



UK Permanent
Representation
to the Conference
on Disarmament

Second Preparatory Meeting for the Third Review Conference of the Convention on Cluster Munitions

Review of the operation and status of the convention 2021-2026

STATEMENT BY THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the Conference on Disarmament,
David Riley
Geneva, 1 July 2026

Mister President,

Let me start by joining others in expressing our condolences to the delegation of Colombia for the tragic loss of Ambassador Gallon. His passing is a great loss for Colombia, for our community in Geneva and for the global campaign for human rights.

The United Kingdom would like to thank you and the ISU for your continued work in preparing this revised Review Document, as well as other papers under consideration today.

We welcome the efforts that have been made to streamline the text since the previous iteration. The reduced length makes the document significantly more accessible and manageable for delegations.

With regards to substance, we note that several concerns previously raised by the UK remain unaddressed in this version.

In particular, we are concerned with the new language in paragraph 43, which appears to undermine key provisions of the Convention such as Article 21 – the so-called interoperability clause.

While we are deeply concerned by the incidents of the use of cluster munitions in different parts of the world, we must also accurately reflect the language and intention of Article 21. Article 21 is an integral and essential part of the Convention, without which a number of States Parties here today may not have acceded to the Convention and that may enable new States Parties to accede in the future, supporting our collective goal of universalisation. For the UK, it is crucial that any document that States Parties agree reflects the full text of the Convention, including Article 21.

With regards to paragraphs 23, 29, and related references, we support the request from the delegations of Japan, Sweden and Germany for the language to reflect that Lithuania was exercising its right through the mechanism provided under Article 20, as well as recognise the broader context in which this decision was taken.

Colleagues in London are continuing to review the latest draft, and we will provide further detailed comments in writing.

Thank you.