



3RC
THIRD REVIEW CONFERENCE
OF THE CONVENTION
ON CLUSTER MUNITIONS
VIENTIANE, LAO PDR | 2026

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COORDINATION COMMITTEE OF THE CONVENTION ON CLUSTER MUNITIONS

GICHD, Maison de la Paix

14:00 – 16:00

Wednesday 26th November 2025

Attendance

Present

Lao People's Democratic Republic – 3RC
Presidency

H.E. Mr. Daovy Vongxay
Ms. Keobounsansomsanouk

Consultants:
Ms. Phonenipha Mathouchanh
Ms. Sara Sekkenes

Australia
(Transparency Measures)
Ms. Jennifer Cavenagh
Ms. Gemma Hallett

Austria
(General Status of the Operation of the
Convention and CCM Gender Focal Points)
Ms. Julia Eberl

Burkina Faso
(Stockpile Destruction and Retention)
Mr. Pambary Cyrille Pascal Bonzi

Cameroon
(General Status of the Operation of the
Convention and CCM Gender Focal Points)
Mr Cedric Enyime

France
(Clearance)
Mr. Mathieu Tasse

Mexico
(Clearance)
Mr. Alonso Martínez Ruiz
Ms. Estefanía Padilla

ISU-CCM
Ms. Pamela Moraga
Dr. Riccardo Labianco

Netherlands (Kingdom of the)
(International Cooperation and Assistance)
Ms. Henriëtte van Gulik

Panama
(National Implementation Measures)
Ms. Grisselle Rodriguez

Peru
(Stockpile Destruction and Retention)
Mr. Angel Horna
Mr. Santiago Sánchez Checa

Switzerland
(International Cooperation and Assistance)
Ms. Zoë Poznicsek

UNODA
(Observer)
Ms. Mélanie Régimbal

ICRC
(Observer)
Mr. Fahad Ahmed

CMC
(Observer)
Ms. Tamar Gabelnick

Norway
(Universalisation)
Mr. Kristian Svanes

Apologies Received

Lebanon

Niger

Philippines

Absent

Costa Rica

Opening Remarks and Adoption of the Agenda

Ambassador Vongxay welcomed participants and expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to chair the Coordination Committee (CC). The Ambassador noted his intention to work closely with all the members of the CC.

The Ambassador invited members to propose any additional items for the agenda. As no requests were made, the agenda was adopted.

Ambassador Vongxay thanked the outgoing members of the CC and welcomed the newly appointed ones. He noted with concern that a second co-coordinator for victim assistance (VA) had yet to be identified. The Ambassador then introduced members of the Presidency team, including the two consultants - Phonenipha Mathouchanh and Sara Sekkenes – who would be supporting the Presidency during the year of the Third Review Conference (3RC) of the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM). Participants were subsequently invited to introduce themselves.

Finally, Ambassador Vongxay confirmed that the CCM Implementation Support Unit (ISU) would serve as the secretariat of the meeting and prepare the meeting notes, which would be circulated to CC members within and made available on the CCM website.

The Presidency of the Lao PDR

The Priorities of the Presidency of the Lao PDR

Ambassador Vongxay outlined the key priorities of the Presidency of the Lao PDR, including the re-affirmation of the disarmament spirit underpinning the CCM, the establishment of practical and measurable steps for clearance, victim assistance (VA), explosive ordnance risk education (EORE). He emphasized the importance of evidence-based action to meet concrete needs, mobilisation and enhancement of international cooperation, assistance, and support, to ensure that no affected State is left behind. The Ambassador also highlighted the importance of strengthening the link between the implementation of the CCM and broader sustainable development objectives, including poverty reduction, food security, education, and livelihoods.

Challenges

The Ambassador also outlined a number of challenges requiring continued collective engagement by CC members and the wider CCM community. These included the weakening international humanitarian law underpinning the CCM, as well as recent withdrawals from the Humanitarian Disarmament Conventions.

The Ambassador recalled that the CCM contributes to the normative framework for the protection of civilians in armed conflicts, through the prohibition of a specific category of weapons. He further noted that prohibitions on specific types of weapons are not unprecedented and that practices once considered acceptable in armed conflicts are no longer acceptable today.

A sustained level of resources dedicated to the implementation of the CCM remains essential, particularly in areas requiring long term engagement, such as clearance and victim assistance. The Ambassador noted that the CCM has already achieved tangible implementation results which should not only continue but further strengthened.

In this regard, the Ambassador emphasized the importance of focusing on practical implementation and addressing of concrete challenges, including those identified during the intersessional meetings in the first part of 2025.

The Ambassador expressed his intention to work closely with all the members of the CC, noting the Committee's critical role in delivering a constructive and forward-looking agenda for the implementation of the CCM.

The Ambassador then gave the floor to the Director of the ISU, Ms Pamela Moraga, asking the ISU to provide updates on issues of concern for the Convention.

Challenges to the Norm

Ms Moraga highlighted three recent developments with the potential to challenge the norms established by the CCM. First, she referred to information concerning a possible transit of cluster munitions destined for Ukraine, originating from Greece and reportedly transiting through Czechia, a State party to the CCM. The ISU noted that the reports were open-source information and noted that the ISU could not independently verify the reported transfer or transit.

Second, Ms Moraga drew attention to reporting by a major British newspaper indicating that new cluster munition remnants had been found in South Lebanon. According to the information cited, the munitions appeared to be of a new type and allegedly originated from a neighbouring country. The ISU again noted that it was not in a position to independently verify these reports.

Finally, the ISU Director informed the Committee of an imminent vote in the Danish Parliament of a resolution concerning Denmark's possible withdrawal from the CCM and the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC).

Ms. Moraga emphasized that the purpose of sharing this information with the CC was purely informative. She reiterated the inability of the ISU to independently verify the instances of transit and new use independently. No further follow-up action was recommended by the ISU at this stage, though the ISU indicated its readiness to gather more information should the CC request it.

Following the ISU update, Ambassador Vongxay invited members of the CC to raise any questions or comment on the matter.

Ms Gabelnick, Director of the CMC, informed the CC that the Monitor is looking into the events reported by the newspaper. According to the CMC Director, Human Rights Watch is looking closely at the report to determine what weapon was used. It may be that the weapon does not meet the definition of a cluster munition, but more information is needed to verify one way or the

other. The CMC Director stated that they are also disturbed regarding Denmark's bill to withdraw from the CCM, as this is not a country that is bordering Russia and so a consideration of withdrawal is in another, even more problematic category.

Preparation for the Process towards the Third Review Conference

The Concept Note on the Path Towards the Third Review Conference

Ambassador Vongxay took the floor to outline the Presidency's plan and road map towards the Third Review Conference in September 2026. He recalled that a concept note on the key documents for the Review Conference had been circulated prior to the CC Meeting, providing an overview of the process and other relevant milestones. He invited feedback from the CC members on the concept note.

The Representative of Peru thanked the Ambassador and the ISU for the concept note and requested additional information regarding the planned regional consultations mentioned in the concept note, including whether these would take place in Geneva or in the regions concerned.

The Representative of the Netherlands also thanked the Presidency and the ISU for the concept note and sought clarification on the proposed timeline, noting that it appeared very tight, particularly with regard to the submission of inputs in July, the circulation of the draft political declaration in mid-August, and full Disarmament agenda. She then asked whether there would be some flexibility on the timeline.

Ambassador Vongxay replied that regional consultations were planned to take place in Geneva and involve all States parties, particularly in the development of the zero draft of the Action Plan.

Regarding the political declaration, Ambassador Vongxay he invited other CC members to share their views and affirmed that moving the timeline towards July might be possible. On the Political Declaration, the Ambassador explained that their intention is to move to the Political Declaration when the draft for the Action Plan is completed.

The Representative of Norway then asked for further information on the universalisation workshop in the Asia Pacific region.

Ambassador Vongxay explained that the workshop on universalisation in the Asia Pacific region would be organised jointly with the Philippines and would build on work undertaken in Manila in March of this year. He indicated that the workshop would be held in Lao and would be directed at States invited to join the CCM, with States parties encouraged to share their experiences in joining the CCM, as had been done by the Philippines in Manila.

Whilst there was no indication in the concept note, Ambassador Vongxay noted the Presidency's intention of organizing a universalisation workshop in Africa, possibility in May 2026 with details on the host country to be yet determined.

Dates and Timeline

Turning to agenda item 2, the timeline for the preparatory process towards the Third Review Conference, Ambassador Vongxay outlined the proposed dates of the forthcoming CC Meetings: 28 January 2026, 2 March, 22 April, 19 June and the final one on 28th August. He acknowledged that two CC meetings would take place during the summer period and requested the understanding of the CC members in order to ensure a smooth process leading up to the Review Conference in September.

The Representative of France asked whether any part of the proposed timeline would overlap with events related to the APMBC.

Ambassador Vongxay indicated that the Presidency had already sought to minimise overlaps with other processes and confirmed that the timeline could be reviewed again if necessary.

The Representative of the ICRC pointed out that the meeting scheduled for 28th August would overlap with the Conference of States Parties (CSP) to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).

The Representative of Australia also pointed out that the date in April is the week before of the Review Conference of the NPT in New York, and, although that is not a conventional disarmament date, some colleagues might be busy with that process. She clarified that, despite the closeness of dates, Australia could attend.

The Representative of Mexico recalled that CC meetings have frequently been accommodated alongside other formal disarmament meetings, noting that CC meetings tend to be short in duration. He suggested that, where necessary, CC meetings could be scheduled earlier in the morning (around 9am) or during lunch breaks.

Ambassador Vongxay took note of the observations and, noting that there were no further observations, informed the Committee that the ISU was in the process of preparing a timetable of the next meetings of the Coordination Committee which would be shared with the CC in due course.

Discussion with the GICHD

Ambassador Vongxay informed the CC that he had met with the Director of the GICHD, Ambassador Tobias Privitelli to discuss the Centre's support and cooperation in the context of preparations for the Third Review Conference. He explained that, in the course of this exchange, a number of possible modalities to support the process were discussed. In particular the possibility was raised of convening a technical working group to provide technical inputs in support of the Review conference process in coordination with the GICHD. Separately, the idea of organising an informal retreat was also discussed, drawing on experiences from APMBC. It was mentioned that these were exploratory ideas and that no decisions had been taken regarding their format as of today. He highlighted the potential utility of such approaches and invited members of the CC to share their views.

The Representative of Peru requested further clarification on whether this meeting would take place within the CC framework and what their respective scope might be.

Ambassador Vongxay explained that in principle, GICHD would coordinate the collection of technical inputs from relevant stakeholders, in parallel with consultations with States parties. In principle the inputs from the technical group could be presented during the retreat in January. The Ambassador further explained that they could reflect on whether and how these ideas fit with existing process and whether it would bring some thinking for the new action plan.

The Representative of Austria thanked the Presidency and expressed the view that the early involvement of other stakeholders, would be a very sensible idea. She also sought clarification regarding the sequencing of the work on the draft action plan, in particular whether an initial draft would be prepared by the ISU for consideration by States parties, or whether inputs would first be collected prior to the preparation of a draft.

The Representative of Australia also agreed on the involvement of other stakeholders, affirming that it might be a good opportunity to consider the National Director Meeting (NDM) as an occasion to engage with a lot of operators and other stakeholders.

In response, Ambassador Vongxay informed the CC that the NDM would take place from 22nd to 24th April. He also noted that it had been suggested that the NDM could provide an opportunity to meet with operators and hear their views on implementation challenges. The format of the exchange would be discussed with GICHD.

With regard to the timeframe for the first draft, Ambassador Vongxay reported that work was underway on the Review Document and that a proposed structure would be prepared for discussion at the second meeting of the CC in January.

No further questions were raised on the matter.

Agenda Item 3: Financial Status of the Convention

Ambassador Vongxay moved the discussion to agenda item 3, on the financial status of the Convention. Before opening the discussion, he provided an update on the work of the Presidency regarding the revised cost estimates for the Third Review Conference. He explained that a list of possible cost saving measures had been prepared and that consultations had also taken place with States parties following the interruption of the silent procedure after the Thirteenth Meeting of States Parties. He noted that the revised cost estimates now include provisions for translation and interpretation requirements, as well as staffing for conference and non-conference services

Ambassador Vongxay then invited Ms Régimbal from UNODA to update the CC on the cost estimates and the related process.

Ms Régimbal reported that for the 2025 budget (USD 476,600), collection rate was at 95%, leaving an outstanding balance USD 21,000. Even with this gap, UNODA was confident that they could cover the document needs which were significantly higher than forecasted based on cashflow

projections as of 31 October. Turning to 2026 cost estimates, Ms Régimbal reported that since the silence procedure was broken, UNODA has been working with the Presidency to identify cost saving measures. Ms. Regimbal further reported that UNODA had recently received an updated list of forecast documentation requirements. On the basis of this information UNODA would be in a position to prepare revised cost estimates. She explained that these estimates, would reflect the adjusted forecast for document translation as provided by ISU and the Presidency, the sourcing of interpreters from regional offices, and adjustments related to planning mission. She added that the revised cost estimates would be made available shortly, with a view to enabling the issuance of invoices to States parties before the end of this year.

Ambassador Vongxay thanked Ms Régimbal and indicated that he looked forward to receiving the revised estimates. He further informed the meeting of the Presidency's intention to continue consultations with concerned States parties and UNODA with a view to arriving at a cost estimate acceptable to all and enabling progress. In this regard, he noted the Presidency's intention to issue the relevant letters in order to initiate a second silent procedure before the end of the year.

The Representative of Mexico thanked Ms Régimbal for the budget clarifications and reminded that Mexico was one of the States that broke the silence. With regard to possible cost-saving measures, he suggested that efforts should be made to encourage China to participate in the meeting as observer, as to increase the number of contributing parties, even if, based on the consultations with them during our presidency, their response will most likely be negative. If that is the case, the Representative of Mexico highlighted that interpretation to Chinese might not be required. Mexico reiterated our support for the Review Conference to take place in Lao People's Democratic Republic. Furthermore, and taking into account that the presidency is planning a field visit in one of the days of the Review Conference, it would be important to explore the possibility to reduce a day of interpretation as a saving measure. The Representative of France took the floor to emphasise the importance of multilingualism, noting that this is a priority for France, including within the UN80 process. With regard to Chinese interpretation, he underlined that, before any decision to remove Chinese from the offered interpretation services, it would be essential to verify whether any other States parties or observers use Chinese as their working language. He cautioned against compromising translation and interpretation services.

Ambassador Vongxay responded to several points raised earlier. With respect to inviting China as an observer, he indicated that, in practice Lao PDR would invite all the missions accredited in the country. Regarding China specifically, he stated that he would revert back to capital to consider whether there would be an option China to attend as an observer. He also noted that it would be difficult to remove only one language from the interpretation services, given that Chinese is one of the official UN languages.

On the proposed field visit, the Ambassador noted that it is common practice for a Review Conference to have such visit during the middle of the week, as it forms part of the overall experience, and provides an opportunity to demonstrate how operators work with affected communities. In response to the suggestion by the Representative of Mexico, the Ambassador

indicated that it would be necessary to verify whether such an arrangement would in fact generate cost savings.

On this issue, Ms Régimbal indicated that UNODA would welcome the inclusion of a field visit. She noted that while the visit could potentially generate cost savings by reducing the Review Conference from five to four days, this would only be the case if the visit were scheduled either at the beginning or at the end of the week. In such a scenario, meeting services and staff could be planned for four consecutive days instead of five. Ms Régimbal further clarified that, if the field visit were scheduled in the middle of the week, no cost savings would be generated. In that case, interpreters and meeting staff would still need to be present in Lao PDR for the full five days of the Conference, and related costs, including travel, accommodation, and daily subsistence allowance (DSA), would not be reduced, even if no meeting services were provided on the day of the field visit.

Ambassador Vongxay emphasised that the intention of the Presidency is to schedule the field visit in the middle of the week. He reflected on the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico regarding interpretation, noting that this would result in only four effective days of interpretation.

Ms Régimbal reiterated that cost-savings would not be achieved if the field visit takes place in the middle of the week, as the overall costs associated with the presence of interpreters and meeting staff for the full duration of the Conference would remain unchanged. She underlined that the only way to use a field visit as a cost saving measure would be to schedule it on the first or last day of the week allowing the United Nations to plan for a four consecutive day meeting.

Updates from the ISU

Ambassador Vongxay moved the discussion to the next agenda item on updates from the ISU.

ISU Reaction on some Points Discussed Earlier

Ms Moraga responded to several points raised earlier in the discussion. She indicated that the ISU would reach out to coordinators to further elaborate their workplans for the upcoming year. With regard to scheduling, she explained that the ISU is required by UNODA's documentation forecast deadlines to have documents ready several weeks in advance of each meeting, noting for example, for the first Preparatory Meeting to be held 30 March, documentation needed to be finalized by mid-January.

Ms Moraga further noted that it would be beneficial to establish a task force/ informal working group to support the drafting of the guidelines for the sponsorship programme.

She also recalled, that one co-coordinator position on victim assistance remains vacant and requested the support of Coordination Committee members in identifying a candidate. She

emphasized that, while the CCM contains some of the most advanced provisions on victim assistance, implementation remains insufficient and requires continued attention.

With regard to the support of the GICHD, Ms. Moraga noted that this would take the form of a technical working group to support the review of the Action Plan. She further noted that a retreat is envisaged for January, which would follow a similar format to that previously used under the APMBC last year.

Ms Moraga then continued with the ISU Director's briefing on the fulfilment of the ISU mandate and the ISU role in the process of the Third Review Conference.

At the outset, Ms. Moraga formally introduced Dr Riccardo Labianco to the CC as the new ISU Implementation Support Specialist. In presenting his background, she noted his expertise as an international lawyer specialised in international humanitarian law, disarmament and human rights, as well as his experience in both academic settings and with an operator. Ms Moraga explained that his recruitment forms part of the ongoing process to strengthen the professional capacity of the ISU in support of its mandate.

Ms Moraga subsequently updated the CC on the ISU's participation in a workshop on international legal obligations for Humanitarian Mine Action authorities and centres in Central Asia which provided an opportunity to present the CCM. She noted that on the margins of this workshop, the ISU Director met with the delegation of Tajikistan with a view to exploring the possibility of accession to the CCM.

Ms Moraga then proceeded with further updates on the CCM ISU's engagement with the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), noting that this marked the first time such a meeting and collaboration, particularly with IPU's IHL Committee had taken place in the history of the CCM ISU. She also informed the CC of a presentation delivered by the Implementation Support Specialist at a Disarmament seminar organised by MINUSCA and UNMAS in the Central African Republic (CAR). She recalled that following the participation of CAR's Minister of Défense at the Thirteenth Meeting of States Parties, the Convention was presented to other members of the Government and Parliament.

Ms Moraga further updated the CC on an administrative meeting held with the GICHD to review the levels of support by GICHD in preparation for the upcoming year. She noted that it was the first time that such a meeting was held.

ISU Financial Update

Ms Moraga continued her briefing by providing an update on the financial status of the ISU. She reported that since the previous Coordination Committee meeting held on 6 August 2025, the ISU has received contributions from **65 States Parties**, bringing the current total amount available to the ISU to **CHF 425.839,96**, corresponding to 85.5% of the approved 2025 budget of CHF 497'138.

Ms Moraga noted that the ISU continues to face a degree of financial uncertainty, as contributions from some States parties remain outstanding. She explained that this situation is due, inter alia,

to differences in the interpretation of the ISU's financial rules, reservations expressed by some States Parties with respect to those rules, and the depreciation of the EUR and USD against the Swiss Franc.

On the exchange rates, Ms Moraga explained that the ISU-CCM budget has experienced notable losses due to foreign-currency fluctuations, in particular in relation to the EUR (approximately 5% decrease over the last two years) and the US dollar (approximately 10% decrease over the last two years) when compared with the Swiss franc, in which over 90% of ISU expenditures are incurred.

The ISU Director recalled that the assessed contributions system was established at the First Review Conference (1RC) and subsequently reaffirmed at the Seventh Meeting of States Parties, with fairness, sustainability, and predictability as the guiding principles for financial contributions to the ISU budget. The ISU Director underlined that such contributions are essential for enabling the ISU to fulfil its role in the preparation of the Review Conference and in providing support to States parties.

Extension Requests

With regard to extension requests, Ms Moraga reported that there is only one State party that has to submit a request during the current work cycle, Chad. She indicated that the ISU had reached out to Chad on four different occasions. On 17 November, the ISU was informed that a staff member would contact the ISU regarding the matter, and the two co-coordinators for clearance were informed accordingly.

Following this update, Ambassador Vongxay invited questions from participants.

The Representative of Austria welcomed the information on engagement with the Inter-Parliamentary Union, describing it as a very positive development, and requested further details on the nature of this engagement.

With the agreement of Ambassador Vongxay, Ms. Moraga responded, indicating that she shared this assessment. She explained that the engagement with the IPU had previously represented a gap in the ISU's outreach efforts. She provided further details on the engagement, noting that it took the form of a presentation by the ISU on the CCM, followed by questions by participants, including representatives from Peru, CAR and India. She noted that this exchange provided an opportunity to explain the rationale for the ban of the weapon and to highlight their long-term humanitarian consequences. The ISU Director added that the relationship established with the IPU could serve as a useful channel for future engagement, including on aligning messages and coordinating on related issues, such as the one highlighted above regarding the Danish Parliament.

Ambassador Vongxay then took the floor recalling that the Presidency is working in coordination with the ISU, including with respect to addressing the vacant co-coordinator position on victim assistance. He reiterated the appeal to the CC members for support in identifying a second coordinator to work with Niger.

The Representative of Australia then took the floor, thanking Ms Moraga for the updates and expressing their interest to further discuss on how to organise the work, as for Australia it would be good to front load as much work as possible. On the sponsorship programme, the Representative of Australia support for the working group, especially because of their work on the Asia-pacific region. The Representative also mentioned the working paper on the topic the CCM ISU circulated last year. Ms Moraga confirmed that there was an informative document issued by the ISU last year, which was sent to the Australian delegation at their request., and uploaded to the CCM ISU's webpage

The Representative of Australia took then the floor again to ask for more information regarding the technical working group and welcomed updates in writing. She then expressed how Australia values the coordinatedion of the work and the presence of a plan that looks forward.

Furthermore, the Representative of Australia asked for more updates on the staffing of the ISU, with particular reference to contractors.

Finally, the Representative of Australia shared their intention to work with Pacific Island States on conventional weapons processes throughout staying in touch on this matter with the Presidency and the ISU.

Ambassador Vongxay welcomed Australia's engagement and indicated that the Presidency looks forward to working closely with Australia on universalisation.

Ms Moraga responded to the points raised that were relevant to the work of the ISU. She confirmed that a workplan outlining activities for 2026 had been prepared for the Presidency. With regard to staffing, she sought clarification on the specific question raised concerning contractors.

The Representative of Australia clarified that she was asking about contractors, that is fixed-term contracted staff, including those that are working pro-bono for the ISU and temporary hiring.

The Representative of Australia clarified that she was asking about contractors, that is fixed-term contracted staff, including those that are working pro-bono for the ISU and temporary hiring.

Ms Moraga replied that, at present, the only temporary hiring concerned Ms Arline Diaz Mendoza, who remains with the ISU while the assistant is absent. Ms. Moraga further clarified that any limited voluntary support referenced was made available to the previous and current Presidencies outside of any contractual relationship with the ISU and was related to specific activities associated with the Youth Contest.

UNGA Annual Resolution on the CCM

The final agenda item for the first CC meeting concerned a discussion on the annual resolution on the CCM at the UN General Assembly (UNGA).

Ambassador Vongxay introduced the agenda item and invited Ms. Moraga to provide an update on the matter.

In her intervention, the Director recalled recent voting trends related to the UNGA annual resolution noting variations observed over the past five years. She highlighted that voting patterns recorded in First Committee can differ from those at the UNGA plenary, and that such contextual analysis can be useful in informing outreach and engagement efforts.

Ms Moraga then shared the voting results of the CCM resolution as adopted by the First Committee:

- Yes: 131
- No: 2
- Abstentions: 41

In discussing these figures attention was drawn to abstentions by two States Parties as well as the loss of support by some States that had previously voted in favour of the resolution. It was noted that some abstaining States are signatories while others are not party to the Convention.

Ms Moraga underlined that overall support for the resolution remains positive. She noted, that, while abstentions and absences merit attention, continued engagement with States could contribute to sustaining and where possible, increasing support for the resolution when it's considered by the UNGA plenary. In this regard, members of the CC had an important role to play.

Ambassador Vongxay recalled that the annual UNGA resolution is tabled under the leadership of the Philippines as penholder. He noted that ahead of the UNGA plenary vote scheduled for the following week, the Lao PDR Mission had reflected on ways to encourage broad support for the resolution. He invited members of the CC to support outreach efforts and expressed confidence that continued collective engagement would contribute positively to the outcome, ensuring that the Convention remained relevant.

Ambassador Vongxay then opened the floor for comments.

The Representative of the ICRC suggested that a comparative analysis of the voting patterns of the last five years will be welcomed. The Representative of Cameroon took the floor to thank the Presidency and the ISU and clarified that, he attended the meeting on behalf of his colleague, in Cameroon's capacity as co-coordinator of the Working Group on the General Status and Operation, and Gender Focal Point, alongside Austria. The Representative of Austria welcomed the discussion and expressed support for the idea of a comparative analysis of the voting patterns at the UNGA on the annual resolution. She also noted that the plenary vote would take place on Monday, 1 December, following a long weekend in New York, which may affect negatively attendance. In this regard, she observed that this year's voting records may not fully reflect overall levels of support for the Convention.

Ambassador Vongxay took again the floor to note that it can be challenging for smaller missions to be present for all the votes during busy periods at the UNGA session.

The Representative of Australia took the floor on the UNGA resolution suggesting that the history of the CCM could be interesting to explain the voting patterns at the UNGA, as well as the voting

patterns at the APMBC. She then said that Australia would be happy to reach out to Pacific States in respect of the UNGA Plenary vote. She also suggested that there could be a more comprehensive consultative process for this resolution, similar to the one on IEDs resolutions co-sponsored by Australia, along with France and Nigeria, including, for example, online sessions in Geneva to promote the resolution itself. Australia is keen to see strong support for the CCM resolution.

In concluding, the agenda item, Ambassador Vongxay thanked attendees and the ISU for their contributions and expressed appreciation for the constructive exchange. He noted that the minutes would be circulated in due course, following completion of internal processes, to allow CC members to reflect on the discussion and support preparations for the next meeting in January.

Ambassador Vongxay further conveyed the openness of the Presidency and the ISU to continued dialogue, as appropriate, and indicated that the ISU would be in contact with Coordinators in relation to upcoming thematic work, in line with established practice. He concluded by thanking members of the CC once again for their engagement and expressed his intention to work closely with all members in the period ahead.