

Summary of the Informal Briefing on the Preparatory Process for the Third Review Conference of the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM)

Date: 30 Jan 2026,

Venue : room XVI, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Third Review Conference Presidency:

H.E. Mr. Daovy Vongxay, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to the United Nations and other International Organisations in Geneva

CCM Implementation Support Unit ISU:

Ms. Pamela Moraga, Director and Mr. Riccardo Labianco, Implementation Support Specialist.

UNODA:

Ms. Silvia Mercogliano.

1. Opening of the Meeting

The informal briefing was opened by H.E. Mr. Daovy Vongxay on behalf of the Presidency of the Third Review Conference. In his opening remarks, the President highlighted the importance of the Third Review Conference, to be held in Vientiane Capital, the Lao PDR, from 14–18 September 2026, as a key moment to reaffirm global commitment to the humanitarian objectives of the Convention. Drawing on the Lao PDR's own experience as a country affected by cluster munitions, he emphasized the value of inclusive partnerships and collective learning in advancing implementation of the CCM.

2. Briefing on Preparations for the Third Review Conference

The President briefed participants on the ongoing planning efforts for the Third Review Conference and its First Preparatory Meeting, including the overall timeline, preparatory milestones, and documentation. Reference was made to the circulation of the initial Concept Note in November 2025 and to the zero draft review document, which is intended as a preliminary basis to stimulate focused input from States. The related formal documentation (CCM Rules of Procedure, CCM /MSP/2010/3 *mutatis mutandis*, the Draft Agenda for the Third Review Conference and the Provisional Draft Agenda for the First Preparatory Meeting) has been submitted to UNODA and is also available on the Convention's website.

The President recalled that, by the time of the Third Review Conference, the Convention would have been in force for more than 15 years, making it timely to assess progress, identify implementation challenges, and consider the future work programme and Action Plan. Emphasis was placed on efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and ensuring that the Convention's implementation architecture remains responsive to current humanitarian needs.

3. Exchange with Delegations

During the exchange, delegations broadly welcomed the launch of the preparatory process and expressed appreciation for the Presidency's efforts and transparency.

Several delegations, including the **United Kingdom, Türkiye, Canada, Australia, Peru, and the Holy See**, commented on the length of the zero draft review document and the demanding documentation schedule in a year with multiple disarmament-related processes. Many encouraged streamlining documentation and requested flexibility with deadlines to allow for interagency consultations at the capitals.

The delegation of Türkiye raised concerns regarding references in the zero draft to cluster munition production, reiterating its longstanding position that it has not used, produced, imported, or transferred cluster munitions since 2005 and does not intend to do so in the future. The delegation requested that this be accurately reflected in future documents.

The **Convention on Cluster Munitions Coalition (CMC)** and **the delegation of Australia** sought clarification on arrangements for the field visit foreseen during the Review Conference, including possible limits on participation and logistical considerations.

A number of delegations, including the **Holy See, Nigeria, Australia, Canada, Panama, Mexico, and Peru**, addressed cross-cutting and thematic issues relevant to the future Action Plan. These included gender considerations, youth engagement, climate and environmental impacts, mental health and psychosocial support, and the importance of consensus-based language. While views differed on scope and terminology, delegations emphasized the need to maintain unity, inclusiveness, and effectiveness.

The delegation of Panama raised questions regarding sponsorship arrangements to facilitate participation, particularly for delegations from distant capitals, and underscored the importance of timely information on this matter.

4. Responses by the Presidency and the ISU

In response, the President thanked delegations for their constructive engagement and clarified that the zero draft is a preliminary document designed to encourage focused written inputs, including through guiding questions for each thematic area. The President noted that the document would be streamlined as the process advances, drawing on written submissions and past review conference practices.

Regarding field visits, the President indicated that further details, including registration procedures and possible allocation per delegation, would be provided in due course, taking into account logistical arrangements.

On the issues raised concerning factual accuracy, cross-cutting themes, and language, the President encouraged delegations to submit written comments and assured participants that these would be considered carefully in cooperation with the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) and thematic coordinators.

The ISU informed delegations that sponsorship guidelines were under development and that further information would be shared once finalized.

In light of requests from several delegations, the President, in consultation with the ISU, announced an **extension of the deadline for written comments on the zero draft to 13 February 2026**, allowing additional time for consultations ahead of regional consultation and the First Preparatory Meeting.

5. Closing

The Presidency outlined the next steps in the preparatory process leading to the Preparatory Meetings and the Third Review Conference. The Presidency reaffirmed its commitment to an inclusive, transparent, and responsive process and encouraged continued active engagement from all States and stakeholders.