.6	86.5	90.3	85.4	
Total		81.4	79.9	87.1	90.3	86.0	

Enclosure II

Staffing of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

Table 1
Numbers of staff, by branch and organ, as at 1 November 2025

Category	Arusha branch	The Hague branch	Chambers	Office of the Prosecutor	Registry	Mechanism overall
All staff	99	134	21	58	154	233
Staff on continuous posts	63	42	7	26	72	105
Staff on general temporary assistance positions	36	92	14	32	82	128
International (Professional and higher categories and Field Service)	65	62	17	41	69	127
Local (General Service)	34	72	4	17	85	106

Table 2
Geographical representation, by regional group, as at 1 November 2025¹

	Arusha branch	The Hague branch	Mechanism overall
Number of nationalities	24	40	52
All staff			233
African	75	9	84 (36%)
Asia-Pacific	3	15	18 (8%)
Eastern European	1	28	29 (12%)
Latin American and Caribbean	–	4	4 (2%)
Western European and Others	20	78	98 (42%)
International (Professional and higher categories and Field Service)			127
African	41	1	42 (33%)
Asia-Pacific	3	8	11 (9%)
Eastern European	1	12	13 (10%)
Latin American and Caribbean	–	1	1 (1%)
Western European and Others	20	40	60 (47%)
Local (General Service)			106
African	34	8	42 (40%)
Asia-Pacific	–	7	7 (7%)
Eastern European	–	16	16 (15%)
Latin American and Caribbean	–	3	3 (3%)
Western European and Others	–	38	38 (36%)

Group of African States: Algeria, Cameroon, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Gambia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

Group of Asia-Pacific States: China, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines and Republic of Korea.

Group of Eastern European States: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, North Macedonia, Poland, Russian Federation, Serbia and Ukraine.

Group of Latin American and Caribbean States: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Haiti and Jamaica.

Group of Western European and Other States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

¹ As the percentages in this table are rounded to the nearest integer, the totals may not add up to 100.

Table 3
Gender representation, by branch, as at 1 November 2025

<i>Category</i>	<i>Arusha branch</i>	<i>The Hague branch</i>	<i>Mechanism overall</i>
Professional and higher			
All Professional and higher	40	62	102
Male	23 (57.5%)	24 (39%)	47 (46%)
Female	17 (42.5%)	38 (61%)	55 (54%)
Professional (P-4 and above)			
All P-4 and above	16	20	36
Male	11 (69%)	9 (45%)	20 (56%)
Female	5 (31%)	11 (55%)	16 (44%)
Field Service			
All Field Service	25	–	25
Male	15 (60%)	–	15 (60%)
Female	10 (40%)	–	10 (40%)
General Service			
All General Service	34	72	106
Male	23 (68%)	38 (53%)	61 (58%)
Female	11 (32%)	34 (47%)	45 (42%)
All staff	99	134	233
Male	61 (62%)	62 (46%)	123 (53%)
Female	38 (38%)	72 (54%)	110 (47%)

Table 4
Number of staff by organ

	<i>Arusha branch</i>	<i>The Hague branch</i>	<i>Mechanism overall</i>
Chambers (including the Office of the President)	7	14	21
Office of the President	3	8	11
Legal Support Section	4	6	10
Office of the Prosecutor	29	29	58
Registry	63	91	154
Immediate Office of the Registrar	7	6	13
Mechanism Archives and Records Section	11	15	26
Witness Support and Protection Unit	2	3	5
Judicial Records Unit	2	3	5
Language Support Services	4	7	11
Division of Administration	21	41	62
Security and Safety Section	16	12	28
United Nations Detention Unit	–	4	4

Annex II to the letter dated 17 November 2025 from the President of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals addressed to the President of the Security Council

[Original: English and French]

Progress report of Serge Brammertz, Prosecutor of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, provided to the Security Council under paragraph 16 of Security Council resolution 1966 (2010)

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Overview	31
II. Residual prosecutorial functions	32
III. Assistance to national prosecutions	32
A. Provision of evidence and expertise to national prosecutors	33
B. National justice for crimes committed in Rwanda	34
C. National justice for crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia	37
D. Denial and glorification	43
E. Missing persons	44
IV. Future planning	45
V. Management	46
VI. Conclusion	46

I. Overview

1. The Prosecutor submits this twenty-seventh progress report pursuant to Security Council resolution 1966 (2010), covering developments from 16 May 2025 to 15 November 2025.
2. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued to advance its two strategic priorities: assisting national jurisdictions prosecuting international crimes committed in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, and effectively litigating mandated residual matters.
3. Regarding residual matters, two issues arising from mid-2023 have unfortunately still not been brought to completion. Fulgence Kayishema, who was arrested in May 2023, remains in the custody of South Africa. There is not yet a prospect for his transfer to the Mechanism, initially, and then to Rwanda for trial. Similarly, Félicien Kabuga remains in the custody of the Mechanism following the indefinite stay of his trial ordered on 8 September 2023. While the Office of the Prosecutor continues to litigate these matters, their completion is outside its control.
4. Regarding national prosecutions of crimes committed during the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda, during the reporting period the Office of the Prosecutor provided assistance to 24 national cases. Cooperation between the Office, the Prosecutor General of Rwanda and other national prosecutors continued to strengthen and increase. The Office provided direct support to national investigations and prosecutions conducted by the authorities of Member States, including by providing investigative support and transferring analytical reports. In furtherance of article 28 (3) of the statute of the Mechanism and the completion strategy of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, the Office will continue providing requested support to the accountability process.
5. Regarding national prosecutions of war crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia, during the reporting period the Office of the Prosecutor provided assistance to 52 national cases. The Office continued to respond to a wide range of requests for assistance from national prosecutors. In addition to searching its evidence collection, the Office responded to requests for direct case assistance, which entailed providing legal, investigative and prosecutorial support to ongoing cases. The Office also continued its efforts to improve regional judicial cooperation in war crimes cases, with a particular focus on the transfer of cases concerning unavailable suspects and accused from Bosnia and Herzegovina to partners in the Western Balkans region. All these efforts, pursuant to article 28 (3) of the statute and the completion strategy of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, are highly valued by national prosecutors in the region and produce meaningful results in the justice process.
6. The Office of the Prosecutor is fully cognizant of the Security Council's desire to consider options for the future of the Mechanism's remaining functions, consistent with resolution 2740 (2024). During the reporting period, the Office provided relevant factual and technical information to the Office of Legal Affairs for the reports of the Secretary-General requested by the Council. With respect to its function of assisting national jurisdictions, which generates most of its workload, the Office supports the transfer of this mandate, together with the Office's evidence collection and its experienced staff, to another United Nations office. Such a transfer is feasible, would ensure that Member States continue to receive the support and assistance they require and would contribute to bringing the work of the Mechanism to completion. During the reporting period, the Office significantly advanced its planning and preparations in order to ensure that it can expeditiously implement any decision of the Council in this regard.

7. In managing its work, the Office of the Prosecutor continued to be guided by the Security Council's views and requests as set forth, inter alia, in paragraphs 18 to 20 of resolution [2256 \(2015\)](#) and paragraphs 7 and 8 of resolution [2422 \(2018\)](#). The Office's budget proposal for 2026 demonstrates its continued adherence to the Council's instructions and implementation of the UN80 Initiative reforms. The Office is proposing a reduction of 20 per cent in its staffing and a reduction of 20 per cent in its total resource requirements compared with its approved 2025 budget.

II. Residual prosecutorial functions

8. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor litigated and addressed residual matters concerning the cases *Prosecutor v. Kabuga* and *Prosecutor v. Kayishema*, as well as applications for early release from convicted persons.

9. With respect to the *Kabuga* case, which was indefinitely stayed on 8 September 2023, Mr. Kabuga remains detained at the United Nations Detention Unit in The Hague. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor filed two submissions relating to the possibility of repatriating him to Rwanda, which is the only country willing and able to accept him. The Prosecution provided an expert medical report in support of its position that Mr. Kabuga can be safely transported via air ambulance. On 13 November, the Trial Chamber issued its decision concluding that Mr. Kabuga cannot be flown to Rwanda, requesting European States to accept him into their territories and declining to provide his medical information to the Rwanda authorities.

10. With respect to the referred case against Fulgence Kayishema, who was arrested on 24 May 2023 but remains in South African custody, the Prosecution filed seven submissions during the reporting period opposing Mr. Kayishema's efforts to further delay his trial and frustrate the justice process. The Office of the Prosecutor calls on South Africa to immediately surrender Mr. Kayishema to the Mechanism in accordance with the arrest warrant.

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

12. As part of its ongoing operations, the Office of the Prosecutor has continued to address witness-related issues, including responding to communications from witnesses and liaising with national authorities regarding witnesses.

III. Assistance to national prosecutions

13. National prosecutions remain essential to achieving greater justice for the victims of war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide committed in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. The Office of the Prosecutor is mandated to assist and support national prosecutions of these crimes, in accordance with the completion strategies of the ad hoc Tribunals, resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#) and the statute of the Mechanism. During the reporting period, the Office continued to receive a high volume of requests for assistance from national judiciaries and international organizations. These requests address three related areas in which support from the Office is needed: first, requests for access to evidence and information; second, requests for substantive legal, investigative and prosecutorial direct case assistance, including through the preparation and transfer of investigation dossiers; and third, requests for assistance in resolving strategic and/or cross-cutting issues affecting the accountability process, including the challenges of fugitives and international

cooperation. The Office also provides strategic advice, feedback and support to national prosecution services and justice sectors. Lastly, the Office continued to assist and engage with a range of stakeholders concerning issues directly related to the accountability process such as denial and glorification, missing persons and capacity-building.

A. Provision of evidence and expertise to national prosecutors

14. Pursuant to article 28 (3) of the statute, the Office of the Prosecutor is mandated to respond to requests from national authorities for assistance in relation to justice for international crimes committed in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. During the reporting period, in implementing this mandate, the Office provided assistance in relation to 193 national case files.

15. National authorities require and request such assistance because the Office of the Prosecutor possesses extensive evidence and invaluable expertise that can greatly benefit national justice efforts. The Yugoslavia-related evidence collection comprises more than 9 million pages of documents, tens of thousands of hours of audio and video records and thousands of artefacts, most of which was not introduced into evidence in any proceeding before the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and thus is only available from the Office. The Rwanda-related evidence collection comprises more than 1 million pages of documents. These large evidence collections are partly available remotely. In addition, staff members of the Office assist national partners by providing their demonstrated expertise in investigations and prosecutions and unique insight into the crimes committed. The Office also offers its good offices to facilitate the work of national partners, particularly in strengthening international and regional cooperation.

16. The volume and complexity of requests for assistance received, as well as the wide range of authorities who are submitting requests for assistance, clearly demonstrate both the large number of cases still to be processed and that continued assistance from the Office of the Prosecutor is vital for greater accountability.

17. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued its consultations with national prosecutors in Rwanda and countries of the former Yugoslavia to discuss their needs and the provision of assistance from the Office for national criminal cases. In September, the Prosecutor attended the annual conference of war crimes prosecutors from the former Yugoslavia, and in November he visited Rwanda for high-level meetings with the Minister of Justice, the Prosecutor General and other senior officials. Throughout the reporting period staff of the Office remained in regular communication with counterparts regarding their investigations and prosecutions.

18. Concerning crimes committed in Rwanda, during the reporting period and pursuant to its cooperation with the National Public Prosecution Authority of Rwanda and other national prosecution services, the Office of the Prosecutor received 30 requests for assistance from eight Member States. Seven requests for assistance were submitted by authorities in Rwanda, eight were from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, four were from France, three were from the Kingdom of the Netherlands, three were from Belgium, three were from Canada, one was from Switzerland and one was from the United States of America.

19. With respect to requests for access to evidence concerning Rwanda, the Office of the Prosecutor received 21 requests for access to evidence and information from seven Member States during the reporting period. In total, the Office handed over 371 documents comprising nearly 13,000 pages of evidence and six audiovisual files. In

addition, the Office confirmed the whereabouts of and obtained cooperation from two witnesses who had appeared before the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the Mechanism to support national authorities. The Office also filed four submissions related to witness protective measures and/or access to evidence in support of national authorities.

20. With respect to requests for direct case assistance concerning Rwanda, during the reporting period the Office of the Prosecutor provided legal, evidentiary and strategic assistance with respect to nine such requests from four Member States. This entailed providing six analytical reports and three investigative memorandums. In addition, the Office handed over 302 documents comprising approximately 7,000 pages of material. This work further entailed more than 10 operational meetings with national counterparts.

21. Concerning crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia, during the reporting period the Office of the Prosecutor received 106 requests for assistance from four Member States and one international organization. Eighty-two requests for assistance were submitted by authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 7 were from Montenegro, 7 were from the United States, 6 were from Serbia, 2 were from Sweden and 1 was from Croatia.

22. With respect to requests for access to evidence, the Office of the Prosecutor received 74 requests for access to evidence and information from four Member States and one international organization. In total, the Office handed over 2,664 documents comprising nearly 126,000 pages of evidence and 25 audiovisual records. In addition, the Office filed four submissions related to witness protective measures and/or access to evidence in support of national authorities.

23. With respect to direct care assistance requests concerning the former Yugoslavia, during the reporting period the Office of the Prosecutor provided legal, evidentiary and strategic assistance with respect to 19 such requests from three Member States. This work entailed 10 memorandums and analytical reports and four operational meetings, as well as the transfer of 266 documents comprising 7,600 pages of material and 31 audiovisual files. Upon the request of Member States, the Office used its good offices and held two meetings with witnesses to secure their cooperation for national proceedings.

24. A backlog of requests for assistance dating back more than six months had previously developed as a result of the significant increase in requests received. That backlog has been reduced from 280 requests in 2021 to 20 as at 15 November 2025. To avoid creating a critical risk to the success of national investigations and prosecutions, as well as to the search for missing persons, it is vital for the Office of the Prosecutor to receive support for its reasonable resource requests to meet its mandate under article 28 (3) of the statute.

B. National justice for crimes committed in Rwanda

1. Completion strategy of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda

25. The completion of trials before the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the Mechanism is not the end of the justice process for the victims of the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda. National authorities now have primary responsibility for the continued implementation of the Tribunal's completion strategy. Courts in countries around the world continue to process cases of international crimes committed during the Rwandan genocide. Consistent with the principle of complementarity and national ownership of post-conflict accountability, prosecutions

by the Rwandan justice sector in accordance with international due process and fair trial standards are in principle the most advantageous accountability mechanism.

26. During the reporting period, the Prosecutor visited Rwanda from 30 September to 2 October for high-level meetings with the Minister of Justice, Emmanuel Ugirashebuta, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Domitilla Mukantaganzwa, the Prosecutor General, Angélique Habyarimana, the Chief Military Prosecutor, Lieutenant Colonel Charles Sumanyi, and the Chairperson of the Rwanda Law Reform Commission, Claudine Dushimimana. The Prosecutor and interlocutors discussed future cooperation and collaboration. The Minister of Justice emphasized that the Office of the Prosecutor possesses unique expertise in investigations and prosecutions and that the Government of Rwanda fully expects that this support will continue to be provided for a number of years to come. It was positively noted that today more investigations and prosecutions are under way than in the past, and that there is a renewed emphasis on securing accountability for crimes committed during the genocide. In Rwanda, the National Public Prosecution Authority is conducting important investigations with the Office's support, including for notorious crimes committed in the former Butare and Kibuye prefectures. The Authority requested the Office to establish joint investigative teams for additional suspects, notably former members of the genocidal Forces armées rwandaises.

27. The Prosecutor and his Office also engaged intensively throughout the reporting period with national prosecutors in a number of other countries concerning progress in the extradition or prosecution of those suspected of committing crimes during the genocide.

2. Fugitives

28. The Prosecutor General of Rwanda is currently searching for more than 1,000 fugitives. In the course of its activities to track the remaining fugitives under its jurisdiction and provide assistance to national authorities, the Office of the Prosecutor has been identifying additional persons who may be reasonably suspected to be responsible for participating in the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda. Similarly, law enforcement and prosecutorial authorities, as well as civil society and others, also continue to identify such persons, particularly in Europe.

29. At the request of the Prosecutor General of Rwanda, the Office of the Prosecutor is providing vital assistance to find solutions to this ongoing challenge. During the reporting period, the Office worked with the Prosecutor General to collect, collate and analyse information and confirm the whereabouts and status of four fugitives, whose fugitive files can now be closed, bringing the total number of files closed this year to 69. Notably, in June 2025, acting on intelligence provided by the Office, the Rwandan authorities took into custody Fulgence Niyibizi, who has been a fugitive for a decade following his indictment for crimes committed in Butare while serving as a trainee at the Ecole des sous-officiers. The Office continues to conduct tracking activities and engage with national partners regarding additional fugitives, and anticipates being able to report more positive progress in the coming period.

3. Cases referred to Rwanda

30. Following his arrest on 24 May 2023, Fulgence Kayishema will be brought to trial in Rwanda, as his case was referred to Rwanda by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda on 22 February 2012. The arrest warrant provides that Mr. Kayishema will initially be transferred to the custody of the Mechanism in Arusha, from where he will then be transferred to Rwanda.

31. Two years have passed since Mr. Kayishema's arrest, yet no evident progress has been made by the South African authorities in transferring him to the Mechanism. Relevant legal proceedings have commenced in South Africa but have been repeatedly delayed. Hearings were conducted before the High Court in Cape Town in late 2023, then postponed to March 2024, then postponed again until August 2024 and to 30 July 2025. The case has now been further postponed until 26 March 2026.

32. The Office of the Prosecutor calls upon South Africa to promptly carry out its international legal obligations under the statute and transfer Mr. Kayishema to the Mechanism's custody so that he can then be transferred to Rwanda for trial. The victims have already waited 30 years for justice, and it is incumbent on the South African authorities to ensure that the victims do not have to wait longer.

4. Progress in national investigations and prosecutions

33. In Rwanda, during the reporting period, on 29 May 2025, the Court of Appeal issued its judgment affirming the conviction of Jean de Dieu Munyakyanza and the sentence of 25 years of imprisonment.

34. On 8 August 2025, François Gasana was extradited to Rwanda from Norway, where he had been detained since 2022. Mr. Gasana is accused of direct participation in killings, including the murder of a child, and incitement to commit genocide in Kivumu in the former Kibuye prefecture. His trial is expected to commence in the near future before the chamber for international crimes of the High Court. During the reporting period, the High Court continued to conduct proceedings in the trials of Jean-Paul Micomyiza and Vincent Murekezi and the appeal of Beatrice Munyenyezi.

35. On 13 November 2025, the Kiyumba intermediary court issued its judgment convicting Germain Musonera of complicity in genocide in relation to crimes committed in Kiyumba and sentenced him to 20 years of imprisonment. Following his extradition from the United States on 4 March 2025, pretrial proceedings against Ahmed Napoleon Mbonkunkiza continued before the Nyarugenge intermediate court. Mr. Mbonkunkiza, a member of the National Revolutionary Movement for Development party and a close associate of the convicted *génocidaire* Mathieu Ngirumpatse, is accused of crimes committed in Nyarugenge.

36. The Rwandan authorities conducted two arrests during the reporting period. As noted above, on 21 June 2025 Fulgence Niyibizi was arrested based on intelligence provided by the Office of the Prosecutor. On 1 November 2025, the Rwandan authorities arrested Faustin Ndindabahizi for suspected genocide crimes committed in the former Kibuye prefecture.

37. In France, on 21 May 2025, a court of appeal upheld an appeal by victims and ordered the reopening of a judicial investigation of Callixte Mbarushimana for suspected crimes committed in Kigali during the genocide. On 23 October 2025, a court of appeal upheld Sosthène Munyemana's genocide convictions and sentence of 24 years of imprisonment. In addition, during the reporting period the *Parquet national antiterroriste* requested that Pierre Kayondo be tried before the *Cour d'assises* on charges of genocide crimes committed in the former Gitarama prefecture.

38. In the United States, Vincent Nzigiyimfura was indicted on 10 June 2025 and arrested on 13 June 2025 in connection with genocide crimes committed in the former Gitarama and Butare prefectures.

C. National justice for crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia

1. Completion strategy of the International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia

39. As the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia emphasized in his final report on the Tribunal's completion strategy report (S/2017/1001, annex II), it had always been foreseen that the completion of trials under the Tribunal and the Mechanism would not be the end of justice for war crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia, but the beginning of the next chapter. Further accountability for the crimes now depends fully on the national authorities of the countries of the former Yugoslavia. The work of the Tribunal has created a solid foundation for national judiciaries to continue implementing the completion strategy and securing more justice for more victims.

40. National judiciaries have achieved progress in accountability for war crimes, albeit unevenly between different countries. Looking forward, national judiciaries continue to face a very large backlog of war crimes cases to process, with several thousand cases remaining across the region. Most importantly, much more remains to be done to bring to justice senior- and mid-level suspects who worked together with or were subordinate to senior war criminals prosecuted and convicted by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

41. The Prosecutor and his Office continued to engage intensively with the authorities of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia. Through meetings with senior officials, media appearances and engagements with the diplomatic community, the Office of the Prosecutor sought to bring visibility and attention to war crimes justice. The Prosecutor and his Office also continued to support solutions to challenges in regional cooperation. National prosecutors and government officials also reported that the assistance provided by the Office is valued and having significant impact. They requested that such cooperation be strengthened even further, recognizing the difference that support from the Office makes in ensuring accountability.

2. Regional judicial cooperation

42. Judicial cooperation between the countries of the former Yugoslavia is essential for ensuring that those responsible for war crimes are held accountable. Many suspects are not present in the territory where they are alleged to have committed the crimes, and extradition is blocked. Cooperation to transfer investigations and indictments is thus essential to achieve justice. Together with regional prosecutors and authorities, the Office of the Prosecutor has been working intensively over the past several years to reverse this trend. These efforts continue to generate notable improvements in regional cooperation in war crimes cases. However, there are still significant challenges.

43. The annual regional conference on war crimes prosecutions was held in September in Brijuni, Croatia. The Prosecutor met with participating delegations from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro on the margins of the conference to address and find solutions to specific regional cooperation issues. Concrete steps to improve regional judicial cooperation were identified and agreed upon at the conference, including a commitment to jointly address remaining obstacles and challenges in the processing of transferred cases. Prosecution offices also affirmed their commitment to ensure the protection of International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and Mechanism witnesses and requested that they be provided greater access to protected witnesses to support the justice process at the national level. The Office of the Prosecutor will engage intensively with partners to support and monitor the implementation of the conclusions in the coming period. Unfortunately, issues

regarding cooperation with Serbia could not be addressed as the Serbian War Crimes Prosecutor's Office for the first time did not participate in the conference.

44. The Office of the Prosecutor reported extensively in the Mechanism's twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth progress reports (S/2024/836, annex II, and S/2025/309, annex II) on the particular challenge of the many case files in Bosnia and Herzegovina that concern suspects and accused persons who currently reside in other countries in the region, predominately Croatia and Serbia. As these persons can only be brought to trial in the country where they currently reside, due to the absence of extradition, such case files need to be transferred from Bosnia and Herzegovina to the country of current residence. There are more than 300 persons suspected or indicted by the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina who are unavailable.

45. In 2024, the Prosecutor engaged in detailed consultations with high-level authorities in Croatia and Serbia and obtained their agreement to accept and appropriately process these cases for transfer, including ensuring that necessary resources are allocated. Since that time, the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina has transmitted 18 cases for transfer to Croatia and Serbia. To date, Croatia has formally accepted one case for transfer, while Serbia has not yet accepted any cases. The Office of the Prosecutor calls upon prosecutors and justice sector authorities in Croatia and Serbia to prioritize the transfer and further processing of these cases and will provide further updates on progress.

3. Bosnia and Herzegovina

46. Throughout the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued its close cooperation with the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina, including through assistance on concrete cases, strategic support and activities to transfer lessons learned. In September, the Prosecutor met with the Chief Prosecutor of Bosnia and Herzegovina to discuss war crimes processing, challenges in ongoing cases and other matters of mutual interest.

47. During the reporting period, the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina filed one indictment against 1 suspect, while four cases against 29 persons were terminated or closed. The Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina also transferred three cases against six suspects to entity-level prosecution services. The remaining backlog at the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina consists of 177 cases against 2,062 persons. Of these, 94 cases are under investigation; the remaining cases are in the pre-investigative phase. In addition, there is a backlog of 228 cases against unknown perpetrators at the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as approximately 1,300 cases against unknown perpetrators at cantonal and district prosecution offices.

48. The Office of the Prosecutor of the Mechanism continues to develop its strong collaboration and cooperation with the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina in three key areas.

49. First, as noted, the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina has a significant backlog of cases concerning suspects known to reside outside Bosnia and Herzegovina, primarily in Croatia and Serbia. The Office of the Prosecutor has engaged intensively to facilitate the transfer of these proceedings to the jurisdictions where the suspects reside for further processing. The Office continues to monitor developments and engage with all relevant authorities.

50. Second, the Office of the Prosecutor continues to collaborate with the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina to advance its ongoing investigations and prosecutions. In particular, the Chief Prosecutor of Bosnia and Herzegovina has instituted a practice of identifying annually priority cases with the goal of completing

investigations and issuing prosecutorial decisions as expeditiously as possible. For 2025, the Chief Prosecutor identified 11 new priority cases. The Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina has requested the Office of the Prosecutor to provide direct support to these priority cases. During the reporting period, the Office assisted a number of priority investigations and provided four legal and analytical memorandums, evidentiary materials including 155 documents totalling 4,077 pages and 25 audiovisual records, and strategic advice.

51. Third, there are still significant impunity gaps that remain to be addressed by the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina. At the request of that Office, the Office of the Prosecutor of the Mechanism previously handed over an extensive investigative dossier concerning the involvement of a mid-level suspect for crimes committed during the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia. During the reporting period, to support further action on this case, the Office of the Prosecutor and the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina established a joint task force. Its first operational meeting took place in The Hague on 17 and 18 June, bringing together prosecutors, legal officers and investigators from both offices. Responding to requests made at the meeting, the Office of the Prosecutor has handed over three legal and analytical memorandums with supporting evidentiary materials. The Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina is treating the case as a priority, and the Office of the Prosecutor is committed to providing the necessary assistance as the investigation progresses.

52. As the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina continues to complete investigations and file indictments, the caseload of the State Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina will increase. This will present an important challenge, particularly as limited courtroom capacity, scheduling issues and other constraints are already delaying the timely completion of trials. Solutions will need to be identified to ensure that war crimes cases are appropriately managed and expeditiously concluded.

53. Overall, and taking into account the completion strategy of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the next few years will be critical to delivering more justice for war crimes in Bosnia and Herzegovina. There remains a significant backlog of cases to investigate and prosecute, and it is clear that the remaining cases are likely to be among the most challenging. Completing this work, even in ideal circumstances, will take many years, and the passage of time only heightens the urgency to work more expeditiously. The Office of the Prosecutor of the Mechanism and the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina will also continue to strengthen their cooperation.

4. Croatia

54. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued to engage with the State Attorney's Office and the Ministry of Justice of Croatia, which hosted the annual regional conference of war crimes prosecutors in 2025.

55. The State Attorney's Office terminated the two remaining category II cases that had previously been transferred from Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2020. While the formal decision has not yet been received, the Office of the Prosecutor was informed that indictments would not be filed against Zlatan Mijo Jelić and Mario Miličević.

56. The category II cases against Messrs. Jelić and Miličević related to the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia trials in *Prosecutor v. Prlić et al.* and *Prosecutor v. Naletilić and Martinović*. Extensive evidence was introduced in those proceedings documenting the suspected responsibility of Messrs. Jelić and Miličević for crimes committed in Mostar in 1993 and 1994. As established in the *Prlić et al.* case, Bosnian Croat leaders implemented a joint criminal enterprise to

ethnically cleanse Bosnian Muslims from claimed territory in Herzegovina. In Mostar, Croatian Defence Council forces forcibly removed Bosnian Muslims from their homes, unlawfully detained and mistreated them in notorious detention facilities such as the Heliodrom, used detainees as forced labour and human shields, and ultimately besieged East Mostar and committed severe crimes including unlawful attacks on civilians, wanton destruction and the unlawful infliction of terror. Messrs. Jelić and Miličević had important command positions in the Croatian Defence Council forces during this period. Mr. Jelić, who was a key subordinate of convicted Croatian Defence Council commanders including Milivoj Petković and Slobodan Praljak, commanded all Croatian Defence Council forces in Mostar at the time of the siege of East Mostar and ethnic cleansing operations against Bosnian Muslims. For example, extensive documentary records show his direct involvement in the unlawful use of detained Bosnian Muslim civilians for forced labour. Mr. Miličević was commander of an anti-terrorist group of the so-called Convicts Battalion and a subordinate of the convicted Croatian Defence Council commander Mladen Naletilić and ultimately of Mr. Jelić. Mr. Miličević's unit is implicated in ethnic cleansing operations in Mostar. For example, witness evidence from a member of his unit shows that it regularly participated in the forcible transfer of Bosnian Muslim civilians and other crimes.

57. In accordance with the completion strategy, Messrs. Jelić and Miličević were not indicted by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, and their cases were transferred first to Bosnia and Herzegovina and then to Croatia for processing. Notably, the Croatian authorities insisted that the cases would only be accepted for transfer from Bosnia and Herzegovina pursuant to the applicable agreement on mutual legal assistance between the countries. As a result, Bosnia and Herzegovina can no longer assert jurisdiction over the cases, and the decisions by the Croatian State Attorney's Office terminate these proceedings against Messrs. Jelić and Miličević. The Office of the Prosecutor will carefully review the formal decisions to close these cases, particularly to identify whether there are systematic evidentiary or legal issues that may have a negative impact on progress on other cases transferred from Bosnia and Herzegovina.

58. As previously reported, there is a large backlog of pending requests for assistance submitted to the Croatian authorities by prosecutors in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Available information indicates that these requests are still not being processed expeditiously, with only a minimal number responded to during the reporting period. Prosecutors from Bosnia and Herzegovina have further confirmed that this situation is obstructing the processing of investigations and trials. The Office of the Prosecutor trusts that the Croatian authorities will prioritize responding to the outstanding requests so that prosecutorial activities can be completed and the approximately 100 related cases can be transferred to Croatia for trial.

59. Overall, and taking into account the completion strategy of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the Croatian authorities have confirmed their commitment to achieving more justice, and there are a significant number of cases that provide opportunities to demonstrate this commitment in practice, including by responding to the backlog of pending requests for assistance and accepting to transfer investigative files from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Decisions were made to terminate investigations in the final two category II cases against Messrs. Jelić and Miličević, but it can be hoped that the case against Nedjeljko Obradović will be more successful. Significant accountability gaps remain for crimes committed by Bosnian Croat forces, and as many suspects now reside in Croatia, achieving further justice depends heavily on the Croatian State Attorney's Office.

5. Montenegro

60. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued its engagement with the Montenegrin authorities. Staff of the Office visited Montenegro from 4 to 5 November for consultations with the President of the Supreme Court, Valentina Pavličić, the Special State Prosecutor, Vladimir Novović, the Supreme State Prosecution Office and representatives of the Ministry of Justice.

61. Notable results were achieved during the reporting period. The judgment was issued in the trial of Slobodan Peković for war crimes committed in Foča in 1992. Mr. Peković was found guilty, marking the first conviction in Montenegro for conflict-related sexual violence, and was sentenced to 20 years of imprisonment. This verdict marks an important step forward for the Montenegrin judiciary and may encourage other victims of sexual violence to come forward and seek justice.

62. In addition, the indictment filed by the Special State Prosecutor's Office against Zoran Gašović on suspicion of having committed crimes in Hadžići was confirmed. This indictment relates to one of the two investigative dossiers previously transferred by the Office of the Prosecutor, demonstrating that the close collaboration between that Office and the Special State Prosecutor's Office is yielding positive results. Moreover, this indictment represents a step forward on two important legal issues. For the first time in Montenegro, the indictment charges the accused with crimes against humanity. Similarly, the indictment is supported by extensive evidence from the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the Mechanism, consistent with recent amendments to the Montenegrin Criminal Procedure Code as previously reported (see [S/2024/836](#), annex II).

63. The Special State Prosecutor's Office in Montenegro currently has one ongoing investigation and multiple cases in the pre-investigative phase. The Office of the Prosecutor of the Mechanism continued to provide direct case assistance to the Special State Prosecutor's Office by obtaining the cooperation of key witnesses and providing other forms of assistance related to ongoing proceedings. At the request of the Special State Prosecutor's Office, the Office of the Prosecutor is also preparing an investigative dossier concerning the suspected involvement of a Montenegrin national in war crimes. The Office of the Prosecutor will continue to provide the necessary support to the Special State Prosecutor's Office and looks forward to reporting on more positive progress.

64. Important reforms in domestic law to support war crimes justice are urgently needed to ensure the successful prosecution of war crimes cases in Montenegro. As previously reported, the Office of the Prosecutor continued to engage with the Montenegrin authorities to strengthen witness protection measures, particularly in cases involving conflict-related sexual violence. The Office continues to provide requested support to promote progress in this and other important areas.

65. The primary challenge to the delivery of war crimes justice in Montenegro continues to be insufficient human resources. Montenegrin investigators and prosecutors have demonstrated their willingness and ability to achieve more accountability. However, with only two prosecutors assigned on a part-time basis to war crimes cases, the results that can be achieved are necessarily limited. The Office of the Prosecutor notes that the Supreme State Prosecutor temporarily reassigned two prosecutors from his Office to assist with the processing of war crimes cases. The Office of the Prosecutor encourages the Montenegrin authorities to consider all potential options to strengthen the capacity of the Special State Prosecutor's Office.

66. While the delivery of war crimes justice in Montenegro is only beginning, the State authorities have accepted that far more needs to be done, and have made clear commitments and taken tangible steps towards achieving more accountability for war

crimes. With the positive developments in the recent period, expectations are high that concrete results will be achieved in the delivery of war crimes justice in Montenegro.

6. Serbia

67. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor's engagement and cooperation with the Serbian authorities was limited due to ongoing institutional challenges. Unfortunately, the selection process for the Chief War Crimes Prosecutor has not yet been concluded. The mandate of the former Chief War Crimes Prosecutor ended in May 2023. Two different persons have served on an acting basis in the interim. The absence of an appointed Chief War Crimes Prosecutor for over two years has necessarily impeded the work of the Public Prosecutor's Office for War Crimes of Serbia. The Office of the Prosecutor of the Mechanism encourages the Serbian authorities to complete the selection process for this important position as soon as possible.

68. During the reporting period, the Public Prosecutor's Office for War Crimes of Serbia issued two new indictments against two accused persons. As at the end of the reporting period, the Public Prosecutor's Office has 15 ongoing war crimes trials. In addition, it has 29 open investigations and six cases in the pre-investigation phase against a total of 89 suspects. Two first instance judgments were issued during the reporting period. The appellate courts issued three judgments, with two cases being returned for retrial.

69. On 1 July 2025, the High Court issued its first instance verdict in the *Živanović* case, acquitting the accused of all charges. The case against Milenko Živanović, a former commander of the Drina Corps of the Bosnian Serb Army and the most senior-ranking person in Serbia to be charged with war crimes, was an important test of the ability of Serbia to pursue accountability for senior-level perpetrators. The Office of the Prosecutor provided extensive assistance to the Public Prosecutor's Office for War Crimes of Serbia. Unfortunately, prosecutorial decisions in the trial, including the selection of charges, the conduct of the trial and the overall prosecutorial approach, exposed serious shortcomings. Similarly, the long-running trial of Branko Basara, a category II case involving another senior official, was discontinued after it was found that the accused was no longer fit to stand trial. In the more than four years of trial in that case, a total of 11 witnesses were heard. In relation to the files previously handed over by the Office of the Prosecutor, the Public Prosecutor's Office for War Crimes of Serbia has open investigations against two suspects.

70. Other outstanding issues concerning accused or convicted war criminals who fled to Serbia have not yet been resolved. As regularly reported since 2014 (see [S/2014/827](#), annex II), Novak Djukić fled to Serbia following his conviction for war crimes by the Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Proceedings to enforce his sentence have not been successfully completed. In 2020, Mirko Vručinić absconded to Serbia before the completion of his trial in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is not clear whether efforts are under way in Serbia to prosecute him. Likewise, Milomir Savčić, who was standing trial in Bosnia and Herzegovina for his alleged involvement in the Srebrenica genocide, fled to Serbia in August 2021. The Public Prosecutor's Office for War Crimes of Serbia has initiated a proceeding against him, but an indictment has not yet been filed.

71. In the Mechanism's ninth progress report ([S/2016/975](#), annex II), the Office of the Prosecutor reported that war crimes justice in Serbia was at a crossroads. Although some positive steps were taken in the intervening period, overall progress has been limited and the processing of war crimes cases in Serbia has not yet yielded expected results. The Office stands ready to assist the Serbian authorities to put war crimes justice back on track and move towards achievement of the goals set out in the 2016

National War Crimes Strategy, including achieving results in the processing of cases against senior- and mid-level officials. The Public Prosecutor's Office for War Crimes of Serbia has demonstrated the capacity to pursue complex cases and establish effective cooperation with regional partners, particularly with Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is critical that the Serbian authorities build on these positive steps to address the substantial backlog of cases, as significant accountability gaps remain. In addition, there are more than 100 cases that will need to be transferred from Bosnia and Herzegovina to Serbia for prosecution. The victims, the public and other stakeholders rightly hope to see concrete advancements demonstrating a will to realize the commitments made in the National War Crimes Strategy. The Office of the Prosecutor hopes to report on tangible results and more meaningful progress over the next reporting periods.

D. Denial and glorification

1. Rwanda

72. In 2006, the Appeals Chamber of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda held that the facts of the genocide committed in Rwanda were established beyond any dispute and thus constituted facts of common knowledge. In particular, the Appeals Chamber concluded that it was a universally known fact that, between 6 April and 17 July 1994, there was a genocide in Rwanda against the Tutsi ethnic group. Establishing that and other facts about the Rwandan genocide was one of the most important contributions of the Tribunal to re-establishing peace and security in Rwanda and promoting reconciliation between the affected communities.

73. Yet today, genocide denial continues. Efforts to minimize the scale of the death and destruction, or to detract attention from the judicially established facts of the genocide, are intolerable and unacceptable. There are no other facts or circumstances that in any way alter the truth that over a period just 100 days in Rwanda, hundreds of thousands of innocents were senselessly targeted, murdered, tortured, raped and forced to flee their homes because they were Tutsi. Genocide ideology continues to present clear risks to international peace and security. Ideologies of discrimination, division and hate are factors promoting conflict and crimes in places all around the globe.

74. The Office of the Prosecutor firmly rejects genocide denial, and is committed to promoting education and remembrance as key tools in the fight against genocide ideology.

2. Former Yugoslavia

75. The Office of the Prosecutor has regularly reported that the denial of crimes and the non-acceptance of facts established in the judgments of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia are widespread throughout the region of the former Yugoslavia. Convicted war criminals are often glorified as heroes. Students in various countries, including within Bosnia and Herzegovina itself, are taught widely different and irreconcilable versions of the recent past. Anniversaries of crimes committed during the conflict, which should be used as opportunities for remembrance and reconciliation, are often co-opted to promote denial, revisionism and the glorification of war criminals. Throughout the region, convicted war criminals regularly appear in the media, at round tables and at other public events as experts and featured speakers. The Office of the Prosecutor has expressed its grave concern in this regard and has called for urgent attention to those issues. Acceptance of the truth of the recent past is the foundation for reconciliation and healing between communities in the former Yugoslavia.

76. Negative developments continued unabated during the reporting period. Government officials throughout the region continued to relativize and deny the crimes committed during the conflicts and glorify convicted war criminals. In advance of the thirtieth anniversary of the Srebrenica genocide in July, denial of the genocide and dangerous rhetoric was at a heightened level. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, convicted war criminals including Radovan Karadžić and Ratko Mladić continued to be glorified at public events, on murals and in school books. In November, a monument dedicated to the convict Slobodan Praljak was unveiled in Čapljina. The Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina is investigating the incident. In Serbia, following his conditional early release by the Mechanism, Nebojša Pavković, a former military general convicted by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia for war crimes in Kosovo,¹ was welcomed by State officials as a hero. After his death, Mr. Pavković received a ceremonial burial at the "Alley of Distinguished Citizens" in Belgrade, a funeral that was attended by State officials, including government ministers, and representatives of the Serbian Armed Forces. Vlastimir Đorđević, the recently released former police general convicted by the Tribunal for war crimes, led the presentation of a newly named street honouring the Posebne Jedinice Policije, a special police unit involved in serious crimes. All these developments lay bare the extent to which the glorification of war criminals and denial of crimes are ever present.

77. The Office of the Prosecutor calls upon all officials and public figures in the region to act responsibly and put the victims and civilian suffering at the forefront in all activities. They should publicly condemn the denial of crimes and glorification of war criminals, rather than engaging in denial and glorification and supporting such efforts with public rhetoric, divisive actions and funds. A break with the rhetoric of the past is long overdue, and leadership in favour of reconciliation and peacebuilding is urgently needed.

E. Missing persons

78. The search for persons still missing from the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia continues to be consistently identified as one of the most important outstanding issues. Significant results have been achieved, with approximately 30,000 missing persons found and identified. Unfortunately, the families of more than 12,000 missing persons still do not know the fates and whereabouts of their loved ones. The search for and exhumation of remains from mass graves and the subsequent identification of the remains need to be accelerated. Further progress on these issues is a humanitarian imperative and fundamental to reconciliation in the former Yugoslavia. Missing persons from all sides of the conflicts must be located, identified and returned to their families.

79. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor and the International Committee of the Red Cross continued their cooperation pursuant to the memorandum of understanding signed in October 2018. From 16 May to 15 November, the Office responded to 234 requests for assistance from the Committee and handed over 1,498 documents comprising over 71,619 pages.

80. Support provided by the Office of the Prosecutor contributed to the overall process of clarifying the fate and whereabouts of missing persons. In addition to providing information about missing persons, the evidence provided by the Office under the joint project significantly contributed to locating grave sites, correcting

¹ References to Kosovo shall be understood in the context of Security Council resolution [1244 \(1999\)](#).

misidentifications and helping to identify bodies that were in mortuaries in the former Yugoslavia region. During the reporting period, information from the Office assisted in clarifying the fate and whereabouts of 15 missing persons.

IV. Future planning

81. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued its planning for the Mechanism's future, consistent with resolution 2740 (2024). The Office fully supports the Security Council's wish for concrete plans and proposals to terminate or transfer Mechanism activities and move decisively towards the Mechanism's orderly closure. The successful completion of fugitive tracking, trials and appeals achieved much of what the Mechanism was established to undertake. There is now an important opportunity to focus on the most essential remaining activities and identify creative solutions for the future. The Office's aim is to present options that would meaningfully reduce the Mechanism's activities and work, achieve significant cost reductions and enable Member States to continue the accountability process in domestic courts.

82. With respect to its primary mandate, pursuant to article 28 (3) of the statute, to assist national jurisdictions in the investigation and prosecution of serious international crimes committed in Rwanda and the countries of the former Yugoslavia, the number of requests for assistance submitted by Member State clients continues at a high level and will for some years to come. This is a positive development that demonstrates that the accountability process is moving forward in domestic courts, as the Security Council intended when adopting the completion strategies. The Office of the Prosecutor has pioneered a collaborative approach between national and international prosecutors to advance the justice process at the domestic level. This model respects States' sovereign responsibility to secure justice, emphasizes local ownership and decision-making and recognizes that for affected communities justice is best delivered locally, where the crimes were committed. The Office further supports the enforcement of national immigration laws and safeguards the refugee process by assisting third States to extradite or prosecute suspected war criminals and *génocidaires*. By strengthening domestic institutions and actors, the Office helps Member States to improve their investigations and prosecutions and achieve fair and effective justice. This work is a critical element of the continued support provided by the United Nations for the justice process, consistent with Member States' war crimes strategies and the completion strategies.

83. Following critical reflection, the Office of the Prosecutor supports the transfer of its mandate under article 28 (3) to another United Nations office. While the Office would gladly continue to perform this work at the Mechanism for years to come, it recognizes that change is urgently needed and that the Mechanism's activities should be brought to an orderly closure. Transferring the Office's assistance function would responsibly address two important goals, by significantly reducing the Mechanism's remaining work and enabling notable cost reductions, while at the same time ensuring that Member States continue to receive the support they need to achieve more justice for more victims and survivors.

84. The Office of the Prosecutor has also given serious consideration to possible options for improving Member States' access to the evidence of judicially protected witnesses of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism. As previously reported in the twenty-first and twenty-fourth progress reports (S/2022/866, annex II, and S/2024/392, annex II), the current system requires national prosecutors to file motions pursuant to rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence to learn the identities of those witnesses and utilize them in their domestic investigations and trials. National

authorities are concerned that many important requests for access to judicially protected witnesses are denied in whole or in part. The Office will provide more information to the Security Council on this function and potential options.

85. The Office of the Prosecutor is committed to providing all support and assistance to the Security Council in its consideration of options for the potential transfer or completion of the Mechanism's residual functions.

V. Management

86. The Office of the Prosecutor is committed to managing its staff and resources in line with the Security Council's instructions that the Mechanism be a small, temporary and efficient structure. The Office continues to be guided by the Council's views and requests as set forth, inter alia, in paragraphs 18 to 20 of resolution [2256 \(2015\)](#), paragraphs 7 and 8 of resolution [2422 \(2018\)](#) and paragraphs 7, 9 and 10 of resolution [2637 \(2022\)](#). An important part of those efforts is the Prosecutor's one-office policy to integrate the staff and resources of the Office across both branches of the Mechanism. Under this policy, staff and resources are available to be flexibly deployed to work on matters arising from either branch as necessary.

87. The budget proposal of the Office of the Prosecutor for 2026 demonstrates its continued adherence to the Security Council's instructions and implementation of the UN80 Initiative reforms. The Office is proposing a reduction of 20 per cent in its staffing, with 48 posts and positions proposed for reduction as of July 2026. It is further proposing a reduction of 20 per cent in its total resource requirements compared with its approved 2025 budget. Through organizational streamlining and optimization, particularly in management and supervisory activities, the Office anticipates that it will be able to manage its significant workload even as it reduces resources.

88. Consistent with its preparations for decisions on the Mechanism's future, the Office of the Prosecutor is undertaking projects to ensure that its records and evidence collection are preserved and can be accessed moving forward. Notably, the Office is reviewing and preparing plans to upgrade its legacy information technology infrastructure, including its evidence management systems. Technical failures and instability in current systems create significant risks to digitized evidence and to the long-term management of physical and digitized evidence.

89. As the Office of the Prosecutor continues to maintain a lean staffing structure, it is regularly confronting workloads that exceed its resources, placing a heavy burden on staff. As the Office cannot defer mandated activities, particularly when national partners are relying on it to support the expeditious completion of their investigations and prosecutions, Office staff members have been required to take on additional responsibilities and work extensive hours. The Office is grateful for the continued dedication and commitment of its staff. Nonetheless, the Office underscores that full approval of its limited budget requests is necessary to ensure the achievement of the its mandated functions.

VI. Conclusion

90. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor carried out its mandated functions, with a particular emphasis on its mandate under article 28 (3) of the statute to assist national prosecutors. The Prosecutor General of Rwanda and national war crimes prosecutors in the countries of the former Yugoslavia continue to emphasize that assistance from the Office is vital to support their efforts. The

Rwandan authorities are still seeking to bring to justice more than 1,000 fugitive *génocidaires*, while prosecutors in the countries of the former Yugoslavia still have more than 1,000 suspected war criminals to investigate and prosecute. By responding to requests for assistance and providing a wide range of legal, investigative, prosecutorial and strategic support, the Office enables Member States to achieve more justice for the crimes committed, implement their national priorities and strengthen the rule of law.

91. The Office of the Prosecutor fully supports the Security Council's wish for concrete plans and proposals to terminate or transfer Mechanism activities and move decisively towards the Mechanism's orderly closure. The Mechanism was always intended to be a temporary institution. In key respects, the plans adopted under the completion strategies and reflected in the Mechanism's statute have been successfully achieved. International trials for the crimes committed in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia have been completed, while Member States have fully assumed responsibility for the justice process. To ensure that Member States receive the support they require to continue achieving justice while advancing significant changes to the Mechanism, the Office supports the transfer of its mandate under article 28 (3) to another United Nations office. The Office will also provide options for change to the Council regarding the current rule 86 procedure. The Office welcomes the opportunity to provide information to and assist the Council as it deliberates on the future of the Mechanism.

92. In all of its endeavours, the Office of the Prosecutor relies on and gratefully acknowledges the support of the international community and especially of the Security Council.
