

**Cour
Pénale
Internationale**



**International
Criminal
Court**

Original: English

No.: ICC-01/12-01/15

Date of original: 22 June 2020

Date: 16 May 2022

TRIAL CHAMBER VIII

Before:

**Judge Raul C. Pangalangan, Presiding Judge
Judge Antoine Kesia-Mbe Mindua
Judge Bertram Schmitt**

SITUATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF MALI

IN THE CASE OF *THE PROSECUTOR* v. *AHMAD AL FAQI AL MAHDI*

PUBLIC

**Public redacted version of Fifteenth update report on the updated
implementation plan, submitted on 22 June 2020, ICC-01/12-01/15- 366- Conf**

Source:

The Trust Fund for Victims

To be notified in accordance with regulation 31 of the *Regulations of the Court* to:

Office of the Prosecutor

Counsel for the Defence

Mr Mohamed Aouini

Legal Representatives of Victims

Legal Representatives of Applicants

Mr Mayombo Kassongo

Unrepresented Victims

**Unrepresented Applicants for
Participation/Reparation**

**Office of Public Counsel for
Victims**

Office of Public Counsel for the Defence

States' Representatives

REGISTRY

Registrar

Counsel Support Section

Mr Peter Lewis

Mr Esteban Peralta Losilla

Victims and Witnesses Section

Mr Nigel Verrill

**Victims Participation and Reparations
Section**

Other (Country Office)

Mr Nouhoum Sangaré

Mr Philipp Ambach

I. BACKGROUND

1. On 12 July 2018, Trial Chamber VIII (“Trial Chamber”) issued a decision on the draft implementation plan (“Decision on the DIP”) wherein it laid down the features of the organisation of the screening process for individual applications for reparations, set 4 March 2020 as the deadline for its completion,¹ and directed the Trust Fund for Victims (“Trust Fund”) to submit monthly update reports in relation to the Trust Fund’s progress during the reparations implementation stage of the present case.² On 4 March 2019, the Trial Chamber approved the Trust Fund updated implementation plan³ and agreed to the submission of such reports at a bimonthly basis (“Decision on the UIP”).⁴

2. On 15 August 2018, 14 September 2018, 15 October 2018, 14 November 2018, 14 December 2018, 14 January 2019, 14 February 2019, 6 May 2019, 2 July 2019, 4 September 2019, 25 October 2019, 27 December 2019, and 20 February 2020, the Trust Fund filed its first,⁵ second,⁶ third⁷, fourth⁸, fifth⁹, sixth,¹⁰ seventh,¹¹ eighth,¹² ninth,¹³ tenth,¹⁴ eleventh¹⁵, twelfth,¹⁶ thirteenth¹⁷ and fourteenth update¹⁸ reports, respectively.

¹ Public redacted version of “Decision on Trust Fund for Victims’ Draft Implementation Plan for Reparations”, 12 July 2018, [ICC-01/12-01/15-273-Red](#), paras 35-49.

² [Decision on the DIP](#), para. 22.

³ Updated Implementation Plan, ICC-01/12-01/15-291-Conf-Exp. A confidential redacted version was notified on 7 November 2018 (ICC-01/12-01/15-291-Conf-Red). A public redacted version was filed on 22 November 2018, *see* Public redacted version of “Updated Implementation Plan”, submitted on 2 November 2018, ICC-01/12-01/15-291-Conf-Exp”, [ICC-01/12-01/15-291-Red2](#); and Lesser public redacted version of “Updated Implementation Plan” submitted on 2 November 2018 ICC-01/12-01/15-291-Conf-Exp, 14 October 2019, [ICC-01/12-01/15-291-Red3](#)

⁴ Decision on the Updated Implementation Plan from the Trust Fund for Victims, 4 March 2019, ICC-01/12-01/15-324-Conf (“Decision on the UIP”) para. 104.

⁵ First monthly update report on the implementation plan, 15 August 2018, ICC-01/12-01/15-277-Conf (“First Monthly Report”).

⁶ Second Monthly update report on the implementation plan, 14 September 2018, ICC-01/12-01/15-283-Conf, with two confidential annexes (“Second Monthly Report”).

⁷ Third monthly update report on the updated implementation plan, 15 October 2018, ICC-01/12-01/15-288-Conf.

⁸ Fourth monthly update report on the updated implementation plan, 14 November 2018, ICC-01/12-01/15-299-Conf, with four confidential annexes (“Fourth Monthly Report”).

⁹ Fifth monthly update report on the updated implementation plan including information concerning further details relevant to the Board of Directors’ complement decision, with one confidential annex, 14 December 2018, ICC-01/12-01/15-305-Conf (“Fifth Monthly Report”).

¹⁰ Sixth monthly update report on the updated implementation plan, 14 January 2019, ICC-01/12-01/15-314-Conf.

¹¹ Seventh monthly update report on the updated implementation plan, 14 February 2019, ICC-01/12-01/15-321-Conf.

¹² Eighth update report on the updated implementation plan, 6 May 2019, ICC-01/12-01/15-321-Conf.

¹³ Ninth update report on the updated implementation plan, with one confidential, *ex parte* annex, available to the Trust Fund, 2 July 2019, ICC-01/12-01/15-332-Conf.

3. On 17 March 2020 and on 16 April 2020, the Trust Fund notified the LRV and the Defence of 12 positive decisions (“first batch”) and 79 negative decisions (“second batch”), respectively.
4. On 29 April 2020, the LRV submitted a request for review of all 79 negative decisions of the second batch.¹⁹ On 15 May 2020, the Trust Fund submitted its response.²⁰
5. On 18 May 2020, the Trust Fund notified the LRV and the Defence of 82 negative administrative decisions (“third batch”).²¹
6. On 2 June 2020, the LRV submitted a request for review of all 82 administrative decisions (“Second LRV Request”).²² On 4 June 2020, the Trust Fund submitted its response.²³
7. On 19 June 2020, the Trust Fund notified the LRV and the Defence of 75 negative decisions (“fourth batch”).²⁴

¹⁴ Tenth update report on the updated implementation plan, confidential *ex parte* available to the Legal Representative of Victims and the Registry, 4 September 2019, ICC-01/12-01/15-335-Conf-Exp.

¹⁵ Eleventh update report on the updated implementation plan, confidential *ex parte* available to the Legal Representative of Victims and the Registry, with one confidential, *ex parte* annex, available to the Legal Representative of Victims and the Registry, 25 October 2019, ICC-01/12-01/15-336-Conf-Exp.

¹⁶ Twelfth update report on the updated implementation plan, confidential *ex parte* available to the Legal Representative of Victims and the Registry, 27 December 2019, ICC-01/12-01/15-340-Conf-Exp.

¹⁷ Thirteenth update report on the updated implementation plan, confidential *ex parte* available to the Legal Representative of Victims and the Registry, 20 February 2020, ICC-01/12-01/15-346-Conf-Exp.

¹⁸ Fourteenth update report on the updated implementation plan and response to LRV Request ICC-01/12-01/15-356-Conf-Red, 22 April 2020, ICC-01/12-01/15-358-Conf-Exp, with four confidential *ex parte* annexes (“Fourteenth Update Report”).

¹⁹ *Demande de réexamen par la Chambre de la Décision du Fonds relative à l'éligibilité des victimes aux mesures de réparations*, ICC-01/12-01/15-360-Conf-Exp with Confidential Annex A (Confidential redacted version notified on 18 May 2020).

²⁰ Trust Fund for Victims’ response to the Legal Representative of Victims’ request for review of administrative decisions on victims’ eligibility, ICC-01/12-01/15-361-Conf with one confidential *ex parte* annex. On 22 May 2020, the LRV submitted a reply (*Observations du Représentant légal sur la Réponse du Fonds au profit des victimes contre le réexamen sollicité des demandes de réparations individuelles*, ICC-01/12-01/15-362-Conf with confidential *ex parte* annex). On the same day, by way of email, the Trust Fund informed the Trial Chamber that it does not intend to surreply.

²¹ The decisions and underlying materials have been notified as annexes to the Trust Fund for Victims’ response to the Legal Representative of Victims’ second request for review of administrative decisions on victims’ eligibility, ICC-01/12-01/15-364-Conf.

²² *Deuxième demande de réexamen par la Chambre des décisions administratives du Fonds au profit des victimes relatives à l'éligibilité des victimes aux mesures de réparations*, ICC-01/12-01/15-363-Conf with Annex A.

²³ Trust Fund for Victims’ response to the Legal Representative of Victims’ second request for review of administrative decisions on victims’ eligibility, ICC-01/12-01/15-364-Conf with three confidential *ex parte* annexes. On 5 June 2020, the LRV submitted a reply (*Observations du Représentant légal sur la « Trust Fund for Victims’ response to the Legal Representative of Victims’ second request for review of administrative decisions on victims’ eligibility »*). On 9 June 2020, by way of email, the Trust Fund informed the Trial Chamber that it does not intend to surreply.

II. CLASSIFICATION OF THE PRESENT SUBMISSION

8. Pursuant to regulation 23 *bis* (1) of the Regulations of the Court, the Trust Fund has classified this report as confidential for the reasons set out in the Trust Fund's previous update reports.²⁵ A public redacted version will be filed as soon as feasible.

III. UPDATE REPORT OF 22 JUNE 2020

9. The present report covers the period from 22 April 2020 until the date of this report.

10. The Trust Fund is pleased to report the progress made during the reporting period as developed below.

A. Preliminary remarks about the ongoing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the implementation of the reparation awards

11. As reported in the Fourteenth Update Report, in spite of mitigating measures put in place, the COVID-19 pandemic has an impact on the Trust Fund's operations in Mali. Since the submission of the Fourteenth Update Report, the travel restrictions have not been lifted, impeding the Trust Fund and the LRV from travelling.²⁶

12. Over the past months, the COVID-19 pandemic broke out in Timbuktu, affecting all communities, including the victim population. The Timbuktu Regional Health Direction reported as of 15 June 2020 a total of 377 positive cases in the health district of Timbuktu with 16 deaths.²⁷ The Trust Fund was made aware of the passing of four potential beneficiaries (whose application forms were jointly collected by the Trust Fund and the LRV) and has informed the LRV accordingly. [REDACTED]

13. On 26 May 2020, the Trust Fund, in agreement with the LRV,²⁸ decided to suspend the collection of applications in Timbuktu to respect the mourning period of the community and avoid spreading the virus. On 22 June 2020, in accordance with the

²⁴ See Annex 1 (decisions), Annex 2 (applications) and Annex 3 (VPRS recommendations).

²⁵ See First Monthly Report, para. 3; Second Monthly Report, para. 8.

²⁶ Joint Threat Assessment Group (JTAG) recommendations 04 June 2020.

²⁷ These data only encompass passing of individuals who were hospitalised and does not include those who passed away in their homes.

²⁸ Emails on 26 May 2020 at 14:07 and on 27 May 2020 at 10:48.

LRV,²⁹ the Trust Fund resumed the collection of applications at a slower pace, after having procured protection material to the intermediary and issued clear instructions in relation to the respect of sanitary rules.

14. Collection is currently ongoing only for potential victims proactively requesting to fill in the forms.

B. Individual reparations awards

15. During the reporting period the Trust Fund (i) completed the identification of potentially eligible victims and the collection of applications; (ii) issued all eligibility decisions for the third and fourth batches; and (iii) made progress on the issue of notification; and (iv) in the process of determining the modalities for the disbursement to eligible beneficiaries.

1. Identification of potential beneficiaries and collection of applications

16. The Trust Fund had reported some difficulties in identifying potential beneficiaries from the Sidi Yehia family (the last pool of beneficiaries yet to identify) as a result of the reluctance [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to associate with individual reparations.

17. After multiple efforts, notably several talks with [REDACTED] who expressed that [REDACTED] would not apply himself but would not obstruct anyone's attempt to seek individual reparations, the Trust Fund compiled a list of potential beneficiaries. Most of them are located in Timbuktu with a substantial pool in Bamako and a limited number of people in other locations.

18. Prior to the severe outbreak of COVID-19 in Mali, the Trust Fund had just started collection of these application forms and of forms from victims residing in other cities in Mali.

19. Yet, as reported above, on 26 May 2020,³⁰ after having sought and obtained the agreement of the LRV, the Trust Fund decided to interrupt the collection of applications via its intermediary in Timbuktu. This was so decided in order to on the one hand respect the mourning period that has affected a large part of Timbuktu and, on the other hand protect the intermediary (who would have otherwise encountered dozens of

²⁹ Email from Trust Fund on 19 June 2020 at 18:33 and response on 22 June 2020 at 11:10.

³⁰ Emails on 26 May 2020 at 14:07 and on 27 May 2020 at 10:48.

people) and avoid that he becomes a vector of COVID-19. Collection resumed on 19 June 2020.

20. Overall, during the reporting period, a number of application forms were collected by the intermediary, with the limitations related to COVID-19. These application forms will be channelled to the LRV shortly.

2. Transfer of the application forms from Bamako to The Hague

21. As previously reported, the Trust Fund and the LRV jointly collected around 570 applications in Bamako and Timbuktu from January to March 2020. [REDACTED]

22. [REDACTED]

3. Administrative decisions

23. During the reporting period, 157 decisions were issued by the Trust Fund corresponding to the third batch of 82 applications, and the fourth batch of 75 applications.

Third Batch (82 applications)

24. On 1 May 2020, VPRS transmitted negative final recommendations in relation to the 82 applications composing the third batch. The LRV did not make any observation within the 15-day deadline set forth in the Decision on the DIP. On 18 May 2020, the Trust Fund issued 82 negative eligibility decisions. All 82 administrative decisions from the third batch have been notified to the Trial Chamber by way of the Trust Fund Response to the LRV Second Request for Review. This batch gave rise to the issuance of five types of decisions.

25. Category A decisions, 20 in total,³¹ are those where the applicant did not claim any sort of descendancy or ancestral link to the saint of any of the Protected Building, but there was an *attestation de filiation* signed by a figure of authority claiming direct

³¹ Decisions corresponding to numbers 23, 26, 28, 30, 32, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 45, 49, 50, 52, 61 – 65 and 71.

descendancy. The Trust Fund rejected these applications on two grounds: the applicant did not claim, not even remotely, to belong to the category of victims eligible to receive individual reparations, and the standard of probabilities for reparation purposes has not been met because the person of authority used by the LRV for this attestation cannot be relied upon to authenticate whether the applicant is a descendant.³²

26. Category B decisions, corresponding to 41 dossiers,³³ are those where the applicants made some reference – even if vaguely – to an ancestral connection to the saint of a Protected Building and the LRV submitted an *attestation de filiation* in support of the direct descendancy of the applicant. The Trust Fund rejected these applications on the ground that the standard of probabilities for reparation purposes has not been met because the person used by the LRV for this attestation cannot be relied upon to authenticate whether the applicant is a descendant.³⁴

27. Category C decisions, eight in total,³⁵ are those where the applicants did not claim any sort of descendancy or ancestral link to the saint of any Protected Building, and the LRV did not put forward any *attestation* whatsoever in support of the applications. In fact, it was unclear to the Trust Fund on what grounds, moral or economic, this form had been submitted for consideration. The Trust Fund would like to further note with concern that four applications corresponding to this category³⁶ do not even contain information or documentation from after August 2017. The Trust Fund notes that this information predates the issuance of the Reparations Order and that the LRV did not react to VPRS' negative Preliminary Assessment.

28. Category D decisions, corresponding to four decisions,³⁷ are those where the applicants did claim some sort of descendancy or ancestral link – even if vaguely – and where the LRV put forward an *attestation de lien de parenté* signed by two different individuals whom the LRV presents as figures of authorities. These applications have

³² See also Trust Fund for Victims' response to the Legal Representative of Victims' request for review of administrative decisions on victims' eligibility, 15 May 2020, ICC-01/12-01/15-361-Conf-Exp (Confidential redacted version notified on 18 May 2020) detailing in more details Trust Fund's decisions following a similar reasoning.

³³ Decisions corresponding to numbers 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 31, 33, 34, 37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46-48, 51, 53-60, 66-70 and 72-82.

³⁴ See also Trust Fund for Victims' response to the Legal Representative of Victims' request for review of administrative decisions on victims' eligibility, 15 May 2020, ICC-01/12-01/15-361-Conf-Exp (Confidential redacted version notified on 18 May 2020) detailing in more details Trust Fund's decisions following a similar reasoning.

³⁵ See decisions 1-4, 6, 14-16.

³⁶ See decisions 1, 4, 5 and 16.

³⁷ See decisions 8, 9, 12 and 13.

been rejected on the grounds that there is no *attestation de filiation* in support of their applications and that the *attestations de lien de parenté* were signed by an alleged authority who did not established his identity (*i.e.* there is no ID attached), let alone his capacity to act as an authority and the details of this authority have never been submitted to the Trust Fund for its assessment.³⁸ The Trust Fund notes with concern that two of these applications do not contain any additional document or information that is older than March 2017.³⁹

29. The last group of decisions are “individual” cases corresponding to nine applications,⁴⁰ which did not fit into any of the foregoing categories because of their particular features and required tailored-made decisions. For example, one application form was signed in 2016 and supported with additional information provided by the applicant in 2017, an *attestation de lien de parenté* signed by an authority who did not disclose his name – let alone his ID – and who claimed that the applicant was born in Timbuktu, whereas her ID card showed Bamako as the place of birth.⁴¹ This application also contained a residence certificate signed by [REDACTED]”, without specifying his name, ID or [REDACTED] and another residence certificate, this time signed by a figure of authority, which failed to specify where the applicant resides. While many of these documents would nevertheless be immaterial to the legal assessment apposite for individual compensation in the present case, the Trust Fund read this and other applications with raising concern caused by the lack of supporting and adequate documentation presented as part of the applications.

30. It is remarkable that a total of 30 applicants do not claim – not even faintly – to bear any ancestral link with any saint.⁴² Of those who do, the LRV has presented – in the best of cases – an *attestation de filiation* signed by someone of who he is on notice will not be accepted as a valid authority for the purposes of signing these attestations. None of the 82 applications contain documents older than June 2019.

³⁸ See also Trust Fund for Victims’ response to the Legal Representative of Victims’ request for review of administrative decisions on victims’ eligibility, 15 May 2020, ICC-01/12-01/15-361-Conf-Exp (Confidential redacted version notified on 18 May 2020) detailing in more details Trust Fund’s decisions following a similar reasoning.

³⁹ See decisions 8 and 13.

⁴⁰ See decisions 5, 7, 10, 11, 17-20 and 29.

⁴¹ Corresponding to applicant a/35098/16 and decision n. 17.

⁴² These correspond to decisions 1-7, 14-16, 19, 23, 26, 30, 32, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 45, 49, 50, 52, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65 and 71.

Fourth Batch (75 applications)

31. On 5 May 2020, VPRS transmitted negative Preliminary Recommendations in relation to the 75 applications composing the fourth batch. The LRV did not make any observation within the 15-day deadline set forth in the Decision on the DIP. On 3 June 2020, the VPRS transmitted 79 negative Final Recommendations to the Trust Fund.

32. On 19 June 2020, the Trust Fund notified the LRV and the Defence of its administrative decisions in this regard. All 75 decisions are appended in Annex 1, as per the Decision on the DIP.⁴³

33. This batch gave rise to five types of decisions.

34. Category A decisions, 25 in total,⁴⁴ are those where the applicants did not claim any sort of descendancy or ancestral link to the saint of any Protected Building, and where the LRV did not put forward any *attestation* in support of the applications. In fact, it was unclear to the Trust Fund on what grounds, moral or economic, this form had been submitted for consideration. The Trust Fund stresses that 21 applications corresponding to this category⁴⁵ do not contain information or documentation that is older than August 2017, and accordingly predates the issuance of the Reparations Order.

35. Category B decisions, corresponding to 35 decisions,⁴⁶ are those where the applicants claimed some sort of descendancy or ancestral link – even if vaguely – and where the LRV put forward an *attestation de lien de parenté* signed by a number of different individuals that the LRV presents as authorities. These applications have been rejected on the ground that there is no *attestation de filiation* in support of their applications and that the *attestations de lien de parenté* produced are insufficient to prove direct descendancy. They were signed by a person used as an authority whose identity the Trust Fund could not establish (*i.e.* there is no ID attached) and has never been informed of at any time before. Furthermore, the Trust Fund has not been informed of the reasons for his capacity to act as an authority or of any materials in

⁴³ Decision on the DIP, para. 46. *See also*, Trial Chamber VIII Direction in Relation to Joint Inquiry from VPRS and TFV, sent by way of email on 14 January 2020 at 1:26pm in which the Trial Chamber specified the minimum requirements for the notification: “By ‘all relevant materials’, the Chamber considers this to mean at least those materials specified in the DIP Decision procedure, (*i.e.* from the VPRS Preliminary Assessment to the TFV’s decision [...]).” Annex 2 contains the application forms and annex 3 the VPRS assessments.

⁴⁴ See decisions 1, 3, 8, 9, 10-13, 23, 25, 30, 31, 43, 49, 50-59, 72, 73.

⁴⁵ All of them except 43, 49, 51 and 57.

⁴⁶ See decisions (4th Batch) 7, 17-21, 24, 26-29, 33-42, 44-48, 63-69 and 71.

support of such a claim.⁴⁷ The Trust Fund stresses that 25 of these applications do not contain any additional document or information that is older than March 2017, that is, from prior the issuance of the Reparations Order.⁴⁸

36. Category C decisions, seven decisions in total,⁴⁹ are those where the applicants claimed – even if vaguely – to bear some ancestral connection to the main Saint buried in the Protected Building, but where the LRV did not provide any *attestation* in support of such link. The Trust Fund stresses that five applications corresponding to this category⁵⁰ do not contain information or documentation that is older than August 2017, that is, from before the Reparations Order.

37. Category D decisions, three in total,⁵¹ concern applicants who refer in their application to some degree of economic dependence from the Protected Buildings. The LRV, however, did not provide the required *attestation d'activité et revenus*. The Trust Fund stresses that two of these applications do not contain any document postdating the issuance of the Reparations Order.⁵²

38. Category “individuals” correspond to five applications⁵³ that required an individualised approach. Four of them do not contain documentation postdating the issuance of the Reparations Order.⁵⁴

4. Notification

39. As reported in the Fourteenth Update Report, the Trust Fund had liaised with the LRV on 17, 24 March and 14 April 2020 on the issue of notification of final decisions.⁵⁵ After a further communication sent on 9 June 2020, the LRV agreed with the methodology proposed by the Trust Fund. The 12 final positive eligibility decisions will be notified jointly by way of a phone call conveying a message jointly agreed upon by

⁴⁷ See also Trust Fund for Victims' response to the Legal Representative of Victims' request for review of administrative decisions on victims' eligibility, 15 May 2020, ICC-01/12-01/15-361-Conf-Exp (Confidential redacted version notified on 18 May 2020) detailing in more details Trust Fund's decisions following a similar reasoning.

⁴⁸ See decisions (4th Batch) 7, 19, 21, 27, 28, 35, 37-39, 41, 42, 46, 47, 61, 63-69, 71.

⁴⁹ See decisions (4th Batch) 2, 14, 22, 23, 60, 70 and 75.

⁵⁰ See decisions (4th Batch) 22, 23, 60, 70 and 75.

⁵¹ See decisions (4th Batch) 4, 6 and 74.

⁵² See decisions (4th Batch) 4 and 6.

⁵³ See decisions (4th Batch) 4, 15-16, 61-62.

⁵⁴ All but number 61.

⁵⁵ Emails sent on 17 March 2020 at 16:47 on 24 March 2020 at 00:23 and on 14 April 2020 at 18:10.

46. Pending the outcome of the procurement process, and without prejudice to the recommendation of the PRC the Trust Fund is preparing draft contracts with the input of the Registry Legal Office. [REDACTED]

C. Collective reparations

47. In respect of collective reparations, the Trust Fund has been able to make progress in the selection of implementing partners for the reparations of (i) the physical damages caused to the Protected Buildings (UNESCO); (ii) the economic (CIDEAL) and moral harm ([REDACTED]).

1. Finalisation of the selection of UNESCO as implementing partner for the rehabilitation and maintenance of the Protected Buildings

48. As reported in the Fourteenth Update Report, after the submission by UNESCO of a revised proposal [REDACTED], the Trust Fund's technical review committee recommended the approval of the proposal.⁵⁸

49. [REDACTED].

50. [REDACTED].

51. Pending the outcome of the procurement process, and without prejudice to the recommendation of the PRC, the Trust Fund is preparing draft contracts with the input of the Registry Legal Office.

2. Finalisation of the selection of the implementing partners for Economic Resilience Facility and reparations for moral harm

52. As reported in the Fourteenth Update Report, the Trust Fund had completed the technical review of the proposals received in respect of both moral and economic

⁵⁸ Fourteenth Update Report, paras 51-56.

reparations⁵⁹ and recommended contracting with an international non-governmental organisation (CIDEAL) in partnership with a Malian local organisation based in Timbuktu for the implementation of the collective reparations for economic harm and with a Malian non-governmental organisation based in Timbuktu with ability to deploy in Bamako ([REDACTED]) for the implementation of the collective reparations for moral harm.

53. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

54. Pending the outcome of the procurement process, and without prejudice to the recommendation of the PRC, the Trust Fund is preparing draft contracts with the input of the Registry Legal Office.

D. Symbolic reparations

55. The Trust Fund will resume coordination with the Malian authorities on the organisation of the ceremony on the symbolic award as soon as restrictions are lifted in Mali and that conditions are such that they permit holding such a ceremony.

E. Human Resources and Fundraising

56. As to the human resources available, all staff members of the Mali team are continuing to work remotely as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The recruitment of an Associate Programme Officer based in Bamako is ongoing but has been slowed down by difficulties arising from COVID-19 in relation to ICC recruitment processes.

57. As to the fundraising efforts, the Trust Fund wishes to report that it keeps on deploying efforts to secure additional funding. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. Additionally, on 19 June 2020, the Trust Fund submitted a consolidated funding request to the Canadian authorities addressing

⁵⁹ Fourteenth Update Report, paras 57-59.

the feedbacks previously received. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED].

CONCLUSION

58. The Trust Fund respectfully requests the Trial Chamber to take note of the present report. The Trust Fund stands ready to provide clarification on any information provided in the present submission or on any other issue affecting the implementation phase of reparations in the present case.



Pieter W.I. de Baan
Executive Director of the Trust Fund for Victims,
on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Trust Fund for Victims

Dated this 22 June 2020
At The Hague, The Netherlands