

**Security Council**

Distr.: General
18 May 2026

Original: English

**Letter dated 18 May 2026 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 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 18 May 2026 from the President of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals addressed to the President of the Security Council

Assessment and progress report of the President of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, Judge Graciela Gatti Santana, for the period from 16 November 2025 to 15 May 2026

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	3
II. Organization of the Mechanism	4
III. President and Chambers	4
A. President	4
B. Judges	6
IV. Judicial activities	6
A. Proceedings related to core crimes	7
B. Continuous judicial activities	8
V. Assistance to national jurisdictions	10
VI. Cases referred to national jurisdictions	10
VII. Enforcement of sentences	11
VIII. Relocated persons	11
IX. Cooperation and information dissemination	12
X. Registry support to Mechanism activities	13
A. Judicial support services	13
B. Victims and witnesses	14
C. Detention facilities	15
D. Archives and records	16
E. Budget, staffing and administration	17
XI. Reports of the Office of Internal Oversight Services	18
XII. Conclusion	19

1. The present report, the twenty-eighth 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 also contained in article 32 (2) of the statute of the Mechanism.² The report covers the progress made by the Mechanism from 16 November 2025 to 15 May 2026.

2. The present report is submitted during the Security Council's biennial review of the progress of work of the Mechanism, which is conducted pursuant to paragraph 17 of resolution 1966 (2010). On 12 May 2026, the Mechanism provided the Council with its sixth review report (see S/2026/496), which details the Mechanism's progress between 16 April 2024 and 15 April 2026, and included the Mechanism's strategic plan,³ which provides updated timelines and recommendations for the completion and transfer of all of the Mechanism's functions. Given the present report's temporal and substantive overlap with the sixth review report, including the strategic plan, the Mechanism has endeavoured to avoid unnecessary duplication of information. Read collectively, the two reports respond to paragraph 17 of resolution 1966 (2010), paragraphs 13 and 14 of resolution 2740 (2024), and the views and recommendations of the Security Council Informal Working Group on International Tribunals.

I. Introduction

3. 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.

4. Due to the dedication of its judges and staff, the Mechanism continued to make strong progress during the reporting period with respect to its residual functions. The Mechanism's judiciary adjudicated numerous requests for access to confidential evidence and protected witness information, and the Appeals Chamber adjudicated several substantive appeals, including in the cases of Félicien Kabuga and Fulgence Kayishema. The President continued to supervise matters related to sentence enforcement, including adjudicating early release applications, and the Trial Chamber seized of the *Kabuga* case continued to actively manage issues regarding Mr. Kabuga's health and his provisional release to a potential receiving State. In a very recent development, on 16 May 2026, Mr. Kabuga passed away while hospitalized in The Hague, and, as a consequence, the proceedings in this case will be terminated, bringing to a final conclusion the Mechanism's last core crimes case. The Dutch authorities have commenced the standard procedures and investigations required under Dutch national law, and the President has assigned a Mechanism judge to conduct an internal inquiry.

5. Beyond the judicial functions, the Mechanism continued to provide critical and direct assistance to domestic authorities in relation to national prosecutions, supervise the day-to-day enforcement of sentences, and preserve and share the legacy of the ad hoc Tribunals through the management of their archives and the Mechanism's own. The recent evaluation by the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), submitted in February 2026 to support the Council's biennial review of the progress of work of the Mechanism, observed that, despite the significant staffing cuts and resource reductions over the past four years, the Mechanism has continued to deliver on its

¹ Unless otherwise specified, information and figures set out in this report are accurate as at 15 May 2026.

² Resolution 1966 (2010), annex 1.

³ Submitted as enclosure III to the sixth review report.

core mandate, with Member States affirming the relevance and necessity of the Mechanism's residual functions (see [S/2026/100](#); see also sect. XI below).

6. The Mechanism remains grateful for the support of Member States and other stakeholders, including its eight outstanding enforcement States. It will continue to rely on the assistance of Member States and other supporters as it works towards the fair and efficient completion and transfer of its residual functions. The Mechanism looks forward to engaging with the Security Council and the Informal Working Group on International Tribunals in relation to the results of the sixth review process and stands ready to implement the decisions of the Council.

II. Organization of the Mechanism

7. The Mechanism consists of three organs: (a) the Chambers; (b) the Prosecutor; and (c) the Registry.⁴ As mandated under article 3 of the statute, the Mechanism continued to operate two branches: one in Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, and one in The Hague, Kingdom of the Netherlands. The President, Graciela Gatti Santana (Uruguay), is based in The Hague, while the Prosecutor, Serge Brammertz (Belgium), and the Registrar, Abubacarr M. Tambadou (Gambia), are based in Arusha. The current terms of all three principals run until 30 June 2026.

8. The Mechanism continued to receive strong cooperation from its host States and remains grateful for their ongoing support and active engagement under the respective headquarters agreements. In The Hague, following the host State's previous indication that it would like the Mechanism to move from the current premises at the latest by 31 December 2026, the Mechanism again actively engaged with relevant Dutch authorities to identify suitable alternative premises. The Mechanism meanwhile continued its efforts to achieve efficiencies and cost savings through space consolidation initiatives. Following the significant downsizing of staff, the Mechanism had vacated 5,269 m² of office space by the end of 2025 and released the use of the on-premises parking garage. This reduction in space will also result in lower utility costs, with projected overall savings of approximately \$1,700,000 in 2026. Separately, the Mechanism continued to accommodate staff of the Residual Special Court for Sierra Leone at its branch in The Hague.

9. In Arusha, the Mechanism's Lakilaki premises are situated on land provided by the United Republic of Tanzania. The premises offer public access to the Mechanism's well-resourced library on international law, which, in particular, features materials on international humanitarian law and international criminal justice. The Arusha branch continued to host three staff members of the World Food Programme and four 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

10. The President is the institutional head and highest authority of the Mechanism and is responsible for the overall execution of its mandate. The President coordinates the work of the Chambers; presides over proceedings in the Appeals Chamber; supervises the activities of the Registry, the enforcement of sentences and the

⁴ The present annex details the work of the Chambers and the Registry, while annex II details the activities of the Office of the Prosecutor.

monitoring of referred cases; and issues practice directions as appropriate. The President is also responsible for exercising a number of judicial, quasi-judicial and administrative functions conferred by the statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.⁵ Lastly, the President represents the Mechanism before the Security Council and the General Assembly, and performs other representational functions vis-à-vis Member States, United Nations organizations and entities and other external stakeholders.

11. The President led the institution with a view to ensuring alignment with the Security Council's vision of the Mechanism as a small, temporary and efficient structure. She actively supported the Mechanism's engagement with the Human Resources Services Division of the Department of Operational Support, which completed its comprehensive civilian staffing review of the Mechanism in March 2026. The scope of the staffing review was to ascertain whether the Mechanism's staffing, in terms of number of posts, functions and structure, is commensurate with its residual functions and aligned with its mandate and strategic priorities, and to provide a road map for achieving further efficiencies and staff reductions. The Division proposed various scenarios aimed at organizational restructuring as well as streamlining operations and reporting lines, while orienting staffing resources to support the Mechanism's core functions. The President remains grateful to the Division for the excellent support received.

12. Through the use of Coordination Council meetings of all three principals and bilateral meetings with the Registrar on matters of shared responsibility, and with ongoing support from the cross-organ working group, the President continued to spearhead the Mechanism's future planning efforts. These collaborative processes resulted in the strategic plan, which presents the principals' unified vision of the future of the Mechanism and its functions and is aimed at providing concrete options to facilitate the Security Council's sixth review of the progress of work of the Mechanism.

13. Building upon the recommendations made by the Secretary-General in his reports of 1 December 2025 (S/2025/785 and S/2025/786), the strategic plan envisages the completion and transfer of several of the Mechanism's most resource-intensive functions while retaining a limited number of judicial functions at the international level. It further proposes significant streamlining through organizational restructuring, physical consolidation, workforce optimization and outsourcing of administrative and other functions. Following these changes, the Mechanism expects that, by 1 July 2028, it will have reduced its staffing by approximately 87% to 89%, compared to levels as at 31 December 2026, and achieved proportionate and significant cost savings. Alternatively, if the Security Council were to decide to transfer these limited judicial functions to a subsidiary body of the Council, they could be performed with a staffing level and non-post resources similar to those of this post-transition Mechanism.

14. The Mechanism continues to house two convicted persons in the United Nations Detention Unit in The Hague, who do not yet have designated States in which their sentences will be enforced. However, the previously reported changes to the Practice Direction on the designation of enforcement States now allow the President to directly engage with potential enforcement States. With more dynamic engagement opportunities, the Mechanism has made substantial progress in identifying a prospective enforcement State for Mićo Stanišić. During the reporting period, the President and the Registrar also continued to have sustained, high-level discussions regarding the potential transfer of Ratko Mladić from the Detention Unit. Lastly, the

⁵ Available at <https://www.irmct.org/en/documents/rules-procedure-and-evidence>.

President further engaged with Member States in order to identify States willing to provide contingency detention arrangements to cover any potential temporary detention needs in anticipation of the closure of the Detention Unit.

15. With regard to her representational function, the President presented the Mechanism's twenty-seventh progress report to the Security Council in December 2025. She also briefed the Informal Working Group on International Tribunals on that occasion and held bilateral meetings with representatives of Member States and high-level officials of the United Nations. In late November 2025, the President participated in 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. The President continues to attach great importance to disseminating information about the work of the Mechanism and the ad hoc Tribunals and ensuring maximum accessibility to their public judicial records. She participated in relevant panel discussions and continued to endorse educational activities undertaken by the Mechanism Information Programme for Affected Communities, funded by the European Union.

B. Judges

16. According to article 8 (1) and (3) of the statute, the Mechanism shall have a roster of 25 independent judges who shall only be present at the seat of the Mechanism's branches when necessary, as requested by the President, and otherwise carry out their functions remotely. Pursuant to article 8 (4), the judges are not remunerated for being on the judicial roster but receive compensation only for the days on which they exercise their functions.

17. The Mechanism presently has 24 judges on its judicial roster, which 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 (The Bahamas), Judge Florence Rita Arrey (Cameroon), Judge Vagn Prusse 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 Hoefer (Germany), Judge Iain Bonomy (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Judge Fatimata Sanou Touré (Burkina Faso), Judge Margaret M. deGuzman (United States of America) and Judge René José Andriatianarivelo (Madagascar).

IV. Judicial activities

18. During the reporting period, the President and judges issued a total of 103 decisions and orders. Of these, 89 (or approximately 9 in 10) related to the Mechanism's continuous judicial functions, which include 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.

19. 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. In addition, the Chambers Legal Support Section continued to ensure that the Case Law Database is up to date, making this valuable resource accessible to researchers, practitioners and judges.

A. Proceedings related to core crimes

20. With respect 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 case, in which proceedings are indefinitely stayed.

1. Trial and Appeals Chamber activities related to an inactive core crimes trial

21. The trial proceedings in the *Kabuga* case were 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 provisional release and the recovery of legal aid funds expended in connection with his defence. The Trial Chamber held a status conference on 17 December 2025 to discuss these issues and to enquire into Mr. Kabuga's current conditions of detention.

22. On 28 November 2025, the Prosecution challenged the Trial Chamber's implementation of the Appeals Chamber's instruction to expeditiously consider appropriate modalities and conditions for Mr. Kabuga's provisional release, including the Trial Chamber's determination that he was not fit to fly to Rwanda, the only country that had agreed to accept him onto its territory. On 28 April 2026, the Appeals Chamber, composed of Judges Agius, presiding, Hall, Liu, N'gum and de Prada, dismissed the Prosecution's arguments in their entirety. As a way forward through the impasse, and given its previous admonition that challenges in identifying a State to which Mr. Kabuga could be provisionally released may not be the basis for his continuous detention on remand pursuant to a Mechanism order, the Appeals Chamber invited the Trial Chamber to examine the appropriateness of vacating the order for Mr. Kabuga's detention on remand. The Appeals Chamber emphasized that its decision was strictly on the merits of the Prosecution's arguments and without prejudice to any future determination on the possibility of transporting Mr. Kabuga to a country willing to accept him on its territory.

23. The Trial Chamber, composed of Judges Bonomy, presiding, El Baaj and deGuzman, continued to work remotely and will do so until the conclusion of the case. As mentioned above, on 16 May 2026, Mr. Kabuga passed away while hospitalized in The Hague. Consequently, the proceedings will be terminated, bringing to an end the Mechanism's last core crimes case. A final hearing was to be held on Wednesday, 20 May 2026, to conclude the case and address any related pending matters.

2. Trial and Appeals Chamber activities related to a referred core crimes case

24. As previously reported, Mr. 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.

25. On 14 August 2025, Mr. Kayishema filed before the Mechanism a request for the 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. It also dismissed a request from 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 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence. On 24 December 2025, the Trial Chamber dismissed the remaining ground put forward by Mr. Kayishema in his request to revoke the referral of his case. On 8 January 2026, Mr. Kayishema filed an appeal against the Trial Chamber's decision denying his requests for revocation of the referral of his case to Rwanda and for assignment of counsel at the expense of the Mechanism. On 24 March 2026, the Appeals Chamber, composed of Judges Agius, presiding, Arrey, Liu, Park and Panton, dismissed the appeal in its entirety.

B. Continuous judicial activities

26. 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.

1. Judicial activity of the President

27. 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.

28. During the reporting period, the President issued a total of 50 decisions and orders. These included 20 decisions and orders relating to enforcement matters and 28 orders relating to the assignment of judges. Of the latter, 22 orders pertained to witness protection matters falling under rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.

29. In connection with the enforcement of sentences, the President issued decisions on five applications for release, granting early release on compelling humanitarian grounds in one case. Separately, she issued one decision on reconsideration of a request for release, two decisions on transfer from an enforcement State and one decision on temporary medical evacuation. Four new applications for early release and one request for reconsideration of a President's decision on release were filed, and the President is currently seized of three pending applications for early release. To facilitate judicial processes related to early release and in line with her overall responsibility for the supervision of enforcement of sentences under articles 25 and 26 of the statute, the President continued to communicate directly with enforcement States, independent monitoring bodies, and convicted persons.

30. In addition, the President dealt with a variety of other substantive judicial 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 one decision, and the *Kayishema* case, in which the President issued two decisions.

31. Lastly, on 16 May 2026, the President assigned Judge Orie to conduct an inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the death of Mr. Kabuga while in the custody of

the United Nations Detention Unit and to report the findings of that inquiry as soon as reasonably possible.

2. Judicial activities of single judges and related appeals

32. 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, 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.

33. 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, 38 orders and decisions were issued concerning applications for information on or the variation of protective measures, with over 80% of such applications granted in full or in part. All were issued by single judges or the presiding judge of a trial chamber. In doing so, the Mechanism discharged its residual functions in relation to both the judicial 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.

34. Turning to matters related to contempt and false testimony under article 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, taking into account the interests of justice and expediency.

35. 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 that occurred in the course of Mr. Robinson's representation of Augustin Ngirabatware during the review proceedings in *Prosecutor v. Augustin Ngirabatware*. An appeal filed by the amicus curiae against the decision referring the matter for disciplinary proceedings is pending before the Appeals Chamber.

36. 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 the country's failure to cooperate with the Mechanism.

37. 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. On 21 November 2025, the single judge determined that the relocated persons had not demonstrated that they are unable to relocate to Rwanda. He further determined that the Mechanism's duty of care in this matter is not indefinite, especially when a safe and durable solution exists, but that such a duty of care and fairness require that the relocated persons be provided with one additional year of financial assistance in 2026

while they seek to normalize their situation or explore returning to Rwanda. The single judge concluded that, after 31 December 2026, the Mechanism no longer has a legal and judicial obligation to provide financial assistance to the relocated persons, while they remain in the Niger, as part of its general duty of care towards them. This decision was not appealed.

V. Assistance to national jurisdictions

38. 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 for variation of protective measures submitted pursuant to rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.

39. Protective measures ordered in respect of a witness in proceedings before the ad hoc Tribunals or the Mechanism remain in force under article 20 of the statute until a subsequent judicial decision under rule 86 is issued to rescind, vary or augment those measures. Such a decision is required to facilitate a witness's testimony in national proceedings or allow access to confidential judicial records in accordance with the existing protective measures.

40. The Judicial Records Unit processed 22 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 852 documents during the reporting period.

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

42. The Secretary-General has provided recommendations as to the transferability of the Prosecution's role in carrying out this mandate (see [S/2025/786](#)), and the strategic plan, building on that guidance, presents proposals related to the entirety of this function for the Security Council's consideration.

VI. Cases referred to national jurisdictions

43. In accordance with its obligation under article 6 (5) of the statute, the Mechanism continued to actively monitor two cases referred to national jurisdictions.

44. In the contempt case against Vojislav Šešelj and others, referred to Serbia in February 2024, the appointed staff monitor continued to engage with the Serbian authorities regarding the status of the case. Three monitoring reports were submitted during the reporting period, which are available as public versions.⁶ In the contempt case against François Ndirabatware, referred to Belgium in September 2024, two monitoring reports were filed publicly.

45. In relation to the *Kayishema* case, which involves core crimes, the monitoring function will start as soon as the accused is transferred to Rwanda.

46. The strategic plan presents proposals for the Security Council's consideration related to the Mechanism's jurisdiction in connection with the referral, monitoring and revocation of referred cases.

⁶ These and other monitoring reports are available on the Mechanism's website.

VII. Enforcement of sentences

47. Pursuant to articles 25 and 26 of the statute, rules 127, 150 and 151 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, and the relevant practice directions, the President exercises overall authority in relation to the designation of enforcement States, transfer of prisoners and supervision of day-to-day conditions of imprisonment, as well as decision-making authority on requests for pardon, commutation of sentence or early release in connection with sentences pronounced by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia or the Mechanism. The sentences are executed by Member States that have concluded enforcement agreements with the United Nations.⁷

48. The President's judicial activities in connection with this function are summarized above (see paras. 28 and 29). The Registry delivers legal, diplomatic and administrative support, assisting the President in supervising the enforcement of sentences imposed by the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism.

49. At the end of the reporting period, 36 convicted persons continue to serve their sentences in the territories of eight Member States, under the supervision of the Mechanism: Belgium (1), Benin (15), Estonia (4), France (1), Germany (3), Norway (2), Senegal (8) and the United Kingdom (2). Additionally, two convicted persons are currently housed at the United Nations Detention Unit in The Hague. Three convicted persons granted conditional early release by the Mechanism also remain under its supervision until their sentences have been completed, with the last sentence concluding in 2030. This brings the total number of convicted individuals under the supervision of the Mechanism to 41.

50. The International Committee of the Red Cross and the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment continued to serve as independent inspection bodies to ensure that the conditions of detention are compatible with international standards. At the Arusha branch, the Registry continued to support the ageing convicted persons in Benin and Senegal, in light of their specific vulnerabilities, providing administrative and financial support to the two enforcement States.

51. The Mechanism is extremely grateful for the ongoing assistance of its enforcement States, which play a key role in allowing the Mechanism to keep fulfilling this critical aspect of its mandate.

52. The fair and effective supervision of sentence enforcement is essential to the completion of the justice cycle. The Secretary-General has provided recommendations as to the transferability of all aspects of this function (see [S/2025/786](#)), and the strategic plan, building on that guidance, presents proposals for the Security Council's consideration.

VIII. Relocated persons

53. The situation of the acquitted and released persons who were relocated to the Niger more than four years ago, pursuant to an agreement between the United Nations and the Government of the Niger, unfortunately remains unresolved.

54. During the reporting period, the Registrar continued to lead efforts to find a solution. He engaged with the national authorities and the relocated persons regarding

⁷ Further information on the Mechanism's enforcement functions, including the locations where convicted persons are serving their sentences, is available at <https://www.irmct.org/en/about/functions/enforcement-of-sentences>.

the regularization of their stay in the Niger, monitored the daily situation of the relocated persons to ensure respect for their fundamental rights, and pursued efforts to identify possible relocation States and to negotiate guarantees of safety and/or regular reporting from Rwanda should the persons wish to be relocated there. In so doing, the Registrar implemented the decision of the single judge issued on 21 November 2025.

55. In line with the reporting regime, which was amended earlier in the reporting period, the Registrar filed reports on the judicial record on 5 February and 5 May 2026.

56. The President continued to highlight the plight of the relocated persons in her engagements with Member States and other stakeholders. As noted above, the President and a single judge of the Mechanism also dealt with additional litigation concerning the relocated persons (see paras. 30 and 37).

57. In its resolution [2740 \(2024\)](#), the Security Council reiterated its call upon all States to cooperate with and render all necessary assistance to the Mechanism in relation to this matter. The Mechanism would welcome any such support and assistance.

IX. Cooperation and information dissemination

58. 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 Rwandan authorities on key issues, including in the preparation of any decisions by the Security Council to transfer functions. At the request of the Rwandan National Public Prosecution Authority, the Mechanism provided a four-day training to staff of its Victims and Witnesses Protection Unit. In addition, the Mechanism's Witness Support and Protection Unit maintained open lines of communication with Rwandan authorities following the 2024 closure of the Kigali field office. This cooperation ensured, inter alia, the timely provision of documents to the Mechanism and streamlined administrative processes and comprehensive support to victims and witnesses, including continued medical assistance and meetings with detainee witnesses to address their specific needs.

59. 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. This request was reiterated in resolution [2740 \(2024\)](#), in which the Council encouraged cooperation among the Mechanism, Member States and relevant entities to support the establishment of such centres. The Mechanism remains hopeful that talks will resume in the coming period in relation to the establishment of information centres in Croatia and Rwanda.

60. The Mechanism, with support from the European Union, also continued its Information Programme for Affected Communities.⁸ During the reporting period, staff of the Programme participated in one webinar and two in-person conferences and delivered one lecture on the legacy of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. These events, hosted by local groups and organizations, were aimed at young people, journalists and researchers from the region. The seventh cycle of the Programme's video lecture series, entitled "International law and facts established before the ICTY", continued during the reporting period with 12 additional lectures.

⁸ See <https://www.irmct.org/en/mip> for further information.

In addition to Mechanism officials, defence counsel, former staff of the Tribunal and others, the series featured lectures by renowned experts from the former Yugoslavia.

61. Overall, the Mechanism Information Programme for Affected Communities continued to receive a positive response, with its social media campaigns having reached nearly 7,200,000 people since January 2019. The Mechanism expresses sincere gratitude to the European Union and its member States for their ongoing and generous support.

62. Unfortunately, the Mechanism was again unable to host public gatherings or visits at its premises in The Hague, due to the previously reported decision of the Central Government Real Estate Agency for the Kingdom of the Netherlands related to fire safety. Given that public access to hearings must be preserved, the visibility of the status conference in the *Kabuga* case, held on 17 December 2025 in The Hague, was nevertheless ensured through a restricted pool of journalists being accredited to cover the proceedings. Footage of the proceedings was also made available on the Mechanism's website and social media for public access.

63. In Arusha, the Mechanism welcomed 243 visitors to its Lakilaki premises, including from international, national and regional institutions, local law firms, academia and government, as well as students and international researchers. The Arusha branch library continued to offer a broad range of services to both internal and external users.

64. The Mechanism continued to disseminate information about its work and judicial developments on its website and social media platforms. During the reporting period, the Mechanism website recorded over 560,000 page views, underscoring the ongoing importance of sharing judicial information, court records, case updates and legacy-related content. Additionally, a total of nine social media campaigns were conducted.

X. Registry support to Mechanism activities

A. Judicial support services

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

66. Most of the residual activities of the Mechanism, such as supervising the enforcement of sentences, contempt matters, 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 800 filings, including 199 Registry legal submissions, totalling 5,104 pages.

67. The Judicial Records Unit at the Hague branch supported the status conference in the *Kabuga* case held on 17 December 2025 in accordance with rule 69 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence. Furthermore, the Unit, together with the Office of the Registrar and the Information Technology Services Section, assisted the Office of the President and the Chambers in creating streamlined solutions for future status conferences and hearings to adapt to the Mechanism's reduced resources. Consequently, the status conference took place in a conference room temporarily transformed into a basic courtroom, enabling the decommissioning of the only remaining Mechanism courtroom.

68. The Language Support Services at both branches collectively translated approximately 6,900 pages. They also provided interpretation services for nine conference days and produced approximately 40 pages of transcripts in English and French.

69. 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 two appeal judgments issued by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. Three appeal judgments of that Tribunal remain to be translated into Kinyarwanda. Meanwhile, to ensure broader access to the Mechanism's jurisprudence, the Language Support Services in The Hague continued with the translations into French of the remaining judgments of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Four of these judgments still require translation from English to French, with two of them currently in progress. The completion of these remaining translations may be affected by the competing demands of ongoing functions and the availability of resources.

70. In terms of defence and legal aid matters, the Registry continued to provide financial and administrative assistance to 51 defence and amicus curiae teams, comprising a total of approximately 70 personnel, the majority of them engaged in pro bono work in post-conviction or post-acquittal proceedings. The Registry also facilitated the work of the defence team in the *Kabuga* case and of the amicus curiae prosecutor in the *Robinson* case, which has now been referred to a national jurisdiction, pending the final outcome of the related appeal proceedings. In addition, the Registry persisted in its efforts towards recovering legal aid funds provided to Mr. Kabuga, further to the Registrar's decision of non-indigence issued in October 2023. During the reporting period, Registry staff processed 22 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

71. Pursuant to article 20 of the statute, the Mechanism is responsible for the judicial, rather than physical, protection of witnesses who have testified in cases completed by the ad hoc Tribunals, as well as witnesses who have appeared or may appear before the Mechanism.⁹ The Witness Support and Protection Unit is the principal unit providing Registry support to witnesses.

72. During the reporting period, the Witness Support and Protection Unit implemented 22 judicial orders involving 24 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. The Unit also continued to monitor the general security situation in the region 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.

73. In relation to the supervision of sentence enforcement, the Witness Support and Protection Unit provided the President with witness-related assessments involving

⁹ Further information in relation to the protection of victims and witnesses is available at <https://www.irmct.org/en/about/functions/witnesses>.

171 witnesses in connection with one early release request. It also informed protected witnesses of the release of convicted persons in cases where they testified.

74. 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, and to States that have accepted relocated witnesses, until such orders are rescinded or waived or the functions are otherwise transferred or terminated.

C. Detention facilities

75. During the reporting period, the United Nations Detention Unit in The Hague housed two convicted persons, Messrs. Mladić and Stanišić, who are currently awaiting transfer to a State, or States, for the enforcement of the remainder of their respective sentences. The Mechanism actively negotiated with potential enforcement States to that effect, ensuring that this is an institutional priority. In addition, Mr. Kabuga remained as a detainee in the Unit until his passing on 16 May 2026, and the Registry provided support to the efforts of his defence team to locate a State for provisional release pursuant to an order of the Trial Chamber.

76. The Mechanism intends to close the Detention Unit and is committed to continued diplomatic efforts with the host State on the Mechanism's residual detention requirements. Although the Kingdom of the Netherlands has 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, discussions continue on the temporary detention of any accused persons in future contempt cases. At the same time, the Mechanism continues to engage with the relevant Dutch authorities to reduce the operational costs of the Unit.

77. The Detention Unit is regularly inspected by the International Committee of the Red Cross to ensure that the Mechanism's Rules of Detention¹⁰ are properly applied and that it complies with international standards, an issue of great importance to the Mechanism.

78. Implementation 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 in accordance with the applicable international standards relating to healthcare, including the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, remains a priority for the Mechanism. 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,¹¹ regular status conferences¹² and the above-mentioned independent inspections.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ 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.

¹² See rule 69 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.

D. Archives and records

79. The Mechanism Archives and Records Section currently manages approximately 4,700 linear metres of physical records and around 3 petabytes of digital records of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism.

80. During the reporting period, the Archives and Records Section ingested an additional 12.39 terabytes of digital records, comprising 109,712 files, into the Mechanism's digital repository. This brings the total ingested so far to 412 terabytes, comprising 418,841 files, which corresponds to 24.3% of the digital archives in the custody of the Section. Concurrently, digital records of the ad hoc Tribunals were migrated from 1,742 CDs, DVDs and floppy disks, which are at risk of loss due to material decay, into more robust preservation storage. Over 94,750 records were migrated during the reporting period. The Section also processed the transfer of 9 terabytes of digital records, comprising more than 4.2 million files of the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, significantly advancing work to be completed before the archives are transferred to a United Nations Secretariat archival entity. These records are currently being prepared for ingestion into the digital preservation system. Separately, digital records of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in 259 folders on shared network drives were appraised, and 13,534 records were identified for ingestion into the digital preservation system.

81. To ensure the preservation of physical documents and minimize damage caused by pollutants and other environmental factors, the Archives and Records Section transferred over 26.8 linear metres of records from Mechanism offices to secure archival storage where temperature and humidity are controlled. Additionally, in response to the recommendations from a conservation assessment undertaken in 2024 for the physical archives in Arusha and as part of ongoing efforts to preserve physical records, 66 items have been preserved. Separately, 75 records contained in a case file for the Mechanism's Arusha branch were rehoused and archivally processed and accessioned.

82. Regarding audiovisual records, digitization of the analogue audiovisual recordings of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia continued and is nearly complete, with an additional 141 recordings digitized and less than 1% remaining. In total, over 44,900 recordings have now been digitized, of which 81% still need to be quality-checked and redacted. Correspondingly, 654 audiovisual recordings of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda were digitized during the reporting period, bringing the cumulative total of recordings digitized so far to 23,792, with 13% remaining to be digitized. Approximately 54% of 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.

83. Over 381,000 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 21,319 users. Separately, the Mechanism Archives and Records Section responded to 83 requests for access to records, 70 in The Hague, where requesters were provided with more than 641 hours (416 recordings) of the public audiovisual recordings of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, and 16 in Arusha, where requesters received 116 transcripts of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

84. In addition, the Archives and Records Section delivered briefings about the archives to 11 visitors in The Hague and 210 in Arusha.

85. Cataloguing of the archives in accordance with international standards also continued, and 3,465 new catalogue entries were created during the reporting period, bringing the total number of descriptions of judicial and non-judicial archives to 16,272. Separately, the publicly accessible catalogue on the Mechanism's website, which contains over 4,400 entries, was accessed by 349 new users from across the globe.

86. The Secretary-General has provided recommendations as to the transferability of the archiving function (see [S/2025/785](#)), and the strategic plan, building on that guidance, presents proposals for the Security Council's consideration.

E. Budget, staffing and administration

87. On 30 December 2025, in its resolution [80/239](#), the General Assembly appropriated to the special account for the Mechanism a total amount of \$56,126,600 gross (\$51,268,200 net) for 2026. The Mechanism implemented the decision of the Assembly¹³ regarding a reduction of \$107,700 in non-post resources for travel and continues to ensure the prompt and efficient completion of its remaining work. The Mechanism expects to fully support its continuous residual work in 2026 within the approved budgetary resources. Details and a breakdown of the Mechanism's expenditures in the first quarter of 2026 are set forth in enclosure I.

88. During the reporting period, the Mechanism continued to operate as a residual institution fulfilling its mandated operations and activities: 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.

89. Under the UN80 Initiative, launched by the Secretary-General in March 2025, the Mechanism was required to target further efficiency gains and reduce costs in its proposed programme budget for 2026. In compliance with this Initiative, the Mechanism proposed the abolishment of 44 posts and positions, representing a 20% reduction in staffing, and a decrease of approximately \$5,000,000 in overall resources compared to the 2025 appropriation. The 2026 budget supports the mandated residual activities of the Mechanism listed above. It also includes resources to support any ancillary activity arising in the Mechanism's last, and inactive, core crimes case.

90. As at 1 May 2026, the Mechanism had 103 staff on posts and a further 96 staff on general temporary assistance positions, for a total of 199 staff.¹⁴ Details concerning the staffing of the Mechanism by division are provided in enclosure II.

91. The Mechanism's continuous and general temporary assistance positions include nationals of 50 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, Malaysia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Nigeria, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Serbia, Spain, Sudan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States and Zimbabwe.

¹³ In its resolution [80/239](#), the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to this effect (see [A/80/570](#)).

¹⁴ This number does not include staff on posts made available to the Programme Planning and Budget Division or to the Office of Legal Affairs.

92. Female staff members comprised 54% 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 Service staff are also taken into account, with a total of 47% overall. As the Mechanism is rapidly downsizing, there has been a significant reduction in external recruitment, and it remains a challenge to achieve gender parity in historically male-dominated fields, such as security and information technology. The Mechanism's focal points for gender continued to raise awareness of the Secretary-General's gender parity objectives and provided input for the text of job openings. In March 2026, the gender focal points conducted an awareness-raising event celebrating International Women's Day and publicly advocating for gender equality.

XI. Reports of the Office of Internal Oversight Services

93. In February 2026, OIOS concluded its evaluation of the methods and work of the Mechanism (see [S/2026/100](#)). The exercise had focused on the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and coherence of the Mechanism's approach to fulfilling its ongoing continuous activities and advancing the completion and transfer of its residual functions, in line with its mandated vision as a temporary and efficient structure.

94. The results of the evaluation indicate that, although the Mechanism has entered its sunset phase, Member States and other stakeholders continue to view the Mechanism's mandated activities as relevant and have acknowledged its effective and efficient execution of these activities despite sustained budgetary and staffing reductions. OIOS found that the Mechanism continued to deliver its core mandate despite experiencing significant budget and staffing cuts over the past four years, and noted the sharp decline (more than 40%) in the Mechanism's overall budget appropriations since 2021 and an overall reduction in staffing of more than 43% over the same period. OIOS further found that, in relation to completing and transferring mandated functions, the Mechanism proposed clear-cut options for the completion and transfer of its sentence enforcement and national assistance functions, and noted that the options for the archives were less developed, in part due to political sensitivities related to their hosting.

95. The final evaluation report contains two recommendations aimed at facilitating the Mechanism's transition towards the completion and transfer of the remaining residual functions in a responsible and sustainable manner. In relation to the first recommendation, the Mechanism has commenced identifying strategic archiving priorities, with a focus on ensuring access for ongoing national investigative and prosecutorial processes, including prioritizing access to public judicial records. Recommendation 2 directs the Mechanism to develop a time-bound plan with resource implications for the options for the completion or transfer of functions. Following Coordination Council meetings and extensive cross-organ consultations, the Mechanism produced the strategic plan, reflecting the unified vision of the Mechanism's principals that directly responds to this recommendation. The Mechanism takes this opportunity to again express gratitude to the OIOS team for its insights, cooperation and disposition throughout the evaluation process. The Mechanism remains committed to fully implementing the OIOS recommendations and sharing further progress in this respect.

96. Regarding the two outstanding recommendations from the previous OIOS evaluation (see [S/2024/199](#)), the Mechanism is pleased to report that the third recommendation, to apply the lessons learned from the closure of the Sarajevo field office to that of the Kigali field office, has also been closed. The Mechanism will

soon submit a request for closure of the fourth and final recommendation, which relates to the adoption of further client orientation, including by improving statistics on assistance activities and soliciting feedback from requesters of assistance and recipients of capacity-building.

97. The Mechanism continues to work towards full implementation of the recommendations made by OIOS following its audit of the Mechanism's management of records and archiving processes, which was concluded in the previous reporting period.

XII. Conclusion

98. The present report demonstrates that, despite facing significant staffing and budgetary constraints and uncertainties regarding its future, the Mechanism has continued to make strong progress with respect to its mandated functions over the past six months. In particular, the Mechanism's residual judicial activities, assistance to national prosecutions, and archiving functions have continued apace. It bears repeating that each of these functions is critical to the fair and just conclusion of the justice cycle and, if the rich legacy of the ad hoc Tribunals and the Mechanism is to be safeguarded, must be completed or transferred in a responsible manner.

99. At the same time, the principals and senior management successfully advanced the Mechanism's future planning during the reporting period. The strategic plan that the Mechanism recently provided to the Security Council reflects the collaboration of the principals on these issues and builds on the recommendations made by the Secretary-General in his reports of 1 December 2025. The strategic plan offers a number of concrete options and timelines regarding the completion and transfer of the above-mentioned functions, with a view to facilitating the Council's sixth review of the Mechanism's progress of work.

100. The Mechanism looks forward to engaging with the Security Council and its Informal Working Group on International Tribunals in the coming weeks and to the forthcoming resolution on the Mechanism's mandate, which is anticipated to be issued by the end of June 2026. The Mechanism stands ready to implement any decisions the Council may take as a result of the sixth review process. In the meantime, the Mechanism expresses sincere thanks to Member States and all those who continue to support its mission and seek to uphold the principles of international criminal justice.

Enclosure I

International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals: approved appropriations and commitments for 2026

Table 1

Approved appropriations for the period from 1 January to 31 December 2026 (net of staff assessment)

(United States dollars)

		Chambers	Office of the Prosecutor	Registry	<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</i>	Mechanism
Arusha	Post	–	3 200 471	6 777 388	–	9 977 859
	Non-post ¹	90 500	1 258 710	6 501 047	5 123 700	12 973 957
Subtotal		90 500	4 459 181	13 278 435	5 123 700	22 951 816
The Hague	Post	–	1 807 280	5 634 618	–	7 441 898
	Non-post	653 000	3 061 806	16 908 617	–	20 623 423
Subtotal		653 000	4 869 086	22 543 235	–	28 065 321
New York	Post	–	–	249 843	–	249 843
	Non-post	–	–	1 300	–	1 300
Subtotal		–	–	251 143	–	251 143
Overall	Post	–	5 007 751	12 661 849	–	17 669 600
	Non-post	743 500	4 320 516	23 410 964	5 123 700	33 598 680
Total		743 500	9 328 267	36 072 813	5 123 700	51 268 280

Table 2

Commitments net of staff assessment as at 1 May 2026 (from Umoja)

(United States dollars)

		Chambers	Office of the Prosecutor	Registry	<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</i>	Mechanism
Arusha	Post	–	839 479	1 932 036	–	2 771 515
	Non-post	12 000	441 096	624 177	1 780 594	2 857 867
Subtotal		12 000	1 280 575	2 556 213	1 780 594	5 629 382
The Hague	Post	–	530 015	1 699 988	–	2 230 003
	Non-post	170 732	908 762	3 440 231	–	4 519 725
Subtotal		170 732	1 438 777	5 140 219	–	6 749 728

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

		<i>Chambers</i>	<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<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</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>
New York	Post	–	–	67 110	–	67 110
	Non-post	–	–	5 385	–	5 385
Subtotal		–	–	72 495	–	72 495
Overall	Post	–	1 369 494	3 699 134	–	5 068 628
	Non-post	182 732	1 349 858	4 069 793	1 780 594	7 382 977
Total		182 732	2 719 352	7 768 927	1 780 594	12 451 605

Table 3
Annual budget committed as at 1 May 2026
 (Percentage)

		<i>Chambers</i>	<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<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</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>
Arusha	Post	–	26.2	28.5	–	27.8
	Non-post	13.3	35.0	9.6	34.8	22.0
Subtotal		13.3	28.7	19.3	34.8	24.5
The Hague	Post	–	29.3	30.2	–	30.0
	Non-post	26.1	29.7	20.3	–	21.9
Subtotal		26.1	29.5	22.8	–	24.1
New York	Post	–	–	26.9	–	26.9
	Non-post	–	–	414.2	–	414.2
Subtotal		–	–	28.9	–	28.9
Overall	Post	–	27.3	29.2	–	28.7
	Non-post	24.6	31.2	17.4	34.8	22.0
Total		24.6	29.2	21.5	34.8	24.3

Enclosure II

Staffing of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

Table 1
Numbers of staff, by branch and organ, as at 1 May 2026

<i>Category</i>	<i>Arusha branch</i>	<i>The Hague branch</i>	<i>Chambers</i>	<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<i>Mechanism overall</i>
All staff	83	116	20	53	126	199
Staff on continuous posts	60	43	7	26	70	103
Staff on general temporary assistance positions	23	73	13	27	56	96
International (Professional and higher categories and Field Service)	53	60	16	35	62	113
Local (General Service)	30	56	4	18	64	86

Table 2
Geographical representation, by regional group, as at 1 May 2026²

	<i>Arusha branch</i>	<i>The Hague branch</i>	<i>Mechanism overall</i>
Number of nationalities	23	39	50
All staff			199
African	66	6	72 (36%)
Asia-Pacific	3	13	16 (8%)
Eastern European	1	21	22 (11%)
Latin American and Caribbean	–	4	4 (2%)
Western European and Others	13	72	85 (43%)
International (Professional and higher categories and Field Service)			113
African	36	1	37 (33%)
Asia-Pacific	3	8	11 (10%)
Eastern European	1	11	12 (11%)
Latin American and Caribbean	–	1	1 (1%)
Western European and Others	13	39	52 (46%)
Local (General Service)			86
African	30	5	35 (41%)
Asia-Pacific	–	5	5 (6%)
Eastern European	–	10	10 (12%)
Latin American and Caribbean	–	3	3 (3%)
Western European and Others	–	33	33 (38%)

(Footnotes on following page)

² As the percentages in this table are rounded to the nearest whole number, the totals may not add up to 100.

(Footnotes to table 2)

Group of African States: Algeria, Cameroon, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Gambia, Kenya, Madagascar, Nigeria, Rwanda, 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.

Table 3
Gender representation, by branch, as at 1 May 2026

Category	Arusha branch	The Hague branch	Mechanism overall
Professional and higher			
All Professional and higher	34	60	94
Male	19 (56%)	24 (40%)	43 (46%)
Female	15 (44%)	36 (60%)	51 (54%)
Professional (P-4 and above)			
All P-4 and above	13	20	33
Male	9 (69%)	9 (45%)	18 (55%)
Female	4 (31%)	11 (55%)	15 (45%)
Field Service			
All Field Service	19	0	19
Male	11 (58%)	0 (0%)	11 (58%)
Female	8 (42%)	0 (0%)	8 (42%)
General Service			
All General Service	30	56	86
Male	21 (70%)	30 (54%)	51 (59%)
Female	9 (30%)	26 (46%)	35 (41%)
All staff	83	116	199
Male	51 (61%)	54 (47%)	105 (53%)
Female	32 (39%)	62 (53%)	94 (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)	6	14	20
Office of the President	2	8	10
Legal Support Section	4	6	10
Office of the Prosecutor	24	29	53
Registry	53	73	126
Immediate Office of the Registrar	7	6	13
Mechanism Archives and Records Section	4	5	9
Witness Support and Protection Unit	2	3	5
Judicial Records Unit	2	3	5
Language Support Services	4	7	11
Division of Administration	20	35	55
Security and Safety Section	14	10	24
United Nations Detention Unit	—	4	4

**Annex II to the letter dated 18 May 2026 from the President of the
International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals addressed
to the President of the Security Council**

**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	26
II. Residual prosecutorial functions	26
III. Assistance to national prosecutions	26
A. Provision of evidence and expertise to national prosecutors	27
B. National justice for crimes committed in Rwanda	29
C. National justice for crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia	30
D. Denial and glorification	35
E. Missing persons	36
IV. Management	36
V. Conclusion	36

I. Overview

1. The Prosecutor submits this twenty-eighth progress report pursuant to Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), covering developments from 16 November 2025 to 15 May 2026.
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 national prosecutions of crimes committed during the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda, during the reporting period, cooperation between the Office of the Prosecutor, 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. The Office also supported efforts to locate Rwandan fugitives.
4. Regarding national prosecutions of war crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia, during the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor 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.
5. The Office of the Prosecutor continued to be guided by the views and requests of the Security Council, as set forth in, inter alia, Council resolutions [2256 \(2015\)](#), [2422 \(2018\)](#), [2529 \(2020\)](#) and [2637 \(2022\)](#).

II. Residual prosecutorial functions

6. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor litigated and addressed residual matters concerning the cases *Prosecutor v. Kabuga* and *Prosecutor v. Kayishema*. Information on the *Kayishema* case is provided in the Prosecutor's section of the Mechanism's sixth review report. Fulgence Kayishema, who was arrested in May 2023, remains in the custody of South Africa. There is not yet a prospect for his transfer, initially to the Mechanism, and then to Rwanda for trial. While the Office continues to litigate this matter, its completion is outside the Office's control.
7. With respect to applications by convicted persons for early release, the Office of the Prosecutor provided comments and information in relation to two such applications.
8. 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

9. 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 International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, Security Council resolution 1966 (2010) and the statute of the Mechanism.

10. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued to receive a high volume of requests for assistance from national judiciaries and international organizations. These requests address three related areas where support from the Office is needed:

- (a) Requests for access to evidence and information;
- (b) Requests for substantive legal, investigative and prosecutorial direct case assistance, including through the preparation and transfer of investigation dossiers;
- (c) Requests for assistance in resolving strategic and/or cross-cutting issues affecting the accountability process, including the challenges of fugitives and international cooperation.

11. The Office of the Prosecutor also provided 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.

12. 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 therefore is only available from the Office. The Rwanda-related evidence collection includes more than 1 million pages of documents. 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 further offers its good offices to facilitate the work of national partners, particularly in strengthening international and regional cooperation.

13. 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.

A. Provision of evidence and expertise to national prosecutors

14. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor provided assistance in relation to 79 national case files.

15. The Office of the Prosecutor continued consultations with national prosecutors in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia to discuss their needs and the provision of assistance from the Office for national criminal cases. In January, the Prosecutor visited Rwanda for high-level meetings with the Minister of Justice, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, the Minister of National Unity and Civic Engagement, the Prosecutor General and the Secretary-General of the Rwanda Investigation Bureau. In May, the Prosecutor visited Bosnia and Herzegovina for meetings with the President of the High Judicial and Prosecutorial Council, the Chief Prosecutor, representatives of the victim community and representatives of the

diplomatic community. Throughout the reporting period, staff in the Office of the Prosecutor remained in regular communication with counterparts regarding their investigations and prosecutions. In December 2025 and February 2026, the Office provided training on its evidence collection and cooperation modalities to 45 national prosecutors, investigators and analysts.

16. 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 32 requests for assistance from nine Member States. Nine requests were from the United States of America, seven were from France, four were from the Kingdom of the Netherlands, four were from Canada and two were from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

17. With respect to requests for access to evidence concerning Rwanda, the Office of the Prosecutor received 15 requests for access to evidence and information from five Member States during the reporting period. In total, the Office handed over 621 documents comprising nearly 24,000 pages of evidence and three audiovisual files. In addition, the Office confirmed the whereabouts of and obtained cooperation from 19 witnesses who had appeared before the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the Mechanism to support national authorities. The Office also filed 10 submissions related to witness protective measures and/or access to evidence in support of national authorities.

18. 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 17 such requests from seven Member States. This entailed providing one extensive investigative dossier concerning a fugitive located by the Office in a European country, two analytical reports, three screening interviews and one legal memorandum, and holding six operational meetings with national counterparts.

19. Concerning crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia, during the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor received 220 requests for assistance from nine Member States. A total of 197 requests for assistance were submitted by authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 7 were from the United States, 3 were from Canada, 2 were from Italy, 2 were from Sweden, 1 was from Montenegro, 1 was from Croatia and 1 was from Serbia.

20. With respect to requests for access to evidence, the Office of the Prosecutor received 197 requests for access to evidence and information from six Member States. In total, the Office handed over more than 2,300 documents comprising nearly 74,000 pages of evidence and 37 audiovisual records. In addition, the Office filed nine submissions related to witness protective measures and/or access to evidence in support of national authorities.

21. With respect to requests for direct case assistance concerning the former Yugoslavia, during the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor provided legal, evidentiary and strategic assistance with respect to 23 such requests from six Member States. This work entailed, inter alia, eight memorandums and analytical reports and 11 operational meetings, as well as the transfer of 522 documents comprising 13,533 pages of material and 54 audiovisual files.

22. 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 1 as at 15 May 2026. 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

23. The completion of trials before the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the Mechanism is not the end to 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.

24. The Office of the Prosecutor has continued its close and extensive cooperation with Rwandan authorities. Rwandan officials have emphasized that the Office 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. Today, there is a renewed emphasis on securing accountability for crimes committed during the genocide. More investigations and prosecutions are under way at the national level than in the past.

25. In Rwanda, the National Public Prosecution Authority is conducting important investigations with the support of the Office of the Prosecutor, 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. 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

26. 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.

27. 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 continued 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

28. 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.

29. More than 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, then to 30 July 2025 and then to 26 March 2026. The case has now been further postponed until 18 June 2026, when it is anticipated to be postponed once again.

30. 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 they do not have to wait longer.

4. Progress in national investigations and prosecutions

31. During the reporting period, the National Public Prosecution Authority of Rwanda issued indictments in 85 cases following investigations and issued arrest warrants for the accused. Rwandan authorities conducted one arrest during the reporting period, arresting Faustin Ndindabahizi for suspected genocide crimes. The Authority reports that it is currently seeking the arrest of 1,198 fugitives.

32. The Busasamana primary court convicted Emmanuel Ntarindwa for genocide and sentenced him to 15 years of imprisonment. The Court of Appeal confirmed the convictions of Jean Twagiramungu and Venant Rutunga for genocide. The Military High Court confirmed the conviction of Bonaventure Minani for genocide and his sentence of life imprisonment. Proceedings for genocide crimes were conducted in six ongoing trials and two ongoing appeals.

33. In France, in February 2026, an appeals court affirmed the conviction and sentence of 14 years of imprisonment for Claude Muhayimana. Mr. Muhayimana, a former driver, was convicted of complicity in genocide and crimes against humanity in relation to crimes committed in the former Kibuye prefecture. In May 2026, the Paris Court of Appeal ruled that investigations against Agathe Habyarimana, the widow of the former President, Juvénal Habyarimana, must resume. This ruling follows an appeal by the national counter-terrorism prosecutor's office after investigative judges dismissed the case against Ms. Habyarimana in August 2025.

34. In February 2026, a Rwandan national was arrested in Denmark on the basis of an arrest warrant issued by Rwanda. Investigations in relation to extradition proceedings are under way.

C. National justice for crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia

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

35. As the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia emphasized in his final 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.

36. 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.

37. The Prosecutor and his Office continued to engage intensively with the authorities of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro. Cooperation with Croatia and Serbia has been more limited. Through meetings with senior officials, media appearances and engagements with the diplomatic community, the Office 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 further 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

38. 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 last 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.

39. 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 who currently reside in other countries in the region, predominantly 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.

40. 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 19 cases for transfer to Croatia and Serbia. To date, Croatia and Serbia have each formally accepted one case for transfer. The Office of the Prosecutor calls upon prosecutors and justice sector authorities in Croatia and Serbia to prioritize further processing of these cases and will provide further updates on progress.

3. Bosnia and Herzegovina

41. 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. The Prosecutor visited Bosnia and Herzegovina from 3 to 6 May 2026

and had high-level discussions with the Chief Prosecutor of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Milanko Kajganić, representatives of the High Judicial and Prosecutorial Council, representatives of victims' associations and members of the diplomatic community.

42. During the reporting period, the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina filed 10 indictments against 24 suspects, while 14 cases against 35 persons were terminated or closed. The Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina also transferred two cases against four suspects to entity-level prosecution services. The remaining backlog at the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina consists of 157 cases against 1,996 persons. Of these, 87 cases are under investigation; the remaining cases are in the pre-investigative phase. In addition, there is a backlog of 232 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.

43. 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.

44. 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 Serbia and Croatia. 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.

45. 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. The Office of the Prosecutor continues to provide direct support to these priority cases. During the reporting period, this support included two legal and analytical memorandums, 94 documents totalling 3,355 pages and 49 audiovisual records.

46. 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 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. The work of the joint task force established by the Office of the Prosecutor and the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina continued, with a second operational meeting held in The Hague on 12 and 13 February 2026. The Office of the Prosecutor handed over one legal and analytical memorandum with supporting evidentiary materials. The Office of the Prosecutor also obtained clearance from a provider to share crucial documents, and used its good offices to help secure important experts for the case. The Office of the Prosecutor is committed to providing the necessary assistance as the investigation progresses.

47. 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 managed appropriately and concluded expeditiously.

48. 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.

4. Croatia

49. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor had limited engagement and cooperation with the Croatian authorities.

50. In a positive development, the indictment against Nedjeljko Obradović filed by the State Attorney's Office was confirmed. This is the final category II case, following the Office's decision to terminate the investigations into Zlatan Mijo Jelić and Mario Miličević without filing indictments, as previously reported ([S/2025/749](#)).

51. There remains a large backlog of pending requests for assistance submitted to the Croatian authorities by prosecutors in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Available information indicates that they 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 progress 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 move forward.

52. 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. There are a significant number of cases that provide opportunities to demonstrate this commitment in practice. Notably, responses are urgently needed to the backlog of pending requests for assistance, while regional cooperation also depends on progress in the transfer of investigative files from Bosnia and Herzegovina. 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

53. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued to collaborate closely with the Special State Prosecutor's Office in Montenegro to advance investigations and prosecutions. Positive progress is being made and the Office of the Prosecutor will continue to provide the necessary assistance as requested.

54. The Special State Prosecutor's Office currently has one ongoing investigation and multiple cases in the pre-investigative phase. The trial against Zoran Gašović on suspicion of having committed crimes in Hadžići commenced during the reporting period. The case arose from one of the two investigative dossiers previously transferred by the Office of the Prosecutor, demonstrating that the close collaboration between the Office of the Prosecutor and Special State Prosecutor's Office is yielding positive results. Moreover, this case represents a step forward on two important legal issues. First, the indictment charges the accused with crimes against humanity, which were previously held to be inapplicable under Montenegrin law. Second, 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).

55. The Office of the Prosecutor continues to assist the Special State Prosecutor's Office in relation to a second previously transferred investigative dossier and hopes to report on advancements in that case in the next reporting period. 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.

56. 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.

57. While the delivery of war crimes justice in Montenegro is only beginning, the Montenegrin 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

58. During the reporting period, the engagement and cooperation of the Office of the Prosecutor with the Serbian authorities was minimal. 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. The absence of an appointed Chief War Crimes Prosecutor for three years has necessarily impeded investigations and prosecutions. The Office of the Prosecutor encourages the Serbian authorities to complete the selection process for this important position as soon as possible.

59. During the reporting period, the Public Prosecutor's Office for War Crimes of Serbia issued five new indictments against six accused persons, only one of which is classified as complex. In addition, it has six open investigations, including investigations against two suspects in relation to the dossiers previously handed over by the Office of the Prosecutor, and one case in the pre-investigation phase, against a total of seven suspects.

60. 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.

61. The processing of war crimes cases in Serbia has been regressing over the last several years. There is a substantial backlog of cases with little evident progress, including cases against senior- and mid-level officials present in Serbia. The Office of the Prosecutor stands ready to assist the Serbian authorities to achieve the goals

set out in the 2016 National War Crimes Strategy. The victims, the public and other stakeholders rightly hope to see war crimes justice get back on track, with a demonstrable will to realize the commitments made.

D. Denial and glorification

1. Rwanda

62. 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 1994 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.

63. 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 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.

64. 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

65. 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 different 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 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.

66. Negative developments continued during the reporting period. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the convicted war criminal Ratko Mladić continued to be glorified at public events, on murals and in school books. In March, a monument dedicated to Milorad Pelemiš, the former commander of the 10th Sabotage Detachment, a unit that participated in the Srebrenica genocide, was unveiled. In Serbia, high-level officials continue to honour convicted war criminals, including Ratko Mladić, Jovica Stanišić and Franko Simatović.

67. 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

68. An important milestone was reached during the reporting period as the Office of the Prosecutor and the International Committee of the Red Cross completed the primary phase of their joint project. The Office has shared evidence about more than 12,000 named individuals and large volumes of evidence about exhumations. The evidence provided by the Office under the joint project contributed significantly to locating grave sites, correcting misidentifications and helping to identify bodies that were in mortuaries throughout the former Yugoslavia region.

69. Support provided by the Office of the Prosecutor has so far contributed to clarifying the fate and whereabouts of 706 missing persons. The Office will continue to assist the International Committee of the Red Cross and national missing persons authorities by sharing its evidence and expertise.

IV. Management

70. 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". 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.

71. 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.

72. 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. The Office cannot defer mandated activities, particularly when national partners are relying on it to support the expeditious completion of their investigations and prosecutions. As a result, 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 its mandated functions.

V. Conclusion

73. 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 former Yugoslavia continue to emphasize that assistance from the Office of the Prosecutor 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, the Office provides Member States with a wide range of legal, investigative, prosecutorial and strategic support. This enables national authorities to achieve more justice for the crimes committed, implement their national priorities and strengthen the rule of law.

74. 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. Member States need ongoing support to continue achieving justice, while the Mechanism must undergo significant change. To achieve both objectives, the Office strongly supports the transfer of its mandate under article 28 (3) to the Secretariat.

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