



Assembly of States Parties

Distr.: General
29 November 2025

Original: English

Twenty-fourth session

The Hague, 1-6 December 2025

Report on the Composition of the Bureau

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. The facilitation on the composition of the Bureau was established for the first time by the Bureau on 15 January 2025 and allocated to the New York Working Group.¹ On 20 March 2025, the Bureau appointed Ms. Loureen Sayej (State of Palestine) as the facilitator for the topic “Composition of the Bureau”.

2. The mandate for the facilitation is contained in the omnibus resolution adopted by the Assembly at its twenty-third session in December 2024:²

(i) *also requests* the Bureau to discuss the representative character of its composition, taking into account, in particular, equitable geographical distribution and the adequate representation of the principal legal systems of the world and, *taking note* of the written summary of views expressed ahead of the twenty-third session of the Assembly, *further requests* the Bureau to, in light of the written summary, consult with all States Parties on the topic and submit a report, without prejudice to any course of action, ahead of the twenty-fourth session of the Assembly;

II. Background

1. At its third session the Assembly decided on the following future composition of the Bureau: African Group, five seats; Asia-Pacific Group, three seats; Eastern European Group, four seats; Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, four seats; Western European and Other States Group, five seats.³ This distribution of Bureau seats has been applied since 2005.

2. In 2024 the issue on the composition of the Bureau was discussed within the Bureau itself. The outcome was the written summary of the views, which was adopted by the Bureau

¹ See agenda and decisions of the second meeting of the Bureau, held on 15 January 2025, available at: https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/asp_docs/2025-Bureau2-Agenda-Decisions.pdf.

² ICC-ASP/23/Res.1, annex I, para. 10(i). Available at: https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/asp_docs/ICC-ASP-23-Res.1-ENG.pdf.

³ See ICC-ASP/3/25, Part I, para. 43: “The Assembly considered the proposal on the election of a President of the Assembly and on the future composition of the Bureau (ICC-ASP/3/24). At its 5th meeting, on 9 September 2004, the Assembly agreed on the following future composition of the Bureau:

- Group of Western European and other States and Group of African States: 5 seats each;
- Group of Latin American and Caribbean States and Group of Eastern European States: 4 seats each;
- Group of Asian States: 3 seats, on the understanding that: (a) the next Chair of the Credentials Committee would be elected from a State Party that belonged to the Asian Group and was not a Bureau member; and (b) the Bureau would extend to her/him a standing invitation to participate in Bureau meetings without the right to vote.

It was understood that this compromise should not automatically extend beyond the term of office of the next Bureau (2005-2008). The possibility was raised of revisiting the question of the composition of the Bureau at the Review Conference in 2009.”

on 5 November 2024, and replicated in an annex to the oral report on the activities of the Bureau at the twenty-third session.

3. In those discussions, Bureau members agreed that the representative character of the Bureau was an important principle for the governance and legitimacy of the Court and the Rome Statute system as a whole and reiterated the importance of equitable geographical representation in the Bureau, noting that the geographical distribution of States Parties had evolved since relevant decisions were taken on the composition of the Bureau twenty years ago. In this regard, Bureau members noted that three regional groups were currently under-represented in the composition of the Bureau when compared with the proportion of States Parties from those groups: the African Group, the Asia-Pacific Group, and the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States. The Bureau members also took account of the longstanding request⁴ from the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States since 2014, to address the topic of equitable geographical representation, and the informal consultations which had taken place in the context of the negotiation of the omnibus resolution in recent years.

(a) Current Composition of the Bureau

4. The geographical distribution of Bureau seats as of 1 March 2024 (124 States Parties) may be compared with the distribution at the opening of the first session of the Assembly in September 2002 (76 States Parties).

Regional Group	% of States Parties (ASP1 2002)	% of Bureau Seats (ASP1 – 2002)	% of States Parties (March 2024)	% of Bureau Seats (March 2024)	of Change (2002–2024) ⁵
Africa Group	22.4%	23.8%	26.6%	23.8%	–2.8 percentage points
Asia-Pacific Group	10.5%	14.3%	15.3%	14.3%	–1.0 percentage points
Eastern European Group (EEG)	15.7%	14.3%	15.3%	19.0%	+3.7 percentage points
Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC)	19.7%	19.0%	22.6%	19.0%	–3.6 percentage points
Western European and Others Group (WEOG)	31.6%	28.5%	20.1%	23.8%	+3.7 percentage points

5. The comparison of Bureau composition between the first session of the Assembly in 2002 and the situation as of March 2024 highlights both continuity and change in regional representation. The data indicate that the Bureau's regional distribution has remained generally stable since the first session of the Assembly. The gradual expansion of the Assembly's membership, particularly within the African, GRULAC and Asia-Pacific groups, has resulted in variations between the proportion of States Parties and the corresponding share of Bureau seats.

- a) The **African Group** and **GRULAC** now represent a higher percentage of total membership than in 2002 (Africa: 26.6% in 2024 compared to 22.4% in 2002;

⁴ *Official Records of the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Thirteenth session, New York, 8–17 December 2014* (ICC-ASP/13/20), volume I, part I, para. 11.

⁵ The “Change (2002–2024)” column reflects the numerical difference between the percentage share of Bureau seats and the percentage share of States Parties within each regional group, at the two reference points.

GRULAC: 22.6% in 2024 compared to 19.7% in 2002), while their share of Bureau seats has remained unchanged (Africa: 23.8%; GRULAC: 19.0%).

- b) The **Eastern European Group (EEG)** and the **Western European and Others Group (WEOG)** hold a higher proportion of Bureau seats relative to their current share of membership (EEG: 19.0% of Bureau seats compared to 15.3% of States Parties; WEOG: 23.8% of Bureau seats compared to 20.1% of States Parties).
- c) The **Asia-Pacific Group** remains broadly consistent with its proportion of States Parties (15.3% of membership and 14.3% of Bureau seats).

III. Consultations with States Parties

6. Throughout the reporting period, the facilitator carried out bilateral and regional consultations with States Parties to ascertain their positions on the mandate of the new facilitation, the composition of the Bureau, the concerns and expectations. Those consultations indicated support for review and consideration of the composition of the Bureau to ensure its representative nature across regional groups and legal systems as stated in the Rome Statute and intended by the Assembly of States Parties.

7. The facilitator also appeared before the New York Working Group on 8 September 2025 and 21 October 2025 to brief the New York Working Group on progress in the implementation of the mandate given and to share with the Working Group the views that had been expressed by States Parties and regional groups to review the composition of the Bureau and ensure that it reflects equitable geographical representation and adequate representation of the principal legal systems.

8. On 20 October 2025, the facilitator convened a meeting of States Parties in New York to continue discussions. The facilitator recalled that the composition of the Bureau has been a longstanding item of discussion for delegations and regional groups. However, there is a broad consensus on the importance of ensuring a representative character for the Bureau, particularly to maintain the legitimacy and governance of the Court. Throughout the years, some delegations expressed concerns about the under-representation and introduced proposals in the context of the negotiation of the omnibus resolution. Other delegations advocated to maintain the status quo. Some delegations pushed for greater geographic representation. Others emphasized the need to reflect legal system diversity in the Bureau composition. No agreement was reached on a formula for allocation of seats. Some delegations stressed that past efforts to reconcile “purely mathematical” approaches with “equal representation” proving unsustainable. The Facilitator emphasized a transparent, consultative process and confirmed that bilateral and regional consultations will continue without prejudice to any outcome.

9. In the meeting, two proposals were introduced for the consideration of delegations. In its non-paper, Brazil called for increasing representation for the African Group, the Asia-Pacific Group and the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC) to address what it considered as long-standing under-representation, guided by three principles: (1) The principle of fair rotation of Vice-Presidencies among regional groups should be upheld, in order to ensure greater participation of Asia-Pacific States through the assumption of Vice-Presidential roles; (2) Latin American and Caribbean States, as well as African States, should each be allocated an additional seat on the Bureau; (3) The Chair of the Credentials Committee and the Rapporteur should be elected from among States Parties belonging to the Eastern European Group and the Western European and Other States Group that are not members of the Bureau. The Bureau should extend to them a standing invitation to participate in its meetings, without the right to vote.

10. The non-paper by Belgium suggested that while membership expansion has been most pronounced in few regions, the Bureau’s composition has not fully adjusted to reflect these demographic shifts. As for the adequate representation of the principal legal systems, Belgium indicated that the regional groups themselves are best placed to guarantee a balanced composition in the Bureau. Belgium proposed a rotation system whereby the composition of the Bureau changes every three years and maintaining the current overall Bureau composition over the next three years while rebalancing regional seats to six for the African Group, five for GRULAC, three for the Asia-Pacific Group and three for the Eastern European Group,

with the remaining seats to be assigned to the Western European and Others Group to reach a more proportional representation.

11. During the discussions, delegations broadly welcomed the renewed focus on equitable representation. While some delegations welcomed efforts by Belgium and Brazil to ensure an equitable representation of the Bureau based on geographical distribution, other delegations emphasized that the composition of the Bureau should reflect not only equitable geographic representation but also adequate representation of the principal legal of the world and reiterated demand to the Secretariat to prepare a report on legal systems worldwide to guide discussion throughout the facilitation. Some delegations supported the approach to adjust representation in line with current membership distribution, while others favoured a more gradual or technical review with structured discussions. Some delegations reserved their positions on both proposals saying more time was needed. Concerns were raised about potential reductions in seats for certain regional groups.

12. Following the 20 October 2025, the facilitator held regional group consultations to discuss the mandate of the facilitation, expectations of the facilitation and the process, positions of delegations and regional groups, as well as proposals by Belgium and Brazil, in an effort to ensure that all regional perspectives were considered as part of the ongoing consultations.

13. The facilitator organised the first regional group consultation with the GRULAC region on 24 October 2025. During that meeting delegations conveyed that GRULAC and Africa remain underrepresented in the Bureau, a situation that has persisted for over a decade and now we have the chance to make the Bureau more equitable. They stressed that the issue of global legal systems is best addressed at the regional level, each regional group, when deciding who will be its members of the bureau, should decide how to have an active representation of the principle legal systems of the world. Delegations declared that the Brazilian proposal can be a potential solution for equitable representation and reminded that the Brazilian proposal builds on 2004 solution that allocated the role of the Chair of the Credentials Committee to a regional group and uses the same precedent in order to allocate this role to one group and the other core function of the Bureau to another, and also with a standing invitation to participate in Bureau meetings. Delegations asserted that for the APG to have a better representation in the bureau, the Brazilian proposal adopts the principle of equitable rotation in the vice presidencies. They said that the proposal by Belgium is constructive and can be integrated with the Brazilian proposal, as long as it is implemented immediately (not delayed by four years). Delegations concluded that a stand-alone resolution at ASP 24 is important for the record and institutional memory of the Court, taking into considerations that the Bureau membership should be reviewed periodically (every 6-9 years).

14. On 4 November 2025, the facilitator organised the second regional group consultation with the African Group. During the meeting, delegations reaffirmed the African Group's longstanding position advocating for more representation in the Bureau reiterating that the composition of the Bureau must reflect geographical representation as the primary and objective criterion, with Africa's numerical weight as States Parties duly recognised. It was stressed that the legal-system diversity, while acknowledged, should be implemented in a manner that reinforces rather than dilutes the central role of geographical distribution and expressed readiness and willingness to engage in a focused and forward-looking manner. A delegation expressed support for elements in the Brazilian proposal with emphasis on geographical representation. Other delegations stressed the need for the African group to come together and develop a unified proposal. Some delegations noted that both the Brazilian and Belgian proposals could serve as a starting point to develop an African proposal for discussions. They stressed that the composition of the Bureau should be based on the number of States Parties in each region and as such Africa should be represented by a higher number of seats to better reflect its membership. Finally, delegations concluded that discussions on legal systems and its adequate implementation should be guided through geographical representation and that more time is needed to continue the discussions.

15. On 4 November 2025, the facilitator organised the third regional group consultation with the EEG group, continuing efforts to gather inputs from other regional stakeholders. In the meeting, delegations emphasized that geographic representation is not the sole criterion for Bureau composition under the Rome Statute and that there is also principle of legal

systems. Other delegations suggested that Rome Statute left door open to other criteria to be taken into considerations: arrears, voluntary contributions, cooperation, percentage of States in the region that are parties to the ICC (for e.g.: EEG: 85% ratification, WEOG: 89% ratification, APG: 35% ratification, Africa: 61% ratification). Some clarified that before moving forward States Parties should discuss at least both criteria: geographical distribution and principal legal systems among other criteria. They stressed that they are open to cooperation with other regional groups but not open to amending the Rome Statute or engaging in proposals that undermine the Rome Statute. They reiterated the request from EEG for a report or paper from the Secretariat analysing the main legal systems in the regions that was requested by the EEG last year, such as civil law, common law, and the unique continental legal systems in EEG, which differ from other traditions like common law, while recalling the difficulty of producing such a paper. Delegations declared openness to working on elements in the Brazilian proposal, but need more information, on how ensure representation without taking seats away from other groups. They explained that EEG is not over represented and opposed losing a seat as proposed in the Belgian proposal stressed the importance of consensus. They urged that the process should not be rushed and allow more time for discussions. Stressed that any outcome should reflect a comprehensive view of all regional concerns, and indicated readiness to review and negotiate any proposals and expressed concern over the limited time available for discussion.

16. On 5 November 2025, the facilitator organised the fourth regional group consultation with the APG group, engaging yet another regional bloc in discussions on the issue. Delegations expressed flexibility toward both the Brazilian and Belgian proposals and willingness to join any emerging consensus. A delegation provided detailed comments on both proposals reiterating that they are not yet convinced with both proposals. On Brazilian proposal a delegation the delegation said: (i) Open to principle of adding one seat each to GRULAC and the African Group. (ii) On principle 3, which states that the Chair of the Credentials Committee and the Rapporteur shall not have voting rights but shall participate in meetings of the Bureau, has no basis in the Rome Statute. Furthermore, the participation of the two might entail operational questions. (iii) Appreciative of the proposal to hold rotations for the Vice-President position and to appoint a representative from the APG region. However, the delegation argued that the President and Vice-President positions are held on an individual capacity and should be determined based on the circumstances of the members of the Bureau at the time, so rotation may not necessarily be appropriate. As for the Belgian proposal: the delegation argued that the rotational process where GRULAC & the African Group and WEOG & EEG would exchange seats every three years is not based on numerical logic, thereby it is doubtful whether this proposal is sustainable.

17. On 5 November 2025, the facilitator organised the fifth regional group consultation with the WEOG group. Delegations affirmed that the mandate of the Composition of the Bureau is primarily focused on discussions, reviews, report, not on producing a concrete outcome let alone a resolution, and stressed the need for having a structured discussion, while aware that discussions on this topic have been taking place for years. They reiterated the importance of a representative Bureau and recognized that previously dialogue took place on this topic. Delegations expressed surprise that others are proposing a standalone resolution and called having a resolution this session as premature, while noting that some elements can be considered for the report. Some delegations stressed that this session is not the session to have an outcome and that any solution should avoid requiring amendments to the Rome Statute, which already allows consideration of multiple criteria, not just geographical distribution and principal legal systems, one example could also be gender balance. A delegation expressed interest in knowing what other criteria is used in international organizations and highlighted the change of number of States Parties with new accessions and withdrawals and that the membership dynamics must be considered. Few delegations viewed elements of Belgian proposal as good basis for discussions as it takes into account different views, interests, and sensitivities. Other delegations expressed interest in Brazilian proposal. On the Brazil proposal, a delegation said that they welcomed the participation of the Chair of the Credentials Committee and the Rapporteur in Bureau meetings but acknowledged practical challenges regarding the fair rotation of seats and that it is often difficult to identify ambassadors willing to assume the role of ASP Vice President, and suggested that the principle of rotation should serve as guidance rather than a rigid rule.

18. On 14 November 2025, the facilitator convened the sixth meeting of the Composition of the Bureau facilitation with all States Parties to brief on the consultations with regional groups, discuss different positions and contentious points as well as the joint proposal by Belgium and Brazil. The facilitator briefed on the regional group consultations and opened the floor for comments and reflections.

19. Regarding the geographical representation and principal legal systems: some delegations reiterated that they are open to this discussion on bureau composition as it is important for the credibility and legitimacy of the Court. Delegations asked about the applicability of the principal of diverse legal systems in the discussions and potential solutions. Other delegations recalled that the established practice is that regional groups decide which countries represent them. Delegations claimed that there was never an issue of unequal representation of any specific legal system. A delegation expressed failure to understand why the principal legal systems criteria should be considered when the Bureau does not perform a judicial function but rather an organizational role, other delegations responded by stating that they are not advocating for one criteria to be the sole criteria but to the contrary these delegations expressed that other criteria needs to be considered and referred to the two criteria mentioned in the Rome Statute as demonstrative. Delegations pointed out that the question of whether we should consider the principal legal systems is settled in the Rome Statute. Some delegations shared the view that Article 112 of Rome Statute refers to “equitable geographical distribution and the adequate representation of the principal legal systems of the world”, meaning that equitable is not the same as adequate- equitable refers to justness and fairness, while adequate is a synonym for sufficient and does not refer to a number. Some delegations reiterated that they do not see a representation problem that needs to be fixed, especially when other criteria are taken into considerations, and that the discussion cannot be reduced into a mathematical exercise.

20. Regarding the mandate of the facilitation and the process: some delegations insisted that a stand-alone resolution is better for institutional memory, is long over-due, and is needed to rectify the situation. Some delegations reiterated that resolution is not a necessary outcome of this exercise at this point and that a report would be within the mandate of the facilitation and expressed reservations to having a stand-alone resolutions. Some delegations reiterated that there is no compelling reason to not have a resolution because the Rome Statute is clear that there should be equitable geographical distribution and right now this is not the case. Some delegations questioned whether the mandate allows to go further than a report and reiterated call for more time to review the composition of the bureau prior to taking any action. Some delegations recognized that other delegations are demanding resolution and are cognizant that if no action is taken now they will have to wait three years, and as such will join consensus and will not oppose a resolution. Some delegations proposed to have discussions and consultations this year followed by a resolution next year. Some delegations urged proceeding with caution and allow delegations to review the proposals. Some delegations said they were expecting proposals and are open to discussions but it is difficult to discuss a proposal based on one criteria only. Some delegations warned that any proposal that would fix an issue by creating another problem would not be sustainable. Some delegations suggested that the way forward is to focus only on discussing the two criteria.

21. Both Belgium and Brazil presented a joint draft resolution (Annex II). They explained that the main rationale behind the draft resolution is to ensure that the composition of the Bureau is representative and reflects, in particular, the equitable geographical distribution. They further informed their view that a compromise solution could be proposal of a rotation system, whereby the composition of the Bureau changes every 3 years (when the current composition of the Bureau ends, WEOG and EEG would cede each a seat to AG and GRULAC for the coming period of 3 years). Two groups would lose a seat for 3 years, but they would hold the seats of chair of credential committee and rapporteur, with standing invitation and no right to vote. They proposed to review the composition of the bureau every 6 years to take into consideration new members or withdrawals. They stressed that the proposal is not intended to diminish the participation of any regional group in the bureau but it seeks to ensure equitable geographical representation as it builds on the compromise reached in 2004 when the role of the chair of the coordination committee was allocated to a specific regional group, again with a standing invitation to participate in bureau meetings. They concluded that this issue is not a new topic to be discussed among delegations, it has been discussed for decades especially since 2014 when GRULAC delivered a statement in

the ASP. Then 2018 was the first time a comprehensive discussion on the issue of the composition of the Bureau took place. A language in the omnibus resolution was introduced, which was later discussed in 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, and in 2023 a group representing 64 States Parties reiterated their concern with this inequitable geographical representation submitted a proposal that is the origin of the mandate we have nowadays. While the original proposal was to have a discussion among all States Parties the compromise was to address it first in the Bureau.

22. In response to the joint proposal, some delegations engaged on substantive, textual matters while others continued to reserve their position by reiterating that, in principle they are not against a draft resolution, but that more time is needed to discuss the composition of the Bureau before negotiating draft resolution. Some delegations thanked the proponents and supported the proposal calling it fair, simple and balanced. Other delegations reserved their position saying that they are not ready to discuss the proposal and need to engage in discussions to identify the problem, if it exists. Some delegations insisted that in this session the geographical distribution should be discussed and a solution found while continue for next six-year discussions on principal legal systems.

23. On 19 November 2025, the facilitator convened the seventh meeting with all States Parties to discuss the paper prepared by the Secretariat on principal legal systems and the compromise proposal. During the meeting, the Secretariat re-presented the paper on geographical distribution and presented the newly prepared paper on the principal legal systems. It was followed by discussion where some delegations welcomed the papers, including the newly prepared one on principal legal systems, while they recognized the complexity of factoring it in the composition of the bureau they reiterated the need for continued structured discussions. For illustration, the paper on the principal legal systems included the following:

Regional group	Civil-law-based	Common-law-based	Islamic-law-based	Customary-law-based	Total ICC States considered	Key characteristics
Africa	69.7% (23 States)	48.5% (16 States)	18.2% (6 States)	69.7% (23 States)	33	Predominantly mixed systems combining civil, common, customary, and Islamic law.
GRULAC	71.4% (20 States)	35.7% (10 States)	0 %	0 %	28	Latin America follows civil law; the Caribbean follows common law; two mixed systems
EEG	100 % (20 States)	0 %	0 %	0 %	20	Entirely civil-law systems (continental European Roman-Germanic model).
APG	63.2% (12 States)	52.6% (10 States)	26.3% (5 States)	47.4% (9 States)	19	Highly diverse region with civil, common, Islamic and customary law elements often combined.

Regional group	Civil-law-based	Common-law-based	Islamic-law-based	Customary-law-based	Total ICC States considered	Key characteristics
WEOG	84.0% (21 States)	28.0% (7 States)	0.0% (0 States)	8.0% (2 States)	25	Predominantly civil law systems, with common law traditions in Anglo-Saxon countries and limited customary elements.

24. Afterwards, Belgium and Brazil introduced a revised proposal (Annex III). They explained that they engaged in consultations with some delegations and regional groups leading to a revised proposal intended as a compromise text among these delegations. The revised text included new language on: principal legal systems; and a new formulation: 25th to 28th sessions the seats remain as they are but the Rapporteur and Chair of Credential Committee are elected from GRULAC and the African Group with a standing invitation.

25. Some delegations reserved their position, re-stating that it is too early to have a resolution and that more discussions are needed. Other delegations welcomed the revised text and stated that while they believed their regional group is warranted to have an extra seat on the bureau, they are, in the spirit of consensus, prepared to be flexible and not block any compromise agreement, while stressing that this is a temporary measures and that discussions will continue. Other delegations welcomed the compromise text, also in the spirit of consensus, and reiterated that they are happy to join the compromise proposal also conditional to two factors: temporary nature of the measure taken and the continued discussions, especially on the principal legal systems. Other delegations expressed their readiness to join consensus while recalling that they were flexible to accept the first draft of the Belgium-Brazil proposal.

26. On 20 November 2025, the facilitator convened the eighth meeting to give delegations more time to continue discussions on the mandate and the revised joint proposal. Some delegations provided technical amendments and substantive suggestions to the text, others reserved their position re-stating that more time is needed for discussions before a decision is taken, while stressing their readiness to engage constructively. Other delegations reiterated that geographical representation is the primary and objective criteria and that the primary legal systems should be implemented in a manner that reinforced not dilute the geographical distribution. Some delegations engaged in mini circle discussions to address technical matters in the draft.

27. At the end of the meeting, these delegations that engaged in the mini circle discussions agreed on a compromise text according to which the composition of the Bureau would remain the same for the next cycle, while the Chair of the Credentials Committee and the Rapporteur of the twenty-fifth, the twenty-sixth, and the twenty-seventh Sessions would be elected from among States Parties belonging, respectively, to the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States and the African Group that are not members of the Bureau, and that the Bureau shall extend to them a standing invitation to participate in its meetings. Aware of extra time requested, the facilitator gave until end of day 21st for comments.

28. On the 21 November 2025, the facilitator received the following messages (1) from a delegation on behalf of a regional group that they require more time to carefully consider the proposal and develop a group position. In this regard and for purposes of progress, the Group favoured proceeding with the report as it currently stands with the reflection on the preliminary discussions delegations had on a possible joint compromise proposal. Owing to the limited time and the need for deeper consultation and full appreciation of the proposal, it is the group's view that this matter can be revisited at the later iteration of this agenda item and that they require additional consideration to adopt a decision/resolution at this moment. (2) A delegation agreed that additional time would be beneficial to further discuss this important matter and explained that this is precisely the purpose of the draft compromise text

under consideration. They recalled that throughout consultations, they made it clear that it is essential adopt language for a resolution during this session, so as not to lose momentum. They said that while their delegation has shown considerable flexibility regarding various proposals, they are not in a position to accept an outcome that does not enhance the representation of their regional group in the Bureau. The delegation conveyed that they would be compelled to break silence should the report fail to include language for the resolution. The delegation explained that such outcome would not only depart from the established practice in this type of facilitation—particularly when several paragraphs of the omnibus resolution remain open pending the language from this report—but would also be inconsistent with the substantive and constructive consultations delegations have held over the past weeks.

29. On 24 November 2025, the facilitator convened informal meetings with States Parties to discuss the way forward and ensure consensus. A delegation on behalf of a regional group reiterated that in principle they are not opposed to a resolution, but discussion need to continue and that consultations with all regional groups are necessary. They recalled that even though their regional group, in their view, is underrepresented, and a solution is needed they aspire for a permanent solution rather than a temporary one that might prejudice the way forward. Other delegations recalled their position that a solution needs to be provided in the report for the next Bureau cycle, which has been their request for a decade, and that if action is not taken the discussion will be postponed until 2029. Other delegations stated that it is impossible to have a solution by next week and that report should not prejudice any course of action. Other delegations stated that there is a momentum now to have a temporary solution in parallel with ongoing discussions. Some delegations stated that there is no need to push for a resolution to find a solution while others explained that they would be ready to proceed with a resolution now with the understanding that it is temporary solution.

30. While some delegations expressed disappointment that no agreement has been reached among all regional groups and delegations for a temporary solution, others recalled that the mandate does not entail finding a solution this session and that they are committed to continue discussions towards finding a solution that can be endorsed by all groups and delegations next year. As a result, some delegations expressed preference to have a compromise language in the Omnibus resolution and stressed that the draft resolutions annexed should not prejudice other future proposals or constitute bases for future discussions. Other delegations said that they showed flexibility this year and were ready to take action and stressed that the text in the Omnibus should not prejudice the outcome of the considerations moving forward and recalled the importance of consensus. While other delegations expressed preference to have the revised draft resolution that was agreed among some delegations and regional groups annexed. No agreement was reached among all regional groups and delegations on the way forward.

Annex I

Draft text for the omnibus resolution

1. The following paragraph of the 2024 omnibus resolution (ICC-ASP/23/Res.1), located in the section on the working methods review, is to be retained:

Reiterates that the Bureau shall have a representative character in its composition, taking into account, in particular, equitable geographical distribution and the adequate representation of the principal legal systems of the world, and requests the Bureau to remain seized of the matter;

2. The following paragraphs of the 2024 omnibus resolution (ICC-ASP/22/Res.3), in the section on the working methods review at para 10 (i) is replaced and is to be reflected as follows:

(i) *also requests* the Bureau to continue to discuss the representative character of its composition, taking into account, in particular, equitable geographical distribution and the adequate representation of the principal legal systems of the world and *further requests* the Bureau to continue to consult with all States Parties on the topic and submit a report, ahead of the twenty-fifth session of the Assembly;

(ii) *also decides* to consider the Composition of the Bureau as its first point on its agenda for the twenty-fifth session of the Assembly, taking into consideration the Reports on the Composition of the Bureau and its Annexes, as well as other proposals, and with a view of taking an action, and requests that the Bureau will adopt the report well in advance.

ANNEX II

Joint Proposal by Belgium & Brazil Composition of the Bureau

The Assembly of States Parties,

PP1 Recalling that the Bureau shall have a representative character in its composition, taking into account, in particular, equitable geographical distribution and the adequate representation of the principal legal systems of the world,

PP2 Encouraging Bureau members to strengthen their communication with States Parties of their respective regional groups to inform the discussion of the Bureau, including by establishing appropriate mechanisms for providing regular updates on the work of the Bureau;

PP3 Noting that the geographical distribution of States Parties had evolved since relevant decisions were taken on the composition of the Bureau;

PP3 Recognizing that the core functions within the Bureau, other than the President, comprise the two Vice-Presidents explicitly provided for in the Statute, a member performing the functions of Rapporteur and the Chairperson of the Credentials Committee,

OP1 Takes note of the written summary of views expressed ahead of the twenty-third session of the Assembly,

OP2 Welcomes the report on the composition of the Bureau;

OP3 Decides that the composition of the Bureau from the 26th to the 28th Sessions will be as follows:

African Group, six seats
Asian Group, three seats
Eastern European Group, three seats
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, five seats
Western European and Other States Group, four seats;

OP4 Decides that the Chair of the Credentials Committee and the Rapporteur from the 26th to the 28th Sessions shall be elected from among States Parties belonging, respectively, to the Eastern European Group and the Western European and Other States Group that are not members of the Bureau, and that the Bureau shall extend to them a standing invitation to participate in its meetings, without the right to vote;

OP5 Decides that the composition of the Bureau from the 29th to the 31th Sessions of the Assembly will be as follows:

African Group, five seats
Asian Group, three seats
Eastern European Group, four seats
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, four seats
Western European and Other States Group, five seats;

OP6 Decides that the Chair of the Credentials Committee and the Rapporteur from the 29th to the 31st Sessions shall be elected from among States Parties belonging, respectively, to the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States and the African Group that are not members of the Bureau, and that the Bureau shall extend to them a standing invitation to participate in its meetings, without the right to vote;

OP7 Acknowledges that the President and Vice-Presidents of the Assembly should be elected on the basis of geographical rotation, where appropriate and practicable;

OP8 Requests the Bureau to remain seized of the matter and to review the question of its composition in advance of the thirty-first session of the Assembly.

ANNEX III

Revised Text

Composition of the Bureau

The Assembly of States Parties,

PP1 Recalling that the Bureau shall have a representative character in its composition, taking into account, in particular, equitable geographical distribution and the adequate representation of the principal legal systems of the world,

PP2 Encouraging Bureau members to strengthen their communication with States Parties of their respective regional groups to inform the discussion of the Bureau, including by establishing appropriate mechanisms for providing regular updates on the work of the Bureau;

PP3 Noting that the geographical distribution of States Parties had evolved since relevant decisions were taken on the composition of the Bureau;

PP3 Recognizing that the core functions within the Bureau, other than the President, comprise the two Vice-Presidents explicitly provided for in the Statute, a member performing the functions of Rapporteur and the Chairperson of the Credentials Committee,

OP1 Takes note of the written summary of views expressed ahead of the twenty-third session of the Assembly,

OP2 Welcomes the report on the composition of the Bureau;

OP2 bis. Recalls that the composition of the Bureau should reflect, inter alia, an adequate representation of the principal legal systems of the world;

OP3 Decides that the composition of the Bureau from the 25^{6th} to the 28th Sessions will be as follows:

African Group, **five** ~~six~~ seats

Asian Group, three seats

Eastern European Group, **four** ~~three~~ seats

Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, **four** ~~five~~ seats

Western European and Other States Group, **five** ~~four~~ seats;

OP4 Decides that the Chair of the Credentials Committee and the Rapporteur **of the twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, and the twenty-seventh** ~~from the 26th to the 28th Sessions~~ shall be elected from among States Parties belonging, respectively, to the **Group of Latin American and Caribbean States and the African Group** ~~Eastern European Group and the Western European and Other States Group~~ that are not members of the Bureau, and that the Bureau shall extend to them a standing invitation to participate in its meetings, ~~without the right to vote;~~

~~*OP5 Decides* that the composition of the Bureau from the 29th to the 31th Sessions of the Assembly will be as follows:~~

~~African Group, five seats~~

~~Asian Group, three seats~~

~~Eastern European Group, four seats~~

~~Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, four seats~~

~~Western European and Other States Group, five seats; —~~

~~*OP6 Decides* that the Chair of the Credentials Committee and the Rapporteur from the 29th to the 31st Sessions shall be elected from among States Parties belonging, respectively, to the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States and the African Group that are not members~~

of the Bureau, and that the Bureau shall extend to them a standing invitation to participate in its meetings, without the right to vote;

OP57 Acknowledges that the President and Vice-Presidents of the Assembly should be elected on the basis of geographical rotation, where appropriate and practicable;

OP68 Requests the Bureau to remain seized of the matter and to review the question of its composition in advance of the thirty-first session of the Assembly. **Requests the Bureau to discuss the representative character of its composition, taking into account, in particular, equitable geographical distribution and the adequate representation of the principal legal systems of the world, and further requests the Bureau to consult with all States Parties on the topic and submit a report ahead of the twenty-fifth session of the Assembly.**
