

**Cour  
Pénale  
Internationale**



**International  
Criminal  
Court**

## **Seventh Diplomatic Briefing of the International Criminal Court**

### **Compilation of Statements**

**\*\*\*Check Against Delivery\*\*\***

**Brussels, 29 June 2006**

**Philippe Kirsch, President**

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen.

It is a pleasure to welcome you to the seventh diplomatic briefing of the International Criminal Court. This is the third briefing the Court has organised in Brussels in order to reach out to those who cannot attend briefings at the seat of the Court in The Hague.

I would like to express our appreciation to the Council of the European Union for providing a venue for the event.

These briefings are organised in order to provide States with regularly-updated information between sessions of the Assembly of States Parties, and to offer you the possibility of communicating directly with the Court's senior management.

We recognise the importance of clearly communicating the Court's activities, objectives and needs to States. As previously indicated, we are open to suggestions to improve the format of our communication - particularly in terms of these diplomatic briefings and information packages you received earlier this week.

The information packages provide an update on the Court in general and on recent developments affecting its different organs – the Presidency and Chambers, the Office of the Prosecutor, the Registry and the Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties.

To build upon that information, our remarks at diplomatic briefings focus on subjects in which the States have shown a particular interest.

For today's briefing, we propose to focus on the Court's strategic planning process. I will first provide you with an overview of key developments in the Court's activities. I will then discuss the Court's strategic plan and ongoing efforts to communicate the plan to States, international organisations and civil society. The Prosecutor will explain his prosecutorial strategy and the contribution of his office to the broader strategic plan of the Court. The Registrar will update you on a number of areas in which the Court's strategic planning process is being put into action, including the 2007 draft budget preparation, permanent premises and the Court's strategic plan for outreach. Renan Villacis, the acting Director of the Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties will update you on the activities of the Assembly of States. We would be pleased to respond to your questions at the end of these presentations.

Much has happened since we last met with you here in Brussels. I would emphasize in particular that the Court is now well into the exercise of its judicial activities. On 17 March this year, the first wanted person was surrendered to the Court. Mr. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo, a national of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, is alleged to have committed

war crimes, namely, conscripting and enlisting children under the age of fifteen years and using them to participate actively in hostilities. In September, the Pre-Trial Chamber will hold a hearing to confirm the charges before trial. If the charges are confirmed, the trial phase will begin early next year.

Arrest warrants were issued last year by a Pre-Trial Chamber in relation to the situation in Uganda for five members of the Lord's Resistance Army, including its leader Joseph Kony. The alleged crimes against humanity and war crimes contained in the warrants include sexual enslavement, rape, intentionally attacking civilians, and the forced enlistment of child soldiers. None of the five have been arrested yet. The Court requires cooperation of States and international or regional organisations to arrest these persons.

Pre-Trial Chambers have also issued decisions in other areas such as forensic examinations, the right of victims to participate in pre-trial proceedings, and disclosure of evidence before the confirmation of charges hearing. 79 decisions have been issued by Chambers since the beginning of the year. This number includes decisions pertaining to substantive issues as well as to issues of a more technical nature.

Some of the work of the Pre-Trial Chambers has been and will likely continue to be confidential as the Chambers seek to balance the need for public proceedings with concerns such as the security of victims and witnesses. Publicly available decisions and other documents are available on the Court's website.

In the meantime, issues are now beginning to be raised before the Appeals Chamber.

To support its activities, the Court is developing its cooperation with international and regional organisations. The support of the United Nations is particularly important in this regard. The UN and the Court cooperate on a regular basis, both in our field activities and in our institutional relations. As you know, our cooperation is governed by a relationship agreement entered into in October 2004.

In April of this year, the Court entered into a cooperation agreement with the European Union. We hope to do the same with the African Union in the near future. Ten days ago, the Prosecutor and I briefed the Peace and Security Council of the African Union on the Court's activities.

Today, it is widely recognized that the ICC is part of a broader system composed of different actors working towards the same goal of international justice. The request of the Special Court for Sierra Leone to use the facilities of the ICC in the trial of Charles Taylor is a case in point. As you are likely aware, Charles Taylor was transferred to the detention facilities of the ICC on 20 June. The Special Court for Sierra Leone, which will try Mr. Taylor, considered that his trial could not occur in Sierra Leone because of security concerns in the region. Mr. Taylor's trial will be conducted by a Trial Chamber of the Special Court for Sierra Leone sitting in The Hague. The ICC will only provide facilities and related assistance. The arrangements are clarified in a Memorandum of Understanding concluded by the ICC and the Special Court in April. The ICC sought the views of States Parties on this matter and the Assembly of States Parties subsequently conveyed to the ICC

its acceptance of the request of the Special Court for Sierra Leone. As per the Resolution of the United Nations Security Council, all costs to be incurred as a result of the trial will be expenses of the Special Court. It is crucial that sufficient funds continue to be made available to the Special Court to cover related expenses.

We can expect more cooperation with international or hybrid courts in the future. Over time it is in the nature of the ICC that it will become the reference institution in the field of international criminal law.

I would now like to give you a brief overview of the direction the Court is taking as it looks to the future, particularly through the development of a strategic plan. Earlier this year, the Court's senior management adopted the first version of the strategic plan. The plan will assist the Court in coordinating our many different activities, ensuring a longer-term perspective in our planning, and setting common priorities for our work.

Through the strategic planning process, the Court aims, in dialogue with States, international organisations and nongovernmental organisations, to set a clear direction for the coming three years and beyond. The strategic plan sets out three interrelated strategic goals for the Court: to ensure the quality of justice; to be a well-recognized and adequately supported institution; and to be a model for public administration. To reach these goals, we have identified thirty strategic objectives over the coming ten years, with emphasis on objectives to be achieved in the next three years.

One part of the strategic planning process is the development of a Court Capacity Model. The Court Capacity Model is a simulation tool, to assist us in planning. The Model tells us what the Court can achieve with a given number of resources. For example, it may indicate the approximate number of staff needed to conduct a certain number of investigations or trials. It can also be used in the reverse, to identify approximately how many investigations or trials the Court can conduct with a fixed number of staff.

Use of the Model may help the Court in a number of ways. First, by running different simulations, the Model may provide a number of alternatives to facilitate decision-making about the Court's overall size. Second, it may be used to identify and eliminate some inefficiencies in the Court's operations. Third, the approach behind the Model will assist the Court in justifying budget requests and clarifying the effect of budgetary changes on the Court's ability to achieve intended results.

The Court Capacity Model is a living tool - It will be continually updated and refined based on new information. A final report on the Court Capacity Model will be presented to the Assembly of States Parties.

We are now turning the strategic plan into action. We have begun a process of consultations with our staff. The staff will play an important role in implementing the plan, including the development of strategies for realizing the objectives. We are also using the strategic goals and objectives to shape the Court's 2007 budget.

We are also discussing the plan with others. The Court presented a progress report of the strategic plan to the Committee on Budget and Finance of the Assembly of States Parties in April. We have

begun a dialogue with States - including a Working Group of the Bureau of the ASP in The Hague - and civil society organizations, to inform them about the plan and to receive their feedback. We look forward to a similar dialogue with the ASP this fall.

The strategic plan is very important to the continued success of the Court. It will be regularly adapted in light of our experiences to guide the Court into the future as we endeavour to collectively advance the aims of the Rome Statute.

I would now like to hand over the floor to the Prosecutor who will provide an overview of his prosecutorial strategy.

## Luis Moreno-Ocampo, Prosecutor

### PROSECUTORIAL STRATEGY

I have the honor to speak with you today about the Prosecutorial Strategy. As President Kirsch just explained, the Court has adopted a common approach to strategic planning which sets out three interrelated strategic goals, and 30 strategic objectives over the coming years to help reach these goals. As you know, the ICC operates under the One-Court principle, while nevertheless respecting the independence of the individual organs. The common sector is contained in the ICC Plan. The Prosecutorial Strategy is independent, but coordinated with the ICC Plan.

#### Background

The OTP has developed its Prosecutorial Strategy after extensive consultation with the staff and senior management. It is based on the experience gained during the Office's first three years of work. We are producing a report on the activities performed during these three years and we will organize meetings with states and other constituencies in order to receive their comments. We will explain how we face certain dilemmas. The **first dilemma** is how to begin cases and gain the necessary support and cooperation. Welcoming voluntary referrals by territorial states was a crucial policy decision taken by the Office. This method of initiating cases has guaranteed greater cooperation and on-the-ground support.

The **second dilemma** faced by the Office is one shared by other international tribunals: how to conduct criminal investigations without a state apparatus, i.e., without any police forces, armies, or other enforcement capacities. The Court faces the added wrinkle of conducting the bulk of its investigations in the midst of on-going conflicts. Operating in the context of on-going conflicts has raised significant challenges for the protection of victims, witnesses and investigators and has also raised thorny dilemmas related to peace and justice. In response, the Office has adapted its investigatory strategies to the individual conflict situations in which it operates, and has adopted an overarching policy of conducting focused investigations.

The **third dilemma** facing the Office is how to execute arrest warrants. This is perhaps the most critical and difficult issue that the Office has encountered in its first three years. The Court does not have its own enforcement capacity. Under the Rome Statute, it is the State Parties that bear the responsibility for arresting suspects and delivering them to the Court for prosecution. It is particularly crucial for a new, permanent International Criminal Court to begin creating a record of successful prosecutions early in its tenure. More assistance is needed to enforce the five outstanding arrest warrants that have been issued in the Northern Uganda case. We anticipate that this will be an on-going challenge in the next phase of its operations.

The report will include a summary of the issues we are discussing before the Pre-Trial and Appeals Chambers regarding fundamental legal matters, such as the scope of victim participation; the role of the each organ in the investigative process; and the scope of review of the Appeals Chamber.

The formulation of the Prosecutorial Strategy took into consideration the lessons learned during the past and is crucial to allows us - the OTP, the ICC as a whole and the State Parties - to

agree upon a common understanding of what is expected of the Office over the next three years. The success of the Court should not be measured in terms of number of cases. Instead a more appropriate measure would be the impact of the Court in the promotion of national efforts and international cooperation to end impunity for the most serious international crimes. Therefore, it is important that we can agree on a common standard for evaluating the Office's work in the coming years. In this regard, this briefing is not the end of the process. Rather, we intend to discuss the Prosecutorial Strategy with representatives of states in September-October in New York and in the Hague. We will circulate a copy of the three year report and the Prosecutorial Strategy in advance, as well as the policy papers which we are in the process of finalizing and which have helped to shape the Prosecutorial Strategy. We will also distribute annexes to our policy paper, defining the standards we apply to select cases and how we interpret art. 53 of the Statute, specifically on the interests of justice. At the end of this process we will adjust our strategy in accordance with the comments received.

### Principles of the Prosecutorial Strategy

At the core of the Prosecutorial Strategy lie three essential principles that the Office has developed during its first three years of work: positive complementarity; focused investigations and prosecutions; and maximizing the impact.

With regard *complementarity*, the Office recognizes that according to the Rome Statute national states have the primary responsibility for preventing and punishing atrocities in their own territories. In this design, intervention by the ICC must be exceptional – it will only step in when states fail to conduct investigations and prosecutions, or where they purport to do so but in reality are unwilling or unable to genuinely carry out proceedings. A Court based on the principle of complementarity ensures the international rule of law by creating an interdependent, mutually reinforcing international system of justice. With this in mind, the Office has adopted a *positive approach* to complementarity, meaning that it encourages genuine national proceedings where possible; relies on national and international networks, and participates in a system of international cooperation. As a consequence, the effectiveness of the Court should not be measured only by the number of cases that reach the Court. On the contrary, the *absence of trials* by the Court, as a consequence of the effective functioning of national systems, would be a major success.

The second principle guiding the Prosecutorial Strategy is that of *focused investigations and prosecutions*. The Office will select situations and cases taking into consideration their gravity in order to work on *the most serious* crimes. Our focus will be on those who bear the *greatest responsibility* for these crimes, according to, and dependent on, the evidence that emerges in the course of an investigation. The policy of focused investigations and prosecutions also means that we select incidents and as few witnesses as possible are called to testify, reducing the security risks and assisting the Court in operating cost efficiently.

The policy of focused investigations and prosecutions is evident in the cases that have been brought so far. In Uganda, the Lord's Resistance Army has had, at a minimum, hundreds of members. According to the evidence collected we concluded that five persons were those bearing the greatest responsibility. In Northern Uganda between July 2002 and June 2004 there were approximately 850 incidents. We chose to focus on just six, representing different regions and

criminalities, for example gender crimes and looting. The selection of cases was affected to a greater extent by security problems in the DRC. We are presenting the first case based on the charge of child conscription.

The third principle guiding the Prosecutorial Strategy is to *maximize the impact* of our activities. The mere existence of the Rome Statute has already had a deterrent effect by encouraging states to incorporate the crimes within the jurisdiction of the Court into their domestic law. Even before the initiation of any investigation by the Court itself, the use of this legislation can be a major step towards preventing atrocities or at least, in bringing to justice the perpetrators of such atrocities. Of course ICC trials and convictions will have an additional deterrent effect. Even before trials have begun, the investigation itself will play a preventative role. The beginning of an investigation increases the risk of punishment and therefore has a deterrent impact. Massive crimes are planned, the announcement of an investigation could have deterrent impact. Interestingly not just in the area of the investigation but also in different countries around the world. We are collecting information about this.

Finally, in establishing and implementing its policies the Office has been and remains cognizant of the important role that *victims* play in the proceedings. At every stage of the judicial process, the Office will consult with the relevant victims and take their interests into account. The Office has also developed procedures to avoid unnecessary risks to witnesses and potential retraumatization.

### Objectives for the Coming Three Years

Based on the OTP's essential principles and utilizing its organizational structure, the Office has formulated *five strategic objectives* for the coming three years.

The first objective is to conduct four to six impartial investigations of those who bear the greatest responsibility in its current or new situations.

The second objective is to further improve the quality of the prosecution, aiming to complete two expeditious trials.

The third objective is to gain the necessary forms of cooperation for all situations to allow for effective investigations and to mobilize and facilitate successful arrest operations.

The fourth objective is to continuously improve the way in which the OTP interacts with victims and addresses their interests.

Finally, the fifth objective is to establish forms of cooperation with states and organizations to maximize the OTP's contribution to the fight against impunity and the prevention of crimes.

On the first OTP objective, we foresee that in the next three years a maximum of six investigations will be needed and that our current resources will be sufficient to carry them out.



With regard to the second OTP objective, the number of trials is difficult to foresee as it is dependant on the arrests and their sequence. The length of the proceedings depends on a number of factors, such as the defense's policy and the security for witnesses. The judges are in charge of the proceedings, however the OTP aims to complete two trials in the coming three years.

I would like to emphasize the third objective of gaining the forms of cooperation necessary to mobilize and facilitate successful arrest operations. While the Court does not have a mandate to "arrest" by itself, the experience gained so far demonstrates that the Office can and should deploy substantial efforts to gathering information on the whereabouts of suspects, galvanizing support and cooperation for arrest and surrender, and promoting coordination among national and international parties potentially involved in a successful arrest.

With regard to the fourth objective of continuously improving the way in which the Office interacts with victims and addresses their interests, the Office has the obligation to assess the interests of victims as part of its determination of the interests of justice under article 53 and rule 48. Furthermore, the Statute provides for a generous scheme of victims participation as a way of ensuring that their views and concerns are taken into account throughout the proceedings. For these reasons and in light of our past experience, it is clear that it is necessary to systematically seek the views of victims and local communities at an early stage, before an investigation is launched, and to continue to assess their interests on an ongoing basis. This systematic interaction will also allow for adequate outreach among local communities in order to enhance the understanding and impact of OTP activities.

Finally, with regard to the fifth objective of establishing forms of cooperation with states and organizations to maximize the OTP's contribution to the fight against impunity and the prevention of crimes, the Office is committed to fostering the type of international cooperation that will encourage and assist states to address impunity for large-scale serious crimes, in a comprehensive fashion.

## Conclusion

The Prosecutorial Strategy, based on the Office's experience over the last three years, will assist the Office in achieving its objectives, and thereby enhance the ability of the Court to reach its overall strategic objectives and goals. However, this cannot be accomplished without the assistance of states. The design of the ICC is that the Court assumes responsibility for the legal aspects, while states ensure that the suspects against whom warrants are issued are arrested. We are planning how to do our part better and we need to receive from you indications of how the international community can assist in executing the arrests warrants. Without your contribution to secure arrests we are unable to fulfill our mandate. Together we can strive to achieve the aims of the Rome Statute to prevent impunity for the perpetrators of the most serious crimes of concern to the international community and thereby contribute to the prevention of these crimes.

Thank you.

**Bruno Cathala, Registrar**

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen.

It is a pleasure for me to welcome you to the 3rd Diplomatic Briefing in Brussels, and the 7<sup>th</sup> to date, as part of the ongoing dialogue the Court wishes to engage in with the States Parties.

As you have had the opportunity to note in the addresses of the President and the Prosecutor, the Court has launched a number of strategic projects and is investing considerable time and energy in them because it believes that their success will be important at this stage of the Court's development. Accordingly, my remarks will focus this afternoon on the issues of the permanent premises and the outreach component of the Strategic Plan. I will also give you a general overview of the draft Programme Budget for 2007.

### *1. Permanent premises*

The Court would like the States Parties to take a decision on the future building. Either we continue to use the current premises, the « Arc », adapt the ICTY building, or build premises designed specifically for an international criminal court. The prevailing uncertainty in this area does not make our work easier. We would like to know where we are going.

The Court has submitted several reports to the Assembly of State Parties addressing several aspects of this matter.

Following a very detailed examination of the various options and their financial impact, the Court has stated its preference for premises built to its specifications. Several essential factors underlie this preference:

- The ability of the future premises to adapt to an evolving permanent institution, which will likely assume different shapes over the course of its history as staffing and geographic requirements change;
- Security requirements of the Court and its operations in The Netherlands;
- The customising and functionality of future premises that represent international criminal justice.

At its last session, the Assembly also emphasised that purpose-built premises “would probably offer the most flexible solution in matching the requirements of a permanent Court, in terms of size, functionality and security”.

Allow me to say a few words about the future building's size, something ordinarily linked to staff size. It must be emphasised that we don't need to have the final figures on the Court's future staffing at this time. An architectural competition could be held on the basis of an order of magnitude. In any event, it will be up to the States Parties to adjust and control the Court's staff size on a regular basis through the budgets it approves.

All these issues are discussed in an ongoing dialogue with The Hague Working Group.

While the decision-making process on the choice of permanent premises follows its course, whatever the outcome, the Court is considering, also at the request of the CBF, concrete measures to establish a framework of sound management for this matter. With the assistance of outside consultants, these measures will make it possible to establish the basis for internal governance mechanisms under the authority of the Registrar. The measures have been included in the draft programme budget for 2007, which I will now turn to.

## *2. Draft programme budget for 2007*

The President has just provided you with a detailed report on the current status of the Court's work.

We anticipate that in 2007 the Court will be dealing with one trial and four situations. Tackling four situations will require that the Court conduct investigations, ensure that the mechanisms to protect witnesses and the indispensable operational support structures are solidly in place, and engage in an ongoing dialogue with affected communities through an effective and reliable outreach programme.

To reach these assumptions, which were used to design the 2007 draft, the Court drew lessons from the experience of previous years. As a result, because there have been no new arrests to date, the Court has not budgeted for a second trial in 2007. However, if persons for whom warrants of arrest have been issued were to be apprehended, the Court would have recourse to the Contingency Fund, which would also be used if there are forensic missions in the field or on-site hearings.

This notwithstanding, the 2007 budget will be larger than the previous year's. The increase results from a number of factors, which I shall now explain briefly.

First, as the Court informed the Assembly during the session in November, the budget tends to increase, from what I will call natural growth, as a result of both the vacancy rate of posts calculated for the 2006 budget and inflation.

The costs relating to the judges' retirement plan, the interim premises, and the detention facility will also contribute to an increase in the 2007 budget.

The investigations will continue next year as well, the direct consequence being the development of systems to protect witnesses and appropriate security measures.

The 2007 budget expresses Court's respect for the solemn commitment it made at the request of the ASP to engage in an ongoing dialogue with the communities affected by a situation. In this regard, the ICC will further strengthen its outreach programme through systematic and sustainable implementation of the international court's outreach plan.

Allow me now to turn to that subject.

### *3. Making Justice Public*

The fact that the Court is located in The Hague, far from where the crimes being judged were perpetrated, imposes at least two requirements on the Court:

- Rendering justice that is both public and transparent, one of the essential conditions of a fair trial; and
- Engaging in a true dialogue and ongoing exchanges with, at a minimum, affected communities, their traditional representatives, the media and other local players. We are also aware of the need to gain better understanding of the feelings and opinions of these communities.

Ever since 2004, the Court has been committed to these outreach activities.

However, our experience in the field so far, criticism offered by our local partners, and the input you have provided on various occasions are all signs that we still have work to do.

It is with this in mind that we have devised our Strategic Outreach Plan, which is part of our more general objective, which the President elaborated on, to enhance the quality of justice at the ICC.

The Plan draws upon the experience of the Court in conducting outreach activities in the field, frequently summarised in various documents now being used by the Court. The Plan of course takes into account the invaluable experience of the international criminal tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. It was a pleasure for the Court to welcome Mrs Binta Mansaray, Outreach Coordinator for the Special Court for Sierra Leone, who has contributed her enormous experience and helped the ICC design its Plan. The role of players outside the Court, NGOs in particular, in conducting outreach activities in the situations where they are involved has also been considered.

The Plan incorporates factors influencing the Court's outreach activities, such as the context in which the ICC operates, the phases of proceedings (before, during and after the trial) and, in addition to the general population, target groups: traditional and local leaders, victims, media, NGOs, women, etc. Our approach to these different categories of people clearly must vary in accordance with their specific needs. Let us take, for example, the case of victims, who have been placed at the heart of the Court's work and who must be informed of the rights conferred upon them by the Statute. In many cases, they live in remote areas with no access to the press or other sources of information. They may be illiterate or very old. Consequently, special programmes must be developed for them.

The Plan will be supplemented by action plans tailored to each situation. In light of pre-defined objectives for each phase of the proceedings, these actions plans will determine the outreach activities and actual mechanisms and related costs.

I would like to illustrate what I mean, which may appear very theoretical, with a few concrete examples, which will highlight this need for adaptation.

In 2007 the Court should have begun the trial phase in the DRC situation. In that phase, outreach activities will ensure that people are informed locally of proceedings taking place in The Hague and

will also endeavour to meet the expectations of victims. Specific outreach tools, such as summaries of trials in video, audio and written format, press conferences, briefing, workshops, and seminars will be used to reach the public concerned.

Conversely, as the Court has issued warrants of arrest in the Uganda situation, it will be fully engaged in the investigation phase, and outreach activities will continue to help to explain the scope of the warrants to the public and make the Court's mission within the affected communities known. Preparatory work for the proceedings should also begin.

I would like to emphasise that the Plan is an evolving document. It will be reviewed and updated as new needs arise for the Court's work.

As soon as the Plan has been finalised, we will hold consultations with the States Parties in particular, in early July in The Hague.

Thank you for your attention.

**M. Renan Villacis, Director *ad interim* of the Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties**

Ladies and gentlemen,

The Secretariat wishes to take this opportunity to highlight a few points contained in the information package sent to you previously.

In terms of the forthcoming meetings of the Assembly, we recall that the fifth session of the Assembly will be held in The Hague from 23 November to 1 December 2006 and that the resumed session, will take place in New York from 29 to 31 January 2007. Relevant documentation, including the provisional agenda, will be posted on the Court's website as soon as it is available. Practical information for the session can also be found therein.

Furthermore, the Secretariat recalls that certain documents of limited distribution, such as internal documentation of the Committee on Budget and Finance, are available for States Parties on the Assembly's Extranet. A message on how to access this Assembly Extranet was sent to States Parties a few weeks ago.

The Committee on Budget and Finance shall hold its seventh session from 9 to 13 October 2006. The respective report should be available on 23 October.

As regards the Bureau, we note that it recently elected Mr. Arthur Napoleon Raymond Robinson (Trinidad and Tobago) to fill in the vacancy in the Board of Directors of the Trust Fund for Victims which corresponds to the seat allocated to the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States.

Furthermore, the Bureau fixed a 12 week nomination period, running from 5 June to 27 August 2006, for the second election of members of the Board of Directors of the Trust Fund for Victims, scheduled to take place during the fifth session of the Assembly.

In relation to the third inter-sessional meeting of the Special Working Group on the Crime of Aggression, which took place from 8-11 June 2006 at the Liechtenstein Institute on Self Determination at the Woodrow Wilson School of Princeton University, the Secretariat notes that an advance version of the respective report is also available at the Court's website. As indicated in that report, the Italian authorities are in the process of organizing a conference on international justice in Turin in the early part of October, during which it may be possible to have another inter-sessional meeting of the Special Working Group. Further developments on this matter would be conveyed to States by the organizers.

Finally, the Secretariat requests States to provide an update of their e-mail addresses.