



**Third Court's report on the development of performance indicators for the
International Criminal Court**

15 November 2017

Table of contents

I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. THE 2016 REPORT	2
III. WORK UNDERTAKEN SINCE THE 2016 REPORT	2
A. PANEL DISCUSSION ON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS HELD DURING THE FIFTEENTH SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY, 22 NOVEMBER 2016	2
B. PRESENTATION TO STATES PARTIES ON EXAMPLES OF PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RELATED TO MANAGEMENT, 6 JULY 2017	3
C. BRIEFING OF STATES PARTIES ON THE THIRD REPORT, 17 OCTOBER 2017	3
IV. METHODOLOGY AND GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS	3
V. FIRST GOAL: THE COURT’S PROCEEDINGS ARE EXPEDITIOUS, FAIR AND TRANSPARENT AT EVERY STAGE	3
A. THE EXPEDITIOUSNESS AND FAIRNESS OF PROCEEDINGS	3
B. TRANSPARENCY OF PROCEEDINGS	6
VI. SECOND GOAL: THE COURT’S LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT ARE EFFECTIVE	6
VII. THIRD GOAL: THE COURT ENSURES ADEQUATE SECURITY FOR ITS WORK, INCLUDING PROTECTION OF THOSE AT RISK FROM INVOLVEMENT WITH THE COURT	7
VIII. FOURTH GOAL: VICTIMS HAVE ACCESS TO THE COURT.....	7
IX. NEXT STEPS	7
Annex I	9
Annex II	30
Annex III	45
Annex IV	51

I. Introduction

1. This third report on the development of performance indicators for the International Criminal Court (“Third Report”) is a follow-up to the first and second reports issued by the Court in November 2015 (“2015 Report”)¹ and November 2016 (“2016 Report”),² respectively. It is part of a continuing effort to improve the efficiency of the International Criminal Court (“Court” or “ICC”) and to respond to the request made in 2014 by the Assembly of States Parties (“Assembly”) to the Court to “[...] intensify its efforts to develop qualitative and quantitative indicators that would allow the Court to demonstrate better its achievements and needs, as well as allowing States Parties to assess the Court’s performance in a more strategic manner”.³

2. As announced by the President of the Court, Judge Silvia Fernández de Gurmendi, when introducing the 2016 Report,⁴ the Court’s work on performance indicators in 2017 has focused on the collection of data for the previously selected indicators. Indicators remain essentially the same with a few technical adjustments. The Third Report provides, for each of the four key goals identified in the 2015 and 2016 Reports – namely, (i) the Court’s proceedings are expeditious, fair and transparent at every stage; (ii) the Court’s leadership and management are effective; (iii) the Court ensures adequate security for its work, including protection of those at risk from involvement with the Court; and (iv) victims have access to the Court – charts with detailed data and accompanying narrative. The presentation of data is in the process of consolidation. Moving forward, future Court’s reports on performance indicators will be focussing on the provision of data geared towards illustrating the Court’s performance over time. In other words, the comparative value of certain data collected today will increase with each evaluation cycle ahead. The further development of organ-specific indicators by the Office of the Prosecutor and the Registry remains under consideration.

3. In the Third Report, the four key goals identified in the previous reports are kept unchanged. The selected indicators, as described in the 2016 Report, have been adjusted further after internal consultations and taking into consideration the observations made by States Parties and civil society following the submission of the 2016 Report.

II. The 2016 Report

4. On the basis of the input obtained from the principals and judges of the Court, as well as from relevant sections of the Court’s organs, both Offices of Public Counsel, representatives of victims and the defence, the Trust Fund for Victims and civil society,⁵ the 2016 Report identified in detail potential measurable factors or criteria that are relevant to assess the achievement of each of the four key goals identified in the 2015 Report – namely, (i) the Court’s proceedings are expeditious, fair and transparent at every stage; (ii) the Court’s leadership and managements are effective; (iii) the Court ensures adequate security for its work, including protection of those at risk from involvement with the Court; and (iv) victims have access to the Court. For each of these goals, the 2016 Report attached an initial and preliminary set of data that was readily available and could be swiftly assembled for each one of the four key goals. The Court undertook to continue in 2017 to collect and assemble relevant data on the selected criteria.

III. Work undertaken since the 2016 Report

5. A number of follow-up initiatives and contacts took place in 2016-2017 to keep States Parties and all other interested external actors apprised of the performance indicators exercise.

A. Panel discussion on performance indicators held during the fifteenth session of the Assembly, 22 November 2016

6. A panel discussion chaired by the ambassadors of Chile and Japan, co-chairs of the Study Group on Governance, was held at the eighth meeting of the Assembly’s fifteenth session, on 22 November 2016.⁶ On this occasion, the President of the Court Judge Silvia Fernández de Gurmendi introduced the 2016 Report, followed

¹ Available at: https://www.icc-cpi.int/itemsDocuments/Court_report-development_of_performance_indicators-ENG.pdf.

² Available at: https://asp.icc-cpi.int/iccdocs/asp_docs/ASP15/ICC-ASP15-SGG-PD-Second-Court-Report-ENG.pdf.

³ ICC-ASP/13/Res.5, 17 December 2014, Annex I, para. 7(b).

⁴ “Presentation of the Court’s Second Report on Performance Indicators for the International Criminal Court”, delivered by President Judge Silvia Fernández de Gurmendi on 22 November 2016, available at: https://asp.icc-cpi.int/iccdocs/asp_docs/ASP15/ICC-ASP15-SGG-PD-PANEL-President-ENG.pdf.

⁵ 2016 Report, paragraphs 9-16.

⁶ https://asp.icc-cpi.int/iccdocs/asp_docs/ASP15/ICC-ASP15-SGG-PD-Summary-ENG.pdf.

by presentations from co-panellists Mr Nicolas Guillou (Chef de cabinet to the President, Special Tribunal for Lebanon), Mr Jim Goldston (Executive Director, Open Society Justice Initiative) and Ambassador Eduardo Rodríguez Veltzé (Ambassador of the Plurinational State of Bolivia to the Kingdom of The Netherlands). Mr Guillou shared the experience gained by the Special Tribunal for Lebanon in the development of performance indicators in the context of international criminal proceedings. Mr Goldston spoke to the vital importance of performance indicators as a means of diagnosis and strategic dialogue with external actors. Ambassador Rodríguez Veltzé concluded by stressing the difficulty to combine the development of performance indicators with the judicial nature of the Court.

7. In the ensuing interactive segment with States Parties and civil society, delegations welcomed the 2016 Report and recognized the progress made by the Court. Some delegations made suggestions to improve the presentation of data, which have been taken into consideration in the present report, as further explained below.

B. Presentation to States Parties on examples of practical application of performance indicators related to management, 6 July 2017

8. On 6 July 2017, as part of Cluster II of The Hague Working Group's Study Group on Governance, staff members of the Registry and of the Office of the Prosecutor participated in informal consultations with States Parties focussed on practical applications of performance indicators related to management. Staff members of the Registry's Human Resources Section, Information Management Services Section and Victims and Witness Section provided the attendees with concrete examples of how performance indicators have helped streamlining management in their respective sections. The Office of the Prosecutor's presentation outlined how it uses the Office's performance indicators as an internal management instrument. Following presentations, questions were taken from representatives of States Parties.

C. Briefing of States Parties on the Third Report, 17 October 2017

9. Further informal consultations were held on 17 October 2017 at the behest of the co-focal points for Cluster II of The Hague Working Group's Study Group on Governance. On this occasion, a staff member of the Presidency briefed the attendees on the work undertaken during the year, the expected contents of the Third Report and the next steps. Staff members of the Registry and of the Office of the Prosecutor as well as the Legal Adviser to the Trial Division were also present to answer technical questions. It was conveyed that the Third Report would be communicated to States Parties in advance of the Assembly's sixteenth session.

IV. Methodology and general considerations

10. The 2016 Report outlined a number of methodological and general considerations which guided the selection of performance indicators.⁷ As said, 2017 has been focused on assembling data for previously defined indicators, which remain essentially the same with a few adjustments.

11. Given that most of the indicators relate to activities performed or assisted by the Registry, leadership in populating the charts with the relevant data has been assumed by the Registry. Great efforts have been deployed in the Registry to increase the sense of ownership over data collection amongst the relevant organs' sections and units as well as an awareness of the importance to keep track and systematise such data. The exercise is being integrated into the sections and units' practice, which will ease the process in the coming years.

12. The following sections summarize the adjustments made to the selected performance indicators.

V. FIRST GOAL: The Court's proceedings are expeditious, fair and transparent at every stage⁸

A. The expeditiousness and fairness of proceedings

13. The 2016 Report identified a number of indicators seeking to measure both expeditiousness and fairness taken together during seven pre-defined key phases:⁹

⁷ 2016 Report, paragraphs 17-27.

⁸ Relevant data is provided in **Annex I**.

⁹ 2016 Report, paragraph 38. The descriptive language has been slightly modified.

- (a) Phase 1 – **Confirmation**: between first appearance and the decision on the confirmation of charges;¹⁰
- (b) Phase 2 – **Trial preparation**: between the decision on the confirmation of charges and the first day of the opening statements;
- (c) Phase 3 – **Trial**: between the first day of the opening statements and the last day of the closing submissions;
- (d) Phase 4 – **Trial deliberations**: between the last day of the closing submissions and the issuance of the judgement on conviction, pursuant to article 74 of the Rome Statute;
- (e) Phase 5 – **Sentencing** (where applicable): between the issuance of the judgement on conviction pursuant to article 74 of the Rome Statute and the issuance of the sentencing decision pursuant to article 76 of the Rome Statute;
- (f) Phase 6 – **Reparations** (where applicable): between the issuance of the judgement on conviction and the implementation of a reparations award, or the approval of an implementation plan, as appropriate, pursuant to article 75 of the Rome Statute;
- (g) Phase 7 – **Final appeals of judgements against conviction and/or sentencing decisions** (where applicable): between the submission of the first notice of appeal and the issuance of the appeals judgement pursuant to article 81 of the Rome Statute.¹¹

14. The above-described phases are those phases which generate the most workload for Chambers, parties and participants and the Registry, but are not exclusive. For instance, prior to phase 1 (confirmation), a number of judicial activities take place, such as the request for issuance of an arrest warrant / summon to appear and the decision thereon. It must also be noted that some of the selected phases may overlap in time. By way of example, the reparations and appeals phases, where applicable, will proceed simultaneously.

15. The indicators outlined in the 2016 Report remain substantially the same, subject to minor adjustments highlighted below. The major improvement to the present report, as was suggested by States Parties, is the display of cases side by side. Indicators have also been re-ordered, so that workload and complexity-related indicators are placed first and duration indicators, which flow from the former, are placed at the end. Data for phases that were ongoing last year have been updated. Figures thus represent the activities of the entire phases as of 30 September 2017.

16. It is recalled that indicators are to be taken and understood in context. Values on their own cannot account for the reality or complexity of a case. For instance, the number of grounds of appeal is based on the manner in which the parties present them and may not necessarily reflect the complexity or otherwise of final appeals. In the appeals currently pending before the Appeals Chamber, the parties have raised different numbers of grounds of appeal. Even a small number of grounds may involve a multiplicity of complex issues that could be considered sub-grounds within a ground. The same holds true in respect of number of charges brought against an accused – a high number of charges does not necessarily mean that a trial is inherently more complex; conversely, a limited number of charges is not necessarily indicative of a simple trial. Yet, the selected indicators, when taken in context, provide a relevant insight into the life of the cases before the Court.

17. Last year, it was decided that data would only be collected for those cases which were ongoing at the time, namely: *The Prosecutor v. Dominic Ongwen*, *The Prosecutor v. Bosco Ntaganda*, *The Prosecutor v. Laurent Gbagbo & Charles Blé Goudé*, *The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo*, *Aimé Kilolo Musamba, Jean-Jacques Mangenda Kabongo, Fidèle Babala Wandu & Narcisse Arido*, and *The Prosecutor v. Ahmad Al-Faqi Al Mahdi*. It was also decided that the previous cases where a judgement on conviction had been rendered (*The Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo*, *The Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga*, and *The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo*) would be object of measurement only in relation to the phases that were ongoing at the time of the 2016 Report. This selection was dictated by the fact that data was not readily available for certain indicators that were identified after they concluded.¹² A similar approach has been taken this year. Additionally, a compilation of the duration of the phases of these previous cases is now appended.

¹⁰ It must be noted that the pre-trial chamber remains seized of the case beyond the decision on the confirmation of charges, until the Presidency constitutes a trial chamber and assigns the case to it, pursuant to article 61(11) of the Rome Statute and rule 130 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.

¹¹ The starting date for this phase has been changed to the submission of the notice of appeal, pursuant to regulation 57 of the Regulations of the Court, to account for the workload generated prior to the completion of the appeals briefing. As they are usually dealt with concurrently, appeals against conviction and appeals against sentence, if any, are considered together for the purposes of the present exercise. Adjudication of appeals against reparations orders is considered as part of the reparations phase (phase 6).

¹² 2016 Report, page 20.

18. Over the reporting period, some cases have progressed from a phase to the next one. Since the 2016 Report, the trial phase (phase 3) has commenced in the *Ongwen* case, thereby concluding the trial preparation phase (phase 2). The sentencing phase (phase 5) concluded in the *Bemba et al.* case, which is now at the final appeals stage (phase 7). The trial phase (phase 3) is still ongoing in the *Ntaganda* and *Gbagbo & Blé Goudé* cases. Reparations (phase 6) are still being considered and implemented in the *Lubanga, Katanga, Bemba and Al Mahdi* cases. More detailed narratives are provided below.

New indicators and adjustments to already existing indicators

19. In addition to consistency adjustments, some of the selected indicators measuring fairness and expeditiousness of cases have been adjusted¹³ and a number of new indicators have been developed, in particular:

- (a) The **number of pages contained in the annexes** and data for **motions submitted by ones other than the parties and participating victims** are new indicators developed this year for all relevant phases. However, data for these indicators could not be readily retrieved for completed phases or portions of phases that were ongoing at the time of the 2016 Report and has therefore been collected only as from November 2016.
- (b) To better reflect the increasing reliance on electronic communications in the conduct of judicial proceedings, an indicator for **decisions and orders communicated by email** has been added for all relevant phases.¹⁴ As Chambers also deliver **decisions and orders orally**, a new indicator measures the number of any such decisions and orders for all relevant phases. In order to better illustrate the use of hearing days, days actually used are compared with **scheduled days**.¹⁵ For the same reasons as above, data for these indicators has been collected as from November 2016.
- (c) Concerning evidence at trial, the terminology used for the relevant indicator has been changed to **“evidence submitted”** to better reflect the different approaches followed by Chambers in relation to evidence – ranging from recognizing items of evidence as formally submitted to deciding on the admission of any such items.
- (d) The involvement of victims in the Court’s proceedings starts well before the reparations phase and generates corresponding workload during prior phases. To account for this reality, indicators on **participating victims** are now included for all relevant phases, where applicable.

20. With respect to Registry services that contribute to the expeditiousness of proceedings, irrespective of the phases (transcript provision, interpretation, translation and witness-related services),¹⁶ the indicators remain the same, with data having been updated for 2016 as of 31 December 2016 and aggregated for 2017 as of 30 September 2017.

Update on the selected cases

21. In order to assist the reading of the relevant charts, a brief update on the status of the ongoing cases is provided.

22. ***The Prosecutor v. Dominic Ongwen.*** Mr Dominic Ongwen is charged with war crimes and crimes against humanity which were allegedly committed in the context of a conflict between the Lord’s Resistance Army and the national authorities in Uganda since July 2002. Trial has commenced in December 2016, with the Prosecution’s presentation of evidence being currently ongoing.

23. ***The Prosecutor v. Bosco Ntaganda.*** Mr Bosco Ntaganda is charged with 13 counts of war crimes and 5 counts of crimes against humanity allegedly committed in Ituri (eastern Republic Democratic of the Congo) in 2002-2003. The trial is currently ongoing with the Defence’s presentation of evidence. Further to Mr Ntaganda’s testimony (which took place on 33 days between June and September 2017), the Defence indicated that there would be ‘drastic cuts’ in the number of witnesses it intends to call.

24. ***The Prosecutor v. Laurent Gbagbo & Charles Blé Goudé.*** Mr Laurent Gbagbo and Mr Charles Blé Goudé are charged with four counts (each covering a series of incidents) of crimes against humanity committed during the 2010-2011 post-election violence in Côte-d’Ivoire. The trial is currently ongoing. Since 7 June 2017, the Presiding Judge issued a number of decisions outlining the schedule and order of appearance of witnesses still to be called by the Prosecution.

¹³ For example, the indicator “Preparation time of the parties” in relation to phase 2 – “Trial preparation” is no longer used as it was considered to be duplicative.

¹⁴ In some of the cases, the Registry periodically files email decisions on the case record.

¹⁵ Discrepancies are mainly explained by witness examinations finishing sooner than anticipated.

¹⁶ 2016 Report, paragraph 40.

25. *The Prosecutor v. Ahmad Al Faqi Al Mahdi*. Mr Ahmad Al Faqi Al Mahdi was found guilty of intentionally directing attacks against cultural property in Timbuktu, Mali, between about 30 June 2012 and 10 July 2012. He was sentenced to nine years of imprisonment. His trial took place on 22-24 August 2016, during which he made an admission of guilty. On 17 August 2017, the trial chamber issued the reparations order, ordering a combination of individual and collective reparations and setting Mr Al Mahdi's liability at 2,7 million euros. The legal representative of victims has appealed this order, which is currently being considered by the Appeals Chamber.

26. *The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo, Aimé Kilolo Musamba, Jean-Jacques Mangenda Kabongo, Fidèle Babala Wandu and Narcisse Arido*. The accused were charged with offences against the administration of justice in connection with defence witnesses' testimonies in the case of *The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo*, in the situation in the Central African Republic. The offences were allegedly committed between 2011 and 2013 in various locations. The charges were partially confirmed on 11 November 2014 and the trial took place between September 2015 and June 2016. All five accused were convicted on 19 October 2016. Sentences were handed down on 22 March 2017.

B. Transparency of proceedings

27. The two indicators selected to reflect public transparency (percentage of judicial decisions that are public vs. confidential; and overall percentage of courtroom time spent in public hearings vs. confidential or closed sessions) are kept unchanged. As indicated in the 2016 Report, data related to the duration of hearings in public session vs. private/closed session has been collected for 2017.

28. With respect to accessibility of ICC-related information, data collection has continued this year to populate the relevant charts with more values in order to increase the comparison purposes.

VI. SECOND GOAL: The Court's leadership and management are effective¹⁷

29. As regards the Court's leadership and management, the 2016 Report selected internal indicators which were not fully captured by already existing reporting obligations or which were scattered over different reports to stakeholders.¹⁸ These performance indicators focus on three main areas: (i) budget implementation; (ii) procurement; and (iii) human resources issues of a Court-wide significance. Data for 2016 has been updated as of 31 December 2016 and values for 2017 are as of 30 September 2017.

30. A comparative value begins to emerge from the data collected. Improvement in performance can be seen in relation to *inter alia*: (i) budget implementation (from 96,7% in 2014 to 97,6% in 2016); (ii) completion of performance appraisals (from 64% at the Court-wide level for the 2014/2015 cycle to 91% for the 2016/2017 cycle); and (iii) geographical distribution of staff (diminution of the number of underrepresented and non-represented States Parties between 2016 and 2017).

31. In relation to geographical distribution of staff, the number of States Parties which are represented has steadily increased from 61 in 2014 to 63 in 2015, to 64 in 2016 and to 67 in 2017, pointing to gradual and continuous improvement in the area of representation of States Parties.

32. Furthermore, even for those States Parties still under-represented, there has been an increase in their representation. For instance, between end 2015 and end September 2017, the representation of the following underrepresented countries has increased: Japan (from 4 to 7), Germany, (from 11 to 14), Poland (from 1 to 4), Mexico (from 3 to 5), Sweden (from 1 to 3), Brazil (from 1 to 2), and Korea (from 0 to 1).

33. The Court recognises that this progress has to be continued. The Court has thus intensified its efforts during the reporting period to ensure continued diversity among staff as well as adequate representation of all States Parties. Among other initiatives, the Registry's Human Resources Section launched earlier in 2017 a web campaign reaching out to nationals of underrepresented and non-represented States Parties.¹⁹ The campaign includes cooperation with LinkedIn and the use of promotional videos in order to broaden the pool of applicants from the most under-represented States.

¹⁷ Relevant data is provided in **Annex II**.

¹⁸ 2016 Report, paragraph 48.

¹⁹ See "Staff Stories", available at: <https://www.icc-cpi.int/jobs>.

34. In relation to gender balance, while further progress needs to be made in relation to most senior professional levels (P-4 and above), the overall representation of female professional staff has increased from 45.78% in 2016 to 49% in September 2017, which is the highest representation since 2014.

VII. THIRD GOAL: The Court ensures adequate security for its work, including protection of those at risk from involvement with the Court²⁰

35. In relation to security, the 2016 Report identified a series of performance indicators aimed at measuring performance in two main areas: (i) physical and asset security; and (ii) information security.²¹ Taking into consideration the threat level the Court is facing,²² the selected indicators purport to answer two general questions: (i) has the Court implemented an appropriate/proportionate threat management / information security programme?²³ and (ii) when a risk manifests itself, has the Court's security framework proven adequate in the circumstances?²⁴ Data for 2016 has been updated as of 31 December 2016 and values for 2017 are as of 30 September 2017.

34. The security-related performance indicators are part of broader efforts to manage the risks which the Court faces. In March 2017, the Court's Coordination Council endorsed an information technology (IT) / information management (IM) five-year strategy (2017-2021) as well as a risk management roadmap for 2017-2018. The development of a more comprehensive measurement framework is undertaken as part of the implementation of both the IT/IM five-year strategy and the risk management roadmap. The need for further performance indicators will be assessed annually in light of the progress made.

VIII. FOURTH GOAL: Victims have access to the Court²⁵

35. With respect to victim's access to the Court, the 2016 Report acknowledged that performance indicators should reflect not only formal participation of victims in proceedings, but also broader access of affected communities to the Court's proceedings in terms of relevant information.²⁶ The 2016 Report outlined groups of indicators measuring: (i) meaningful victim participation;²⁷ (ii) reparations and assistance;²⁸ (iii) the Court's field presence;²⁹ and (iv) in-country outreach and public information.³⁰ Data for 2016 has been updated as of 31 December 2016 and values for 2017 are as of 30 September 2017.

36. Cognizant of the paramount importance of ensuring and promoting victims' access to the Court, all units and sections involved in the four above-outlined aspects of victim participation, as well as the Trust Fund for Victims, are in the active process of developing further indicators to complement those already existing. These additional indicators will be aimed at better assessing the impact of the various measures taken by the Court to ensure victims' access to the Court and to reach out to the affected communities. As always, the Court stands ready to reach out and cooperate with relevant stakeholders to aggregate relevant information.

IX. Next steps

37. In addition to being a managerial tool, performance indicators help to illustrate the complexity of the Court's activities and thus contribute to a better understand the Court's work.

38. As said, the Court's work on performance indicators in 2017 has focused on the collection of data for the previously selected indicators. Next year, the Court will continue to collect relevant data for the four identified goals and will, on that basis, continue to assess whether the selected indicators need to be further adjusted. In particular, taking into account the projected developments in the ongoing cases, including the completion of certain phases, it is expected that fuller data will be available for next year's progress report.

²⁰ Relevant data is provided in **Annex III**.

²¹ 2016 Report, paragraph 53.

²² 2016 Report, paragraphs 56-59; 69-72.

²³ 2016 Report, paragraphs 60-65; 73-75.

²⁴ 2016 Report, paragraphs 66-67; 76.

²⁵ Relevant data is provided in **Annex IV**.

²⁶ 2016 Report, paragraphs 77-79.

²⁷ 2016 Report, paragraphs 80-83.

²⁸ 2016 Report, paragraphs 84-88.

²⁹ 2016 Report, paragraphs 89-91.

³⁰ 2016 Report, paragraphs 92-94.

Annex I – FIRST GOAL: The Court’s proceedings are expeditious, fair and transparent at every stage

I.	The expeditiousness and fairness of proceedings	
A.	Phase 1 – Confirmation	9
B.	Phase 2 – Trial preparation	11
C.	Phase 3 – Trial	12
D.	Phase 4 – Trial deliberations	14
E.	Phase 5 – Sentencing	15
F.	Phase 6 – Reparations	16
G.	Phase 7 – Appeals	17
H.	Interlocutory appeals	18
	(<i>explanatory notes</i>)	19
I.	Overall disclosure figures	20
J.	Duration of the phases for the previous cases	21
	1. <i>The Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo</i>	21
	2. <i>The Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga and Mathieu Ngudjolo</i>	22
	3. <i>The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo</i>	23
K.	Relevant Registry services that contribute to the fairness and expeditiousness of proceedings irrespective of the phases	24
	1. <i>Transcripts, translation and interpretation</i>	24
	2. <i>Volume of witness-related services delivered</i>	26
II.	Transparency of proceedings	27
A.	Indicators of public transparency	27
B.	Accessibility of ICC-related information	28

**PHASE 1 – CONFIRMATION
Between first appearance and the decision on the confirmation of charges**

Indicators	Ongwen		Ntaganda		Gbagbo & Blé Goudé		Al Mahdi		Bemba et al.	
	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments
Number of suspects	1		1		2		1		5	
Time lapse between transfer of suspect in ICC custody and assignment/appointment of permanent counsel ¹	16 days	Transfer: 21 January 2015 Appointment: 6 February 2015	27 days	Transfer: 22 March 2013 Appointment: 18 April 2013 *** Mr Nianganda confirmed the counsel who had assisted him during first appearance.	0 day (L. Gbagbo) 4 days (C. Blé Goudé)	L. Gbagbo Transfer: 30 November 2011 Appointment: 30 November 2011 L. Gbagbo confirmed upon arrival one of the several counsels who had said they were representing him. C. Blé Goudé Transfer: 22 March 2014 Appointment: 26 March 2014 C. Blé Goudé's counsel had been appointed since July 2012.	5 days	Transfer: 26 September 2015 Appointment: 1 October 2015 *** Mr Al Mahdi confirmed the counsel who had assisted him during first appearance.	16 days (J.-P. Bemba) 2 days (A. Kilolo) 0 day (J.-J. Mangenda) 8 days (F. Babala) 9 days (N. Arido)	J.-P. Bemba Transfer: 23 November 2013 Appointment: 9 December 2013 A. Kilolo Transfer: 25 November 2013 Appointment: 27 November 2013 J.-J. Mangenda Transfer: 4 December 2013 Appointment: 4 December 2013 E. Babala Transfer: 25 November 2013 Appointment: 3 December 2013 N. Arido Transfer: 18 March 2013 Appointment: 27 March 2013
Number of charges confirmed	70		18		4		1		42	
Prosecution	80	* ⁱⁱⁱ	92	*	223	1 606	56	888	105	597
Defence	38	*	42	*	202	3 058	4	36	240	3 401
Number of motions / number of pages contained in the motions / number of pages contained in the annexes ⁱⁱ	4 (External LRV)	*	1 (LRV)	*	40	610	*	*	N/A	N/A
Victims ^v	7 (OPCV)	*	14 (OPCV)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Others (including Registry)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of applications	*		*		*		*		*	
Number of victims authorised to participate	2 026		1 119		*		*		*	
Participating victims										
									*	
									N/A	
										There were no participating victims in this case.

PHASE 1 – CONFIRMATION (continued)
Between first appearance and the decision on the confirmation of charges

Indicators	Ongwen		Ntaganda		Gbagbo & Blé Goudé		Al Mahdi		Bemba et al.	
	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments
Decisions and orders ^v	Oral		*		*		*		*	
	In writing		116		169	L. Gbagbo: 139 C. Blé Goudé: 38	12		133	
	By email (where applicable)		*		*		*		*	
Amount of evidence submitted for the purpose of the confirmation of charges (number of items / pages) ^{vi}	Prosecution		1 658 items 12 534 pages		3817 items (L. Gbagbo) 2425 items (C. Blé Goudé)		593 items		715 items 2 286 exhibits	
	Defence		*		776		0		187	Mr Ardo: 86 items Mr Kilole: 101 items
Number of hearing days used ^{vii}	Confirmation hearing		5		8 (L. Gbagbo) 4 (C. Blé Goudé)		1		N/A	For proceedings under Article 70, no hearing is required; proceedings were held in writing.
	Others		16		7 (L. Gbagbo) 3 (C. Blé Goudé)		1		6	
Number of languages supported in the courtroom			3	English, French, Kinyarwanda	2	French, English	3	English, French, Arabic	2	English, French
	Scheduled confirmation hearing date achieved ^{viii}		No	Initially set for 24 August 2015; postponed to 21 January 2016 to allow the Prosecution to investigate and possibly expand the case in light of the amount of time passed since the issuance of the arrest warrant	No	No	Initially set for 18 June 2012, but postponed to 13 August 2012 following a Defence request, and again postponed <i>proprio motu</i> by the Chamber to 19 February 2013, due to Mr Gbagbo's fitness for trial.	No	N/A	Initially set for 18 January 2016, the hearing took place on 1 March 2016, at the request of the defence
Absolute duration of the phase			14 months, 1 day	Date of first appearance: 26 January 2015 **** Decision on the confirmation of charges: 26 March 2016	L. Gbagbo: 30 months, 8 days C. Blé Goudé: 8 months, 15 days	Date of first appearance: 5 December 2011 Decision on the confirmation of charges: 12 June 2014 ** * C. Blé Goudé Date of first appearance: 27 March 2014 Decision on the confirmation of charges: 11 December 2014	5 months, 25 days	Date of first appearance: 30 September 2015 **** Decision on the confirmation of charges: 24 March 2016	11 months, 16 days	Date of initial appearance (J-P. Bemba; A. Kilole, F. Bahala): 27 November 2013 *** Decision on the confirmation of charges: 11 November 2014 Mr. Mangenda and Mr. Arido had their initial appearance hearing on 5 December 2013 and 20 March 2014, respectively.

PHASE 2 – TRIAL PREPARATION

Between the decision on the confirmation of charges and the first day of the opening statements

Indicators	Ongwen		Ntaganda		Gbagbo & Blé Goudé		Al Mahdi		Bemba et al.				
	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments			
Number of accused persons	1		1		2		1		5				
Number of charges	70		18		4		1		42				
Number of motions / number of pages contained in the motions / number of pages contained in the annexes	Prosecution	53	837	*	131	946	*	34	384	*	113	981	*
	Defence	30	291	*	209	2 792	*	10	91	*	215	2 154	*
Victims	LRV	6	86	*	22	259	*	6	39	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
	OPCV	5	62										
Others (including Registry)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Decisions and orders	Oral	3		11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	In writing	32		100	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Amount of disclosed material by the parties (number of items / pages) ^{1A}	By email (where applicable)	*		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Prosecution	18 613	126 141	12 886	102 415	11 088	72 018	12 496	36 704	3 034	8 824		
Number of hearing days used ¹	Defence	68	331	1	2	95	941	2	8	350	1 794		
	Other	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		
Scheduled trial start date achieved	Yes		No		No			Yes		Yes			
Absolute duration of the phase	8 months, 11 days	Decision on the confirmation of charges: 26 March 2016 *** First day of opening statements: 6 December 2016	14 months, 25 days	Decision on the confirmation of charge: 9 June 2014 *** First day of opening statements: 2 September 2015	No	L. Gbagbo: 19 months, 17 days *** C. Blé Goudé: 13 months, 18 days	4 months, 30 days	Decision on the confirmation of charges: 24 March 2016 *** First day of trial: 22 August 2016	10 months, 19 days	Decision on the confirmation of charges: 11 November 2014 *** First date of opening statements: 29 September 2015			

PHASE 3 – TRIAL
Between the first day of the opening statements and the last day of the closing submissions

Indicators	Ongwen		Ntaganda		Chagbo & Blé Goudé		Al Mahdi		Bemba et al.			
	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments		
Number of accused persons	1		1		2		1		5			
Number of charges	70		18		4		1		42			
Time allocated for opening statements	7.5 hours	5 hours for the Prosecution 2.5 hours for the LRVs *** At its request, the Defence will make its opening statement at the beginning of its evidence.	9 hours	4 hours for the Prosecution 4 hours for the Defence 1 hour to be divided between the two LRVs	8 hours	3 hours for the Prosecution 3 hours for the Defence team 2 hours for the LRV	5.5 hours	3 hours for the Prosecution 1.5 hours for the Defence 1 hour for the LRV (as initially granted; additional time granted in the course of opening statements)	9 hours	2 hours for the Prosecution 1.5 hours for Mr Bemba 1 hour for Mr Kilolo 1.5 hours for Mr Mangenda 1.5 hours for Mr Babala 1.5 hours for Mr Arido		
Time allocated for closing submissions		Trial is ongoing		Trial is ongoing		Trial is ongoing	*		14 hours	4 hours for the Prosecution 2 hours per defence team		
Number of hearing days scheduled	83		*	No cumulative data available before November 2016 Between 11 November 2016 and 30 September 2017: 106 days scheduled; 97 days were effectively used.	*	No cumulative data available before November 2016 Between 11 November 2016 and 30 September 2017: 110 days scheduled; 97 days were effectively used.	*		*			
Number of hearing days used	82		208		177		3		40			
Number of witnesses	30	Subject to certain conditions being met, the Chamber has accepted written testimony (with no need to appear during trial) of 47 witnesses.	65		61		3		13			
	5		19		7		0		6			
	17		3		2		2		8			
Average time per witness	3		23		20		0		5			
	7 hours, 58 minutes		7 hours, 56 minutes (victims included)	Mr Ntaganda has testified 127 hours long. Without his testimony, the average would be: 4 hours, 38 minutes	9 hours		2 hours		5 hours			
Percentage of witnesses benefitting from protective measures ³¹	74 %		76 %		25 %		67 %		63 %			
Number of witnesses brought to headquarters	32		68		56		3		13			
Participating victims	4 143		2 291		889		8		N/A			
	4 100		2 142		726		8		N/A			
Number of victims allowed to present views and concerns		Presentation of evidence by the Prosecution is ongoing.	5	Three victims also gave evidence.		Presentation of evidence by the Prosecution is ongoing.	0		N/A			
Number of motions / number of pages contained in the motions / number of pages contained in the annexes	147	1 918	1 614	436	8 627	6 051	1	3	*	63	572	*
	51	294	132	260	2 589	568	3	59	*	243	2 038	*
	8	54	*	60	453	9	1	5	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
	212	5 323	5 063	57	747	669	50	207	93	*	*	*

PHASE 3 – TRIAL (continued)
Between the first day of the opening statements and the last day of the closing submissions

Indicators	Ongwen		Ntaganda		Gbagbo & Blé Goudé		Al Mahdi		Bemba et al.	
	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments
Decisions and orders	Oral		256		161		12		80	
	In writing		197		178		18		266	
	By email (where applicable)		38		28		37		*	
Amount of disclosed material by the parties (number of items / number of pages)	Prosecution	*	18 150	*	4 289	*	111	2 844	6 601	33 350
	Defence	*	581	*	102 (LG) 1 (CBG)	*	2	8	907	8 532
	Other (including Registry)	*	478	*	55	*	*	*	*	*
Amount of evidence submitted ³⁴ (number of items / number of pages)		3 801 items	564 items		1 568 items		714 items		2075 / 13 123	
Number of pages of final submissions by the parties		Trial is ongoing		Trial is ongoing		Trial is ongoing			49	Prosecution: 21 pages Defence: 28 pages <i>The Defence only submitted observations on sentencing.</i>
Number of languages supported in the courtroom	3	English, Acholi, French	4	English, French, Kinyarwanda, Swahili	3	French, English, Dioula	3	English, French, Arabic	2	English, French
Length of the evidentiary phase	Prosecution	8 months, 15 days	18 months, 15 days	The presentation of evidence by the Prosecution started on 16 January 2017 and is ongoing.	19 months, 28 days	As of 30 September 2017 The presentation of evidence by the Prosecution started on 3 February 2016 and is ongoing.	N/A	N/A	1 month, 29 days	
	Victims, if applicable		3 days	From 10 to 12 April 2017			N/A	N/A	N/A	The trial was held in a short span of time.
Defence			4 months, 2 days	The presentation of evidence by the Defence started on 29 May 2017 and is ongoing.			N/A	N/A	2 months	
Absolute duration of the phase		9 months, 25 days	24 months, 29 days	As of 30 September 2017 First day of opening statements: 6 December 2015 *** Trial is ongoing	20 months, 3 days	As of 30 September 2017 First day of opening statements: 28 January 2016 *** Trial is ongoing	3 days	Trial was held from 22 to 24 August 2016.	8 months, 4 days	First date of opening statements: 29 September 2015 *** Last day of closing statements: 1 June 2016

PHASE 4 – TRIAL DELIBERATIONS

Between the last day of the closing submissions and the issuance of the judgement on conviction^{xy}

Indicators	Ongwen		Niaganda		Ghagho & Bié Gondé		Al Mahdi		Bemba et al.	
	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments
Number of pages of judgement ^{zhi}							49	Judgement and sentence combined in one decision; judgement itself is about 30 pages.	458	
Number of pages of annexes (if applicable)							0		0	
Number of pages of appended opinions (if applicable)							0		0	
Absolute duration of the phase		Trial is ongoing		Trial is ongoing		Trial is ongoing	1 month, 3 days	Last day of trial: 24 August 2016 Date of judgement: 27 September 2016	4 months, 19 days	Last day of closing statements: 1 June 2016 Date of judgement: 19 October 2016

PHASE 5 – SENTENCING

Between the issuance of the judgement on conviction and the issuance of the sentencing decision

Indicators	Ongwen		Naganda		Ghagho & Blé Goudé		Al Mahdi		Bemba et al.		
	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	
Number of motions / number of pages contained in the motions / number of pages contained in the annexes	Prosecution								14	154	44
	Defence								71	474	202
	Victims								N/A	N/A	N/A
	Others (including Registry)								*	*	*
Decisions and orders											
Amount of evidence submitted for the purpose of sentencing (number of items / pages)	Prosecution									22	
	Defence									28	
	Victims									157	
Number of witnesses heard ^{vi}	Prosecution										
	Defence										
	Others										
Number of hearing days used ^{vi}	Prosecution										
	Defence										
	Others										
Number of pages of sentencing decision	Prosecution										
	Defence										
	Others										
Absolute duration of the phase	Prosecution										
	Defence										
	Others										

PHASE 6 – REPARATIONS

Between the issuance of the judgement on conviction and the implementation of a reparations award or the approval of an implementation plan, as appropriate

Indicators	Lubanga		Katanga		Bemba		Al Mahdi	
	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments
Time lapse between the issuance of judgement on conviction and reparations decision/order		Date of judgement on conviction: 14 March 2012 *** Date of first reparations order: 7 August 2012 The reparations order was amended by the Appeals Chamber on 3 March 2015. The determination of Mr Lubanga's amount of liability is still under consideration.		Date of judgement on conviction: 7 March 2014 *** Date of reparations order: 24 March 2017 The reparations order is currently being appealed.		Date of judgement on conviction: 27 September 2016 *** Date of reparations order: 17 August 2017 The reparations order is currently being appealed.		
Number of victims seeking reparations, as applicable	442		297	No applications have yet been sought.	139	137 individuals and 2 organisations		
Number of victims who will receive reparations, in case of individual awards			297			The implementation phase screening is yet to take place.		
Number of motions / number of pages contained in the motions / number of pages contained in the annexes	Victims	22 230 9	23 2 655 2 424	2 16 *	135 1 468 1 333			
	Defence	19 537 486	* *	6 58 7	4 49 *			
	TFV (where appropriate)	23 317 221	11 246 158	7 40 29	3 48 *			
	Other (including experts) ^{xvii}	484 7 270 7 161	2 5 *	95 61 2 476	237 2 131 1 957			
Decisions and orders	Oral	*	*	*	*			
	In writing By email (where applicable)	46 *	17 *	14 *	17 *			
Number of hearing days used	*		1	0	1	Delivery of the reparations order on 17 August 2017		
Time lapse between issuance of reparations decision/order and implementation of award/approval of reparations plan	Symbolic reparations 19 months, 19 days Collective reparations 25 months, 4 days	Date of the amended reparations order: 3 March 2015 *** Date of approval of implementation plan (symbolic reparations): 21 October 2016 Date of approval of implementation plan (collective reparations): 6 April 2017						
Time lapse between the approval of reparations plan and implementation of the plan								
Number of pages of the reparations order	94	The reparations order, as amended by the Appeals Chamber, contains 20 pages.	131 (over 1000 pages for the annex)		61			
Absolute duration of the phase		Phase is ongoing		Phase is ongoing		Phase is ongoing		Phase is ongoing

PHASE 7 – FINAL APPEALS

Between the submission of the first notice of appeal and the issuance of the appeals judgement

Indicators	Ongwen		Ntaganda		Gbagbo & Blé Goudé		Al Mahdi		Bemba et al.	
	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments
Number of appealing parties									5 (against conviction)	Mr Aido; Mr Bababala; Mr Mangenda; Mr Bemba; Mr Kilolo
Number of grounds per party ^{viii}									4 (against sentence)	Mr Aido; Mr Bababala; Mr Bemba; Prosecution
Number of motions / number of pages contained in the motions / number of pages contained in the annexes									23 / conviction 20 / sentence N/A / conviction 2 / sentence	Mr Aido; 5 (conviction); 2 (sentence) Mr Bababala
Decisions and orders									13 178 31 189 4 833 3 645 N/A N/A N/A 5 15 4	
Number of hearing days used ^{ix}									28	Requests to convene an oral hearing have been submitted in September 2017
Number of pages of appeals judgement										
Absolute duration of the phase		Trial is ongoing		Trial is ongoing		Trial is ongoing		No appeal has been lodged	11 months	As of 30 September 2017. The first notice of appeal against the trial judgement was filed by Mr Aido on 31 October 2016. The phase is ongoing.

INTERLOCUTORY APPEALS

Year	Number of interlocutory appeals handled	Average duration (days)		Comments
		Between the submission of the appeal brief and the issuance of the judgment	Between the completion of all submissions and the issuance of the judgment	
2017	7	92	88	The notice of appeal of one of these appeals was dismissed <i>in limine</i>
2016	6	107	88	
2015	17	147	129	
2014	14	168	108	Since 2014, stored data allows measuring of averages also from the completion of the appeal briefing
2013	7	87	N/A	
2012	12	58	N/A	
2011	19	49	N/A	
2010	10	92	N/A	

ⁱ It is noted that the speed of activity to be performed is dependent on the speed of decision-making process of the suspect: the list of counsel and other relevant information is provided to the suspect upon arrival.

ⁱⁱ The term ‘motion’ extends to any motion, application or request as well as to any other form of initial submissions. Responses and replies are not counted. Further versions of a ‘motion’ (e.g. lesser redacted versions, translations, etc.), as well as annexes, are also not counted.

ⁱⁱⁱ “*” refers to data that is not available.

^{iv} Victims’ filings include only those made by or on behalf of victims, i.e. the victims’ legal representatives before the Court (including the Office of Public Counsel for the Victims).

^v The figure only includes decisions and orders of the relevant Pre-Trial Chamber (and excludes any decisions by the Appeals Chamber or the Presidency). Further versions of the decisions and orders (e.g. lesser redacted versions, translations, etc.), as well as annexes, are not counted.

^{vi} The ‘number of items’ includes documents and objects.

^{vii} Due to the nature of the confirmation phase, which requires very few hearings, the present chart does not include scheduled days.

^{viii} Pursuant to rule 121(1) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence. It is noted that it is normal practice that parties seek postponements of the confirmation of charges hearing pursuant to rule 121(7) of the Rules due to mostly evidence disclosure-related issues and require preparation time of the parties.

^{ix} Disclosure commences in pre-trial and continues beyond the confirmation of charges until a deadline set by the Trial Chamber usually some months before the start of the hearing phase of trial.

^x Due to the nature of the preparation phase, which requires few hearings, the present chart does not include scheduled days.

^{xi} This indicator reflects the factual context of a case. A case where a lot of witnesses suffered serious trauma as children, for instance, may require more protective measures than a case where the witnesses did not. *See* article 68(2) of the Rome Statute.

^{xii} Regarding evidence, the practice varies between Chambers – some Chambers will formally admit evidence, while others will only consider evidence as submitted. This figure is a common denominator between the two practices.

^{xiii} Although the sentencing decision is usually issued at a later stage, the Court’s legal framework does not prevent the trial chamber to issue such decision at the same time as the decision on conviction.

^{xiv} The term ‘closing submissions’ entails oral or written submissions, which ever come last. The duration of this phase is in and of itself indicative of the Chamber’s workload.

^{xv} Considering that the number of witnesses heard for the purposes of sentencing is usually low, there is no need to differentiate between the various types of witnesses.

^{xvi} Due to the nature of the sentencing phase, which requires very few hearings, the present chart does not include scheduled days.

^{xvii} Expert reports are usually filed through the Registry.

^{xviii} It is recalled that the number of grounds of appeal is based on the manner in which the parties present them and may not necessarily reflect the complexity or otherwise of final appeals. Some grounds may involve a multiplicity of complex issues that could be considered sub-grounds within a ground.

^{xix} Due to the nature of the appeals phase, which requires very few hearings, the present chart does not include scheduled days.

^{xx} As per the Appeals Chamber’s jurisprudence, the decision to hold an oral hearing in appeal proceedings against final judgements is a discretionary one and made on a case-by-case basis.

I. Overall disclosure figures

Office of the Prosecutor

Number of documents disclosed

2015: 40 869

2016: 19 075

2017: 6 252¹

Number of pages disclosed

2015: 239 736

2016: 109 457

2017: 28 091²

¹ As of 30 September 2017.

² As of 30 September 2017.

J. Duration of the phases for the previous cases

The Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo

Number of accused: 1

Number of charges: 3

Duration of phases

Phase 1 – Confirmation 10 months, 10 days

Initial appearance: 20 March 2006

Decision on confirmation of charges: 29 January 2007

Phase 2 – Trial preparation 23 months, 29 days

Decision on confirmation of charges: 29 January 2007

First day of opening statements: 26 January 2009

Phase 3 – Trial 31 months, 1 day

First day of opening statements: 26 January 2009

Last day of closing submissions: 26 August 2011

Phase 4 – Judgement 6 months, 18 days

Last day of closing submissions: 26 August 2011

Date of issuance of judgement: 14 March 2012

Phase 5 – Sentencing 3 months, 27 days

Date of issuance of judgement: 14 March 2012

Date of issuance of sentence: 10 July 2012

Phase 6 – Reparations Ongoing

Date of issuance of judgement: 14 March 2012

Implementation of reparations plan: N/A

Phase 7 – Appeals 25 months, 29 days

Date of the first notice of appeal: 3 October 2012

Date of the appeals judgement (whichever comes last): 1 December 2014

The Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga and Mathieu Ngudjolo

Number of accused: 2

Number of charges: 10

Duration of phases

Phase 1 – Confirmation 11 months, 4 days

Initial appearance (Katanga): 22 October 2007

Joinder of cases with Ngudjolo: 10 March 2008

Decision on confirmation of charges: 26 September 2008

Phase 2 – Trial preparation 13 months, 30 days

Decision on confirmation of charges: 26 September 2008

First day of opening statements: 24 November 2009

Phase 3 – Trial 30 months

First day of opening statements: 24 November 2009

Last day of closing submissions: 23 May 2012

Phase 4 – Judgement 21 months, 13 days

Last day of closing submissions: 23 May 2012

Date of issuance of judgement: 7 March 2014

Phase 5 – Sentencing 2 months, 17 days

Date of issuance of judgement: 7 March 2014

Date of issuance of sentence: 23 May 2014

Phase 6 – Reparations Ongoing

Date of issuance of judgement: 23 May 2014

Implementation of reparations plan: N/A

Phase 7 – Appeals N/A

(appeals were withdrawn)

The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo

Number of accused: 1

Number of charges: 5

Duration of phases

Phase 1 – Confirmation 11 months, 12 days

Initial appearance: 4 July 2008

Decision on confirmation of charges: 15 June 2009

Phase 2 – Trial preparation 17 months, 8 days

Decision on confirmation of charges: 15 June 2009

First day of opening statements: 22 November 2010

Phase 3 – Trial 47 months, 23 days

First day of opening statements: 22 November 2010

Last day of closing submissions: 13 November 2014

Phase 4 – Judgement 16 months, 9 days

Last day of closing submissions: 13 November 2014

Date of issuance of judgement: 21 March 2016

Phase 5 – Sentencing 3 months, 1 day

Date of issuance of judgement: 21 March 2016

Date of issuance of sentence: 21 June 2016

Phase 6 – Reparations Ongoing

Date of issuance of judgement: 21 March 2016

Implementation of reparations plan: N/A

Phase 7 – Appeals Ongoing

K. Relevant Registry services that contribute to the fairness and expeditiousness of proceedings irrespective of the phases

1. Transcripts, translation and interpretation

(% of services delivered on time *versus* requested)

Transcripts

Transcript provision		Overall volume ³	Timeliness of delivery of edited transcripts in %	Reclassification ⁴
2017	ENG	246(18143)	99.5	18(1256)
	FRA	247(18360)	100	33(2340)
2016	ENG	284(21115)	*	93(7499)
	FRA	278(20937)	*	87(7583)
2015	ENG	144(8012)	*	308(17769)
	FRA	130(7404)	*	43(2271)
2014	ENG	171(11692)	*	79(5670)
	FRA	169(11515)	*	71(5110)

* Data not available

Translation / interpretation

Court interpretation 2014-2017

	Requests received	Services provided/ on time ⁵	Cancelled requests ⁶	Implementation	Overall amount of interpreter days vs. outsourced	
					Staff:	FLs: ⁸
2017 ⁷	2204	2204	351	100%	1602	622
2016 ⁹	2721	2721	298	100%	1931	799
2015	1500	1500	211	100%	590	267
2014	1308	1308	140	100%	1147	145

³ Number and pages of edited transcript produced per year. The edited transcript is the full confidential or public version of the transcript. Certain hearings were only transcribed in one language which explains the discrepancy between the number of English and French edited transcripts produced.

⁴ Number and pages of transcripts reclassified during the year mentioned in the table.

⁵ For court interpretation, service delivery is done real time, as soon as the event takes place.

⁶ A "cancelled request" is when a request for interpretation is made and then cancelled by the requester for various reasons (for instance, no hearing following a shorter testimony).

⁷ As of 30 September 2017.

⁸ "FLs" means free-lancers.

⁹ The values of last year's report have been updated as of 30 December 2016.

Field and operational interpretation 2014-2017

	Requests received	Services provided/ on time ¹⁰	Implementation	Overall amount of field interpreter days
2017 ¹¹	123	111	90%	805 ¹²
2016 ¹³	119	102	86%	528 ¹⁴
2015	89	82	92%	675
2014	92	77	84%	408

Translation of judicial documents 2014-2017

	Pages of translation produced	Services provided/ on time ¹⁵	Pages of translation outsourced
2017 ¹⁶	6106	100%	231
2016 ¹⁷	7214	100%	787
2015	6455	100%	286
2014	8213	100%	103

Translation of non-judicial documents 2014-2017

	Pages of translation produced	Services provided/ on time ¹⁸	Pages of translation outsourced
2017 ¹⁹	2502	100%	155
2016 ²⁰	5366	100%	911
2015	4094	100%	182
2014	2735	100%	129

¹⁰ The service delivery “on time” refers to the number of requests received reduced by the number of requests that were cancelled by the service requester. The rationale for changing the methodology is that, in fact, field and operational interpretation services are always provided on time, because they can by their very nature (real time delivery) not be provided with a delay. The data for 2014 and 2015 did not include the field interpretation requests that were made, but subsequently cancelled by the service provider. The only way to get a meaningful percentage in the implementation column is therefore to calculate this rate on the basis of cancelled requests, which gives a better idea to which extent services were provided *vis-à-vis* services requested.

¹¹ As of 30 September 2017.

¹² The increase in field interpreter days in 2017 is due to the high level of field activity needing field interpretation support in 2017, including a number of lengthy Defence counsel missions in DRC and Uganda, weekly monitoring (implementation of regulation 175 of the Regulations of the Registry) in situation languages in the *Ntaganda* case and in the *Ongwen* case, rule 68 witness certification missions (new in 2017) and several field missions in the reparations phase of proceedings. In addition, field interpreters were deployed at headquarters to provide consecutive interpretation for a witness giving testimony in a language of lesser diffusion in the *Ntaganda* case. These assignments, in combination with VWS activities (vulnerability assessments, protection assessments and witness familiarisation) in the field and at headquarters have resulted in a substantially increased workload in terms of the number of field interpreter days in 2017.

¹³ The values of last year’s report have been updated as of 30 December 2016.

¹⁴ Substantial drop from 2015 in *Overall amount of field interpreter days* is due to the cessation of the DRC project which counted 202 days in 2015.

¹⁵ The service delivery “on time” also includes document submitted pursuant to a re-negotiated timeline as well as delay of less than five days

¹⁶ As of 30 September 2017.

¹⁷ The values of last year’s report have been updated as of 31 December 2016.

¹⁸ The service delivery “on time” also includes document submitted pursuant to a re-negotiated timeline as well as delay of less than five days

¹⁹ As of 30 September 2017.

²⁰ The values of last year’s report have been updated as of 30 December 2016.

2. Volume of witness-related services delivered

The Victims and Witnesses Section (VWS) is responsible for the availability and appearance (in person or via videolink) in every case before the Court. In addition, the VWS is responsible of the protection of victims and witnesses relating to the proceedings before the Court. Relevant statistics, while serving as an internal key performance indicator, have to remain confidential in order not to endanger individuals or operations.

Some overall indicators are, however, available.

Relevant value	2014 ²¹	2015 ²²	2016 ²³	2017
Number of witnesses assisted at the Court, including psychosocial and other support	26	36	85	142
Number of individuals receiving protection measures	Approx. 650	Approx. 620	Approx. 510	Approx. 440
Relevant interaction with Chambers	Expert input for approx. 65 Registry filings; 70 reports to Chambers by email.	Expert input for approx. 57 Registry filings; 76 reports to Chambers by email.	Expert input for 28 filings and approx. 100 expert protection and psychological advice and reports sent to the Chambers via e-mail. Furthermore the VWS attendance to hearing was required 11 times.	Expert input for 5 filings and approx. 180 expert protection and psychological advice and reports sent to the Chambers via e-mail. Furthermore the VWS attendance to hearing was required 2 times.
Number of specific cases subject to interaction	9	9	15	15
Conclusion / amendment of relocation agreements	2	2	2	2
New partner States having indicated readiness to access ad hoc relocation cases	N/A	N/A	2	4

²¹ See Report on activities and programme performance of the International Criminal Court for the year 2014, ICC-ASP/14/8, 4 May 2015, paras. 171 f.

²² See Report on activities and programme performance of the International Criminal Court for the year 2015, ICC-ASP/15/3, 14 September 2016, paras. 181 f.

²³ For 2016 and 2017, in order to be in line with 2014 and 2015, the same period as the one used for the Report on activities and programme performance of the ICC (numbers provided for September 2015 to September 2016 and September 2016 to September 2017) has been used.

II. Transparency of proceedings

A. Indicators of public transparency

It needs to be noted that the figures below need to be read in the context of the relevant trial phase per trial: since many reclassifications from confidential to public are only undertaken towards the end of a trial, the number of public decisions may increase in time.

	Percentage of judicial decisions that are public vs. confidential ²⁴		Overall percentage of courtroom time spent in public hearings vs. confidential or closed sessions
	2016 ²⁵	2017 ²⁶	2017 ²⁷
Ongwen	Public 83% Classified 17%	Public 84% Classified 16%	Public 84% Private 16%
Ntaganda	Public 65% Classified 35%	Public 73% Classified 27%	Public 63% Private 37%
Al Mahdi	Public 100% Classified 0	Public 69% Classified 31%	Public 100% Private 0%
Gbagbo & Blé Goudé	Public 75% Classified 25%	Public 75% Classified 25%	Public 93% Private 7%
Bemba <i>et al.</i>	Public 100% Classified 0	Public 92% Classified 8%	Public 79% Private 21%

²⁴ The term “public” includes redacted and reclassified versions of decisions. Redaction orders are excluded from this calculation.

²⁵ The values of last year’s report have been updated as of 31 December 2016.

²⁶ As of 30 September 2017.

²⁷ As of 30 September 2017.

B. Accessibility of ICC-related information

Indicator	2014	2015	2016	2017 ²⁸	Comments
Number of visitors to the website	1 795 000	1 727 000	1 071 000 ²⁹	585 000 ³⁰	The statistics tool (WebTrends) was not deployed with the launch of the new website in 2016, so we are missing data from September 2016 to August 2017.
Number of internet pages viewed	12 425 764	5 964 691	5 145 720	3 530 040	
Live streaming	289 170	41 975	5 874 473	15 822 909	
Number of ICC social medias accounts followers, posts and impressions ('share's, 'like's, etc.)	Twitter: 119 000 followers	Twitter: 161 000 followers	Twitter: 201 000 followers 48 767 impressions/day 79 'likes'/day	Twitter: ³¹ <i>English account:</i> 236 000 followers 40 737 impressions/day 106 'likes'/day <i>French account:</i> ³² 1 084 followers 1 337 impressions/day 4 'likes'/day	
			YouTube: 11 200 followers 2 700 000 views	YouTube: 12 600 followers 2 897 211 views	
				Facebook: ³³ <i>English page:</i> 68 620 followers 3 752 261 impressions 22 407 engagements <i>French page:</i> 829 followers 237 352 impressions 2 819 engagements	

²⁸ As of 30 September 2017.

²⁹ Not including September to December 2016.

³⁰ From May to September 2017.

³¹ Until 10 October 2017.

³² Since July 2017.

³³ Since July 2017.

Indicator	2014	2015	2016	2017³⁴	Comments
Number of visitors to court hearings	7 244	4 731	11 520	15 671	Figure represents only visitors that were received by Events and Protocol Unit
Number of press releases, interviews and other communications	4 344	5 924	4 006	3 093 ³⁵	It includes also documents posted on the web site
Number of information sessions with medias and number of participants	570	445	206	164 ³⁶	Figure refers to number of information sessions with media in the field
Number of ICC publications distributed	13 355	30 911	25 944	6 742 ³⁷	Material distributed through field offices and in the HQ
Number of audio and video summaries produced for international media	380	364	631	171	

³⁴ As of 30 September 2017.

³⁵ Until June 2017.

³⁶ Until August 2017.

³⁷ Until August 2017.

Annex II – SECOND GOAL: The Court’s leadership and management are effective

I. BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION.....	31
A. BUDGET PERFORMANCE OF PROGRAMME BUDGET 2017.....	31
B. BUDGET PERFORMANCE OF PROGRAMME BUDGET 2016.....	31
C. BUDGET PERFORMANCE OF PROGRAMME BUDGET 2015.....	32
D. BUDGET PERFORMANCE OF PROGRAMME BUDGET 2014	32
II. HUMAN RESOURCES.....	33
A. AVERAGE TIME OF RECRUITMENT PROCESS	33
B. PERCENTAGE RATE OF STAFF APPRAISALS CONDUCTED AND PERFORMANCE RATINGS PER ORGAN/OFFICE.....	34
C. GEOGRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION AND GENDER BALANCE OF STAFF 2017 – 2014	35
III. PROCUREMENT	41
A. WORKLOAD INDICATORS – ACTIVITIES FOR 2017 MONTHLY	41
B. WORKLOAD INDICATORS – ACTIVITIES FOR 2016 MONTHLY	42
C. WORKLOAD INDICATORS – ACTIVITIES FOR 2015 MONTHLY	43
D. WORKLOAD INDICATORS – ACTIVITIES FOR 2014 MONTHLY	44

I. Budget implementation

In thousand euros

A. Budget Performance of Programme Budget 2017¹

Court organs²	<i>Approved Budget</i>	<i>Actual Expenditure</i>	<i>Implementation rate in %</i>	<i>Variance</i>
MP I	12,536.0	9,244.0	73.7	3,292.0
MP II	44,973.6	33,352.1	74.2	11,621.5
MP III	76,633.2	59,804.8	78.0	16,828.4
Total	134,142.8	102,400.9	76.3	31,741.9

B. Budget Performance of Programme Budget 2016

Court organs	<i>Approved Budget</i>	<i>Actual Expenditure</i>	<i>Implementation rate in %</i>	<i>Variance</i>
MP I	12,430.6	12,702.8	102.2	-272.2
MP II	43,233.7	40,939.5	94.7	2,294.2
MP III	72,759.2	71,697.6	98.5	1,061.6
Total	128,423.5	125,339.9	97.6	3,083.6

¹ As of 30 September 2017.

² The main organs of the Court (including a number of independent Court offices) are called "Major Programmes" (MP) in budgetary terms. The Judiciary/Presidency represents MP I; OTP is MP II; and the Registry is MP III.

C. Budget Performance of Programme Budget 2015

Court organs	<i>Approved Budget</i>	<i>Actual Expenditure</i>	<i>Implementation rate in %</i>	<i>Variance</i>
MP I	12,034.1	10,906.0	90.6	1,128.1
MP II	39,612.6	38,369.6	96.9	1,243.0
MP III	65,025.9	64,956.7	99.9	69.2
Total	130,665.6	126,832.1	97.1	3,833.5

D. Budget Performance of Programme Budget 2014

	<i>Approved Budget</i>	<i>Actual Expenditure</i>	<i>Implementation rate in %</i>	<i>Variance</i>
MP I	10,045.8	10,021.6	99.8	24.2
MP II	33,220.0	32,156.0	96.8	1,064.0
MP III	66,293.0	64,460.8	97.2	1,832.2
Total	121,656.2	117,668.5	96.7	3,987.7

II. Human resources

A. Average time of recruitment process

The Court monitors its recruitment times to ensure that vacancies are filled in an efficient and timely manner. It must be noted however that the Court's aim is not to reduce the recruitment time as much as possible, but to balance the needs for an efficient process with the requirement for a solid and transparent process whereby the Court identifies and invests in the most suitable talent available.

The below table indicates "time to recruit", which is the time from publishing of the vacancy announcement and until finalization of the recruitment process. Once the process is finalized, the arrival date of the new staff member will depend on factors such as the selected person's notice period and whether the Court due to vacancy rate requirements is unable to fill the post and therefore can only roster the selected candidate for future recruitment.

	Duration general service (GS) selection process	Duration professional level (P) selection process	Comments
2017	84 days	73 days	
2016	73 days	86 days	

B. Percentage rate of staff appraisals conducted and performance ratings per Organ/Office

	Completed performance appraisals		
	2014/2015	2015/2016	2016/2017
Judiciary	2%	36%	44%
Office of the Prosecutor	70%	72%	100%
Registry	71%	64%	93%
Office of Internal Audit	0%	75%	100%
Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties	0%	14%	38%
Secretariat, Trust Fund for Victims	0%	38%	0%
Total	64%	65%	91%

<i>Overall performance rating</i>	2014/2015	2015/2016	2016/2017
Did not meet	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Partially Met	1.60%	1.20%	0.83%
Fully met	80.40%	77.00%	75.47%
Exceeded	15.90%	21.00%	20.50%
Significantly exceeded	2.10%	1.00%	3.20%

C. Geographical representation and gender balance of staff 2017 – 2014

1. Gender balance of all established posts, excluding elected officials

As of 30 September 2017					
ALL ICC	F	M	Total	F%	M%
Judiciary	30	20	50	60.00%	40.00%
OTP	158	142	300	52.67%	47.33%
Registry	214	302	516	41.47%	58.53%
Secretariat of the ASP	4	6	10	40.00%	60.00%
Secretariat of the TFV	2	2	4	50.00%	50.00%
Project Director's Office	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
IOM	3	1	4	75.00%	25.00%
Office of Internal Audit	3	1	4	75.00%	25.00%
Total	414	474	888	46.62%	53.38%

Professional posts	F	M	Total	F%	M%
Judiciary	19	19	38	50.00%	50.00%
OTP	111	117	228	48.68%	51.32%
Registry	107	111	218	49.08%	50.92%
Secretariat of the ASP	2	3	5	40.00%	60.00%
Secretariat of the TFV	1	2	3	33.33%	66.67%
Project Director's Office	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
IOM	2	1	3	66.67%	33.33%
Office of Internal Audit	2	1	3	66.67%	33.33%
Total	244	254	498	49.00%	51.00%

As of 30 September 2016					
ALL ICC	F	M	Total	F%	M%
Judiciary	26	21	47	55.32%	44.68%
OTP	102	113	215	47.44%	52.56%
Registry	190	273	463	41.04%	58.96%
Secretariat of the ASP	2	3	5	40.00%	60.00%
Secretariat of the TFV	4	2	6	66.67%	33.33%
Project Director's Office	0	1	1	0.00%	100.00%
IOM	0	1	1	0.00%	100.00%
Office of Internal Audit	3	1	4	75.00%	25.00%
Total	327	415	742	44.07%	55.93%

Professional posts	F	M	Total	F%	M%
Judiciary	15	18	33	45.45%	54.55%
OTP	70	89	159	44.03%	55.97%
Registry	89	98	187	47.59%	52.41%
Secretariat of the ASP	1	2	3	33.33%	66.67%
Secretariat of the TFV	2	2	4	50.00%	50.00%
Project Director's Office	0	1	1	0.00%	100.00%
IOM	0	1	1	0.00%	100.00%
Office of Internal Audit	2	1	3	66.67%	33.33%
Total	179	212	391	45.78%	54.22%

As of 30 September 2015					
ALL ICC	F	M	Total	F%	M%
Judiciary	26	19	45	57.78%	42.22%
OTP	101	102	203	49.75%	50.25%
Registry	164	222	386	42.49%	57.51%
Secretariat of the ASP	1	3	4	25.00%	75.00%
Secretariat of the TFV	4	2	6	66.67%	33.33%
Project Director's Office	1	1	2	50.00%	50.00%
IOM	0	1	1	0.00%	100.00%
Office of Internal Audit	3	1	4	75.00%	25.00%
Total	300	351	651	46.08%	53.92%

Professional posts	F	M	Total	F%	M%
Judiciary	14	15	29	48.28%	51.72%
OTP	66	76	142	46.48%	53.52%
Registry	80	79	159	50.31%	49.69%
Secretariat of the ASP	1	2	3	33.33%	66.67%
Secretariat of the TFV	2	2	4	50.00%	50.00%
Project Director's Office	0	1	1	0.00%	0.00%
IOM	0	1	1	0.00%	0.00%
Office of Internal Audit	2	1	3	0.00%	0.00%
Total	165	177	342	48.25%	51.75%

As of 31 December 2014					
ALL ICC	F	M	Total	F%	M%
Judiciary	29	18	47	61.70%	38.30%
OTP	97	102	199	48.74%	51.26%
Registry	182	238	420	43.33%	56.67%
Secretariat of the ASP	2	3	5	40.00%	60.00%
Secretariat of the TFV	5	2	7	71.43%	28.57%
Project Director's Office	2	2	4	50.00%	50.00%
IOM	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
Total	317	365	682	46.48%	53.52%

Professional	F	M	Total	F%	M%
Judiciary	16	15	31	51.61%	48.39%
OTP	63	79	142	44.37%	55.63%
Registry	87	85	172	50.58%	49.42%
Secretariat of the ASP	2	2	4	50.00%	50.00%
Secretariat of the TFV	3	2	5	60.00%	40.00%
Project Director's Office	1	2	3	33.33%	66.67%
IOM	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
Total	172	185	357	48.18%	51.82%

2. Gender balance per level – all established posts, excluding elected officials

As at 30 September 2017

Grade	F	M	Total	F %	M %
D-1	1	8	9	11.11%	88.89%
P-5	14	30	44	31.82%	68.18%
P-4	31	53	84	36.9%	63.10%
P-3	75	90	165	45.45%	54.55%
P-2	96	62	158	60.76%	39.24%
P-1	26	10	36	72.22%	27.78%
G-7	8	11	19	42.11%	57.89%
G-6	27	47	74	36.49%	63.51%
G-5	74	76	150	49.33%	50.67%
G-4	49	28	77	63.64%	36.36%
G-3	10	55	65	15.38%	84.62%
G-1	2	3	5	40.0%	60.0%
Total	413	473	886	46.61%	53.39%

As at 30 September 2016

Grade	F	M	Total	F %	M %
D-1	1	9	10	10.0%	90.0%
P-5	13	26	39	33.3%	66.7%
P-4	26	49	76	34.2%	64.5%
P-3	57	75	132	43.2%	56.8%
P-2	71	48	119	59.7%	40.3%
P-1	11	4	15	73.3%	26.7%
G-7	7	6	13	53.8%	46.2%
G-6	19	48	67	28.4%	71.6%
G-5	73	69	142	51.4%	48.6%
G-4	37	28	65	56.9%	43.1%
G-3	10	50	60	16.7%	83.3%
G-1	2	2	4	50.0%	50.0%
Total	327	414	742	44.1%	55.8%

As at 31 October 2015

Grade	F	M	Total	F %	M %
D-1	1	7	8	12.5%	87.5%
P-5	10	19	29	34.5%	65.5%
P-4	24	42	66	36.4%	63.6%
P-3	50	72	122	41.0%	59.0%
P-2	65	30	95	68.4%	31.6%
P-1	13	7	20	65.0%	35.0%
G-7	7	7	14	50.0%	50.0%
G-6	22	58	80	27.5%	72.5%
G-5	72	54	126	57.1%	42.9%
G-4	38	30	68	55.9%	44.1%
G-3	5	25	30	16.7%	83.3%
G-2	5	12	17	29.4%	70.6%
Total	312	363	675	46.2%	53.8%

As at 31 December 2014

Grade	F	M	Total	F %	M %
D-1	1	8	9	11.1%	88.9%
P-5	10	20	30	33.3%	66.7%
P-4	23	42	65	35.4%	64.6%
P-3	55	72	127	43.3%	56.7%
P-2	68	37	105	64.8%	35.2%
P-1	15	6	21	71.4%	28.6%
G-7	7	9	16	43.8%	56.3%
G-6	23	59	82	28.0%	72.0%
G-5	76	55	131	58.0%	42.0%
G-4	35	31	66	53.0%	47.0%
G-3	4	26	30	13.3%	86.7%
Total	317	365	682	46.5%	53.5%

3. Geographical distribution

Geographic representation - number of States Parties which are:³	31/12/2014	31/12/2015	31/12/2016	31/09/2017
OVER-REPRESENTED	26	29	27	27
IN BALANCE	14	19	11	20
UNDER-REPRESENTED	21	15	26	20
NON-REPRESENTED	61	60	60	57
STATES NOT PARTY TO RS	17	22	23	23
Total	139	145	147	147
TOTAL NUMBER OF STATES PARTIES REPRESENTED	61	63	64	67
Percentage of State Parties represented	50%	51%	52%	54%

³ It should be noted that the Court used a different methodology up to and including 2016 in relation to categorising under- and over-represented States. During that period, countries were considered under- and over-represented if they did not meet or were over a specific target number, even if their representation was still within the “desirable range”. Since 1 January 2017, as per established practice in other organisations, the States with representation within the “desirable range” are considered in balance.

Status of States Parties – Underrepresented and non-represented in their respective years

Country	Target representation to be in balance 2015	Difference to target representation (as at 31/12/15)	Target representation to be in balance 2016	Difference to target representation (as at 31/12/16)	Target representation to be in balance 2017	Difference to target representation (as at 01/01/17)	Difference to target representation (as at 30/09/17)	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REPRESENTATION (End 2015 and 30/09/2017)
Japan	36	-32	42	-35	41	-34	-34	+ 3 staff (from 4 to 7)
Brazil	12	-11	19	-17	18	-16	-16	+1 (from 1 to 2)
Germany	24	-13	28	-15	27	-14	-13	+3 (from 11 to 14)
Mexico	8	-5	8	-5	8	-5	-3	+2 (from 3 to 5)
Sweden	4	-3	5	-2	5	-2	-2	+2 (from 1 to 3)
Italy	15	-3	17	-3	17	0	0	+5 (from 12 to 17)
Poland	4	-3	5	-3	5	-1	-1	+3 (from 1 to 4)
Switzerland	4	-2	6	-3	6	-3	-4	+0 (from 2 to 2)
Argentina	3	0	5	-1	5	0	0	+2 (from 3 to 5)
Chile	2	-1	3	-2	3	-2	-2	+0 (from 1 to 1)
Denmark	3	-2	4	-2	4	-2	-2	+1 (from 1 to 2)
Greece	3	-1	3	-1	3	0	-1	+0 (from 2 to 2)
Venezuela	3	0	4	-2	4	-2	-2	-1 (from 3 to 2)
Philippines	2	-1	3	-1	3	0	0	+2 (from 1 to 3)
Nigeria	3	-1	4	0	4	0	0	+2 (from 2 to 4)
Bulgaria	1	0	2	-1	2	-1	-2	-1 (from 1 to 0)
Costa Rica	1	0	2	-1	2	-1	-1	+0 (from 1 to 1)
Cyprus	1	0	2	-1	2	-1	-1	+0 (from 1 to 1)
Burkina Faso	1	0	2	-1	2	-1	-1	+0 (from 1 to 1)
Zambia	1	-1	2	-1	2	-1	-1	+1 (from 0 to 1)
Malawi	1	0	2	-1	2	-1	-1	+0 (from 1 to 1)
Jordan	1	0	2	-1	2	-1	-1	+0 (from 1 to 1)
New Zealand	2	-1	3	-1	2	+1	+1	+2 (from 1 to 3)
Benin	1	0	2	-1	1	0	0	+0 (from 1 to 1)
Iceland	1	0	2	-1	1	0	-1	-1 (from 1 to 0)
Afghanistan	1	-1	2	-2	2	-1	-1	+1 (from 0 to 1)
Guatemala	1	-1	2	-2	2	-2	-1	+1 (from 0 to 1)
Republic of Korea	8	-8	10	-10	10	-9	-9	+1 (from 0 to 1)

III. Procurement

Facilities Management reports to the Committee on Budget and Finance of the Assembly on a yearly basis relevant performance- and workload indicators. The table below indicates a) the number and value of purchase orders and requisitions versus the number and value of items that had to go through the Procurement Review Committee; b) these aggregated activities vs. the amount of staff carrying out these tasks.

A. Workload indicators – activities for 2017 monthly

Overview of procurement activities in 2017 (as of September)

	<i>Jan</i>	<i>Feb</i>	<i>Mar</i>	<i>Apr</i>	<i>May</i>	<i>Jun</i>	<i>Jul</i>	<i>Aug</i>	<i>Sep</i>	<i>Oct</i>	<i>Nov</i>	<i>Dec</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
Number of Procurement Staff (fixed term)	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
Purchase Orders⁴ (POs)													
No of Pos in 2017	187	158	166	93	163	93	106	109	120				
No of POs previous year	154	155	144	125	112	126	63	91	101	178	271	204	1 724
Value of Pos in 2017	4 697 165	2 548 376	1 317 376	1 243 553	2 786 651	1 504 456	1 082 400	1 136 177	661 244				
Value of POs previous year	4 907 160	3 067 331	2 265 905	1 391 541	1 389 604	1 917 326	621 303	979 613	4 449 569	3 273 008	3 270 993	6 313 510	33 846 863
Requisitions⁵													
No of Requisitions	246	134	163	127	134	106	114	140	206				
Previous year	167	155	131	77	113	102	61	103	121	178	241	133	1 582
Procurement Review Committee⁶ (PRC)													
No of PRC in 2017	4	0	7	2	0	4	0	8	5				
No of PRC previous year	2	1	0	2	3	1	2	3	1	7	12	6	40
Value of PRC in 2017	2 642 281,20	0	1 205 946,50	2 122 072,97	0	3 146 930,68	0	1,449,454.67*	450,273.05*				
Value of PRC previous year	349 665	78 787	0	876 625	693 504	1 889 787	489 014	459 426	362 667	3 641 235	1 752 063	1 803 213,20	12 395 986

NB: In 2017 more sophisticated master contracts and consolidated tenders are developed to extract better value and rationalise the number of purchase requisitions and line items. The GHIP and SIDI (*) multi-year contract PRC value are not recorded as by September PRC work is in progress.

⁴ A purchase order is a formal document issued by the Procurement Unit and sent to a vendor to ratify a purchase once all conditions and details have been negotiated and agreed upon. It has the same legal status as a contract. It is an external purchase document.

⁵ A Requisition or a purchase requisition (PR) is a request from a Section to Procurement Unit to procure a certain quantity of a material or a service so that it is available at a certain point in time. It is an internal document. It is not used outside the enterprise.

⁶ Procurement Review Committee, established by the Registrar, renders written advice to the Registrar on procurement actions leading to the award or amendment of procurement contracts exceeding €50,000.00, Procurement contracts such as agreements, purchase orders, and contracts that involve income to the Court.

B. Workload indicators – activities for 2016 monthly

Overview of procurement activities in 2016

	<i>Jan</i>	<i>Feb</i>	<i>Mar</i>	<i>Apr</i>	<i>May</i>	<i>Jun</i>	<i>Jul</i>	<i>Aug</i>	<i>Sep</i>	<i>Oct</i>	<i>Nov</i>	<i>Dec</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
Number of Procurement Staff (fixed term)	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
Purchase Orders (POs)													
No of Pos in 2016	154	155	144	125	112	126	63	91	101	178	271	204	1 724
No of POs previous year	213	155	148	112	122	109	114	96	106	123	132	95	1 525
Value of Pos in 2016	4 907 160	3 067 331	2 265 905	1 391 541	1 389 604	1 917 326	621 303	979 613	4 449 569	3 273 008	3 270 993	6 313 510	33 846 863
Value of POs previous year	5 724 959	8 752 567	17 815 135	13 318 453	11 226 815	3 692 474	9 932 198	7 487 919	2 676 295	3 634 079	3 520 365	3 633 519	91 414 778
Requisitions													
No of Requisitions	167	155	131	77	113	102	61	103	121	178	241	133	1582
Previous year	357	172	146	134	131	128	113	110	132	181	203	188	1 995
Procurement Review Committee (PRC)													
No of PRC in 2016	2	1	0	2	3	1	2	3	1	7	12	6	40
No of PRC previous year	1	1	1	4	1	3	6	6	1	4	5	0	33
Value of PRC in 2016	349 665	78 787	0	876 625	693 504	1 889 787	489 014	459 426	362 667	3 641 235	1 752 063	1 803 213,20	12 395 986
Value of PRC previous year	2 100 000	223 580	95 400	361 700	75 000	737 308	2 359 287	1 427 128	98 400	4 942 318	784 401	0	13 204 522

NB: In 2015 and partially in 2016 due to the exceptional magnitude, complexity and intricacies of the Unified Project (Court's permanent premises Construction project and Transition projects) for the new head quarter building and premises in The Hague, temporary consultancy procurement resources were used by the Project Director to drive effectively the procurement. Therefore subsequent adjustments were made to procurement processes and PRC thresholds.

C. Workload indicators – activities for 2015 monthly

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total (year)
Number of Procurement Staff	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
<u>Procurement</u>													
<u>Purchase Orders</u>													
No of Pos	213	155	148	112	122	109	114	96	106	123	132	95	1 525
No of Pos previous year	356	260	200	147	147	147	130	113	151	176	206	146	2 179
Value of Pos	5724959	8752567	17815135	13318453	11226815	3692474	9932198	7487919	2676295	3634079	3520365	3633519	91 414 778
Value of Pos previous year	5111927	103636284	1447824	1675611	1280431	1901048	1762093	2689314	1305111	1838703	1739892	30080516	154 468 754
<u>Requisitions</u>													
No of Requisitions	357	172	146	134	131	128	113	110	132	181	203	188	1 995
Previous year	298	161	141	126	122	112	123	100	153	218	244	167	1 965
<u>PRC</u>													
No of PRC	1	1	1	4	1	3	6	6	1	4	5	0	33
No of PRC previous year	3	1	0	3	1	1	7	1	2	5	2	4	30
Value of PRC	2100000	223580	95400	361700	75000	737308	2359287	1427128	98400	4942318	784401	0	13 204 522
Value of PRC previous year	1208717	1540000	0	599742	65000	1105160	1474668	100200	4746800	645367	385719	1447797	13 319 170

D. Workload indicators – activities for 2014 monthly

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total (year)
Number of Procurement Staff	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
<u>Procurement</u>													
<u>Purchase Orders</u>													
No of Pos	356	260	200	147	147	147	130	113	151	176	206	146	2 179
No of Pos previous year	244	142	134	109	112	103	101	74	114	162	197	139	1 631
Value of Pos	5111927	103636284	1447824	1675611	1280431	1901048	1762093	2689314	1305111	1838703	1739892	30080516	154 468 754
Value of Pos previous year	47525307	1795962	2415781	2950898	1303056	1937376	1103984	508109	1237013	4347900	1949827	4577189	71 652 402
<u>Requisitions</u>													
No of Requisitions	357	172	146	134	131	128	113	110	132	181	203	188	1 995
Previous year	298	161	141	126	122	112	123	100	153	218	244	167	1 965
<u>PRC</u>													
No of PRC	3	1	0	3	1	1	7	1	2	5	2	4	30
No of PRC previous year	1	2	4	2	10	6	2	1	3	5	7	6	49
Value of PRC	1208717	1540000	0	599742	65000	1105160	1474668	100200	4746800	645367	385719	1447797	13 319 170
Value of PRC previous year	500000	500777	2615533	90000	2047479	3215000	83000	1E+07	484500	458115	943047	1848000	22 985 451

44

Annex III – THIRD GOAL: The Court ensures adequate security for its work, including protection of those at risk from involvement with the Court

I. PHYSICAL AND ASSET SECURITY (IN THE FIELD AND AT HEADQUARTERS)..... 46

A. HAS THE COURT IMPLEMENTED AN APPROPRIATE/PROPORTIONATE THREAT MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME?..... 46

1. Adequacy and intervals of training of security personnel..... 46

2. Mission-specific indicators 47

3. Substantive security and safety related incidents 2014-17 48

B. WHEN A RISK MANIFESTS ITSELF, HAS THE COURT’S SECURITY FRAMEWORK PROVEN ADEQUATE IN THE CIRCUMSTANCES? 48

II. IT SECURITY (IN THE FIELD AND AT HEADQUARTERS) 49

A. THREAT LEVEL..... 49

B. HAS THE COURT IMPLEMENTED AN ADEQUATE/PROPORTIONAL INFORMATION SECURITY PROGRAM?..... 49

C. WHEN A RISK MANIFESTS ITSELF, HAS THE COURT’S SECURITY FRAMEWORK PROVEN ADEQUATE IN THE CIRCUMSTANCES?..... 50

I. Physical and asset security (in the field and at Headquarters)

A. Has the Court implemented an appropriate/proportionate threat management programme?

1. Adequacy and intervals of training of security personnel

	Amount of security trainings	Topic of training	Implementation
2017 ⁷	66 Security Officers (ongoing) 2 Security specialists 2 Analysts 6 ICC Field Security personnel 35 ICC Staff	Mandatory training ⁸ Specialised training ⁹ Extra training ¹⁰ Field training ¹¹ Field training ¹²	100% (expected) 50 % (100% expected) 100 % N/A N/A
2016 ¹³	60 Security Officers 1 ICC security officers 0 ICC Security field staff	Mandatory training Extra training ¹⁴ Field training	88 % 100 % N/A ¹⁵
2015	13 Security pioneer group for Permanent Premises 45 Security officers at Interim Premises 53 ICC Security officers ¹⁶ 7 ICC Security field staff ¹⁷	Mandatory training Mandatory training Extra training Field training	100% 93% 100% 66%
2014	47 Security Officers 10 ICC security staff ¹⁸ 11 ICC Security field staff ¹⁹	Mandatory training Extra training Field training	86% 100% 57%

⁷ As of 30 September 2017.

⁸ Mandatory includes firearms, first aid, fire & safety and security screening (X-ray) training. All security personnel at the headquarters have completed the UN Active Shooter training.

⁹ UN Close Protection training

¹⁰ UN Strategic Analysis Warning training.

¹¹ All ICC field security personnel have received the basic training in their current functions. For additional training, field security personnel have access to the UN online organised training courses. Other specialist training, such as firearms training, has been provided by Security and Safety Section. 1 Field Security Officer completed the Security Certification Program (UN course for field security personnel).

¹² 35 ICC personnel travelling to the high risk areas in the field have completed the Secure and Safety Approaches in the Field Environment (SSAFE) training provided together with the Dutch authorities.

¹³ The values of last year's report have been updated as of 31 December 2016.

¹⁴ Train the trainer (ToT) for the Safe and Secure approaches in field environment training (SSAFE).

¹⁵ All ICC Field Security Personnel have received the basic training in their current functions. For additional training, field security personnel have access to the UN online organised training courses. Other specialist training, such as firearms training, is to be sought locally with the UNSMS partners.

¹⁶ 2 Emergency Trauma bag training, 5 ToT for Arrest and Restraint training, 2 Security Certification Program (UN course for field security personnel), 1 Intermediate Training Program (UN course for senior field security personnel), 1 Firearms Training Officer Course and 42 Briefing by the Dutch Security authorities.

¹⁷ Firearms training for field security personnel at headquarters. The ICC Field Security personnel are not armed and the training has been maintained as a contingency measure.

¹⁸ 2 UN Close protection training, 2 Security Certification Program (UN course for field security personnel), 2 Firearms Training Officer Course, 1 ToT SSAFE, 2 SSAFE in the field and 1 UN Hostage Incident Management course.

¹⁹ Firearms training for field security personnel at headquarters. The ICC Field Security personnel are not armed and the training has been maintained as a contingency measure.

2. Mission-specific indicators

Both the Office of the Prosecutor and the Registry carry out missions in the field. Common indicators are as follows:

- Has there been a mission briefing?
- When engaging with external actors, has regular protocol been followed?

The following table measures **Registry** field missions:

	Overall amount of missions²⁰	Missions with previous full briefing	Implementation %
2016 ²¹	278	264-278	95-100%
2015	608	578-608	95-100%
2014	538	511-538	95-100%
2013	515	489-515	95-100%
2012	505	480-505	95-100%
2011	539	512-539	95-100%
2010	414	393-414	95-100%

This data is based on estimations from the Field Offices (FO). 95 to 100% of the Registry staff attend the security briefing upon arrival.

All ICC staff, including Registry staff, must attend the security briefing upon arrival and a wide range of strategies are used by the FOs to ensure their attendance to said compulsory security briefings. On an exceptional basis, in-country security briefings may be cancelled or re-scheduled by the Security Officer due to circumstances beyond their control. When such cases happen, the Security Officers make relevant security arrangements with the UN. The occasions when/where security briefings are not provided to staff are an exception. By way of mitigating measures, through established mission planning processes, staff are provided with the contact details of the Security Officer and Field Office personnel in-country.

For reasons of protection of individuals and requirements of confidentiality, figures as to the absolute number of potential witnesses reached out to by the **Office of the Prosecutor** per year/situation cannot be disclosed. Not all OTP missions relate to witness contact; those that do have 100% implementation as regards the observance of witness protocol.

²⁰ Number of Registry Missions. One mission can include several travellers.

²¹ Up to 18 October 2016

3. Substantive security and safety related incidents 2014-17

Incident	2014		2015		2016 ²²		2017 ²³	
	HQ	Field	HQ	Field	HQ	Field	HQ	Field
Death of staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arrest of staff	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assault	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Burglary	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0
Fire alarm	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lost property	9	1	13	3	9	4	36	5
Physical security breach	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Property damage	3	3	2	3	4	3	11	0
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0
Suspicious incident	2	2	8	1	1	1	3	0
Theft	4	0	2	0	0	0	1	1
Traffic accident ²⁴	1	12	7	3	1	4	3	0

B. When a risk manifests itself, has the Court's security framework proven adequate in the circumstances?

	Number of security incidents that that led to harm due to the Court's error	Number of these incidents where a 'lesson learnt' assessment followed	Comments
2017 ²⁵	0	N/A	
2016 ²⁶	0	N/A	Relevant data collection has commenced in 2016

²² The values of last year's report have been updated as of 31 December 2016.

²³ As of 30 September 2017.

²⁴ No injuries or harm to ICC personnel or others, only damage to vehicle(s).

²⁵ As of 30 September 2017.

²⁶ The values of last year's report have been updated as of 31 December 2016.

II. IT security (in the field and at Headquarters)

A. Threat level

The table below indicates the number of substantive incidents²⁷ that have occurred during the period 2014-2017. These performance indicators provide only a limited perspective of the effectiveness of the information security program as they do not provide an indication of the efficiency obtained against a backdrop of continuous and persistent attacks.

	2014	2015	2016 ²⁸	2017 ²⁹
Denial of service	1	2	4	4
Malware infection	1	1	3	0
Storage media theft/loss	3	3	2	1
Unauthorised data access	4	4	2	0
Unauthorised disclosure	5	4	2	1

Placing the above data into context, the following table includes an indication of the number of attacks that are detected and stopped by the Court prior to being successful and causing a substantive incident.

	Per month (2016)	Per month (2017)
Scans and probes	1,000,000	38,000,000 ³⁰
Spam / phishing /malicious email	10,000	1,300,000 ³¹
Malware infection	600	600
Document handling errors	10	10

B. Has the Court implemented an adequate/proportional information security program?

To counter the cyber-threats facing the Court's wide and distributed IT infrastructure, the Court deploys, in accordance with the assessed risks, numerous defensive, detective and awareness controls configured to achieve a defence-in-depth. However, cyber security is a rapidly evolving realm, requiring new and sometimes innovative methods to identify and counter the ever-increasing range and sophistication of attack methods.

²⁷ Substantive incidents are defined as those where there has been a discernible non-trivial adverse impact upon the information security goals and objectives of the Court or its Organs and Sections, either collectively or individually, caused by an act or omission of any party.

²⁸ The value of last year's report has been updated as of 31 December 2016.

²⁹ As of 30 September 2017.

³⁰ Significant increase in scan and probe detection is the direct result of planned enhancements to the ICC traffic inspection and monitoring capability resulting from ongoing assessment of cyber threats. Previous records summarised identical attacks.

³¹ Significant increase in malicious email detection is the direct result of planned enhancements to the ICC email hygiene technology following increase of ransomware attacks in 2016. Previous records summarised identical attack campaigns.

	Number of relevant software updates detected ³²	Number of relevant software updates carried out	Implementation	Comments
2017 ³³	Microsoft – 318 Other - 168	Microsoft – 318 Other - 168	100%	
2016 ³⁴	Microsoft – 31 Other - 43	Microsoft – 31 Other - 43	100%	
2016 ³⁵	Microsoft – 116 Other - 187	Microsoft – 116 Other - 187	100%	Software patches are made available to the ICC by software vendors and are implemented each month by ICC
2015	Microsoft – 135 Other - 204	Microsoft – 135 Other - 204	100%	
2014	Microsoft – 85 Other - 115	Microsoft – 85 Other - 115	100%	

C. When a risk manifests itself, has the Court’s security framework proven adequate in the circumstances?

	Number of substantive incidents ³⁶	Number of incidents leading to harm	Immediate counter measures taken	Lessons learnt process carried out	Implementation / Comments
2017 ³⁷	6	6	6	6	100%
2016 ³⁸	13	13	13	13	100%
2015	14	14	14	14	100%
2014	14	14	14	14	100%

It should be noted that the substantive incidents indicated above are those where a discernible non-trivial adverse impact occurred, affecting the information security goals and objectives of the Court or its Organs and Sections, either collectively or individually, caused by an act or omission of any party. The number of substantive incidents occurring each year represents a very small percentage of the number of events and potential incidents that are detected.

³² This table shows whether or not the software patch management process is operating adequately

³³ As of 30 September 2017.

³⁴ From 1 October to 31 December 2016.

³⁵ As of September 2016.

³⁶ E.g. denial of service, malware infection, storage media theft/loss, unauthorised data access, unauthorised disclosure.

³⁷ As of 30 September 2017.

³⁸ The values of last year’s report have been updated as of 31 December 2016.

Annex IV – FOURTH GOAL: Victims have access to the Court

I. MEANINGFUL VICTIM PARTICIPATION (INFORMATION, APPLICATION, LEGAL REPRESENTATION, AND MODALITIES OF PARTICIPATION).....	52
A. INDICATORS PER PHASE OF A CASE - NUMBER OF VICTIMS PARTICIPATING BY PHASE OF PROCEEDINGS AS OF 30 SEPTEMBER 2017	52
B. VICTIM LEGAL REPRESENTATION - NUMBER OF VICTIMS REPRESENTED BY THE OPCV AND/OR EXTERNAL VICTIMS’ REPRESENTATIVES PER CASE AT TRIAL	53
C. NUMBER OF FIELD TRIPS OF COURT-APPOINTED LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF VICTIMS	54
1. Number of field trips of court-appointed legal representatives of victims (OPCV Counsel and field assistants).....	54
2. Number of field trips of court-appointed external legal representatives of victims.....	55
D. NUMBER OF APPOINTMENTS AND MISSIONS UNDERTAKEN BY DUTY/AD HOC COUNSEL/ AND RULE 74 COUNSEL 2012-2017	56
II. REPARATIONS AND ASSISTANCE.....	57
A. NUMBER OF VICTIMS FOR EACH CASE BENEFITTING FROM REPARATIONS PROJECTS DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD.....	57
B. NUMBER OF VICTIMS BENEFITTING FROM ASSISTANCE MANDATE-RELATED TFV PROJECTS VS. OVERALL NUMBER OF VICTIMS	57
III. ICC FIELD PRESENCE	58
NUMBER OF ICC SITUATIONS IN WHICH THE COURT HAS ESTABLISHED A FIELD OFFICE.....	58
IV. IN-COUNTRY OUTREACH AND PUBLIC INFORMATION.....	59
A. NUMBER OF EVENTS ORGANIZED BY THE COURT’S OUTREACH UNIT, AND THE LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION.....	59
B. NUMBER OF HOURS OF RADIO AND TV BROADCASTS OF AUDIO-VISUAL PRODUCTIONS ON THE ICC	59
C. ESTIMATED POPULATION REACHED THROUGH RADIO AND TELEVISION	60
D. NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS GIVEN IN THE FIELD TO LOCAL MEDIA	60

I. Meaningful victim participation (information, application, legal representation, and modalities of participation)

A. Indicators per phase of a case - number of victims participating by phase of proceedings as of 30 September 2017

Number of victims participating by phase of proceedings	Pre-trial phase	Trial phase	Appeals phase	Reparations
Lubanga Case – ICC-01/04-01/06	7	120	151	442 ³⁹
Katanga Case – ICC-01/04-01/07	N/A	307	N/A	297 ⁴⁰
Ntaganda Case – ICC-01/04-02/06	1 119	2 142	N/A	N/A
Bemba Case – ICC-01/05-01/08	55	5 229	N/A	5 569 ⁴¹
Gbagbo and Blé Goudé Case – ICC-02/11-01/15	N/A ⁴²	726	N/A	N/A
Ongwen Case – ICC-02/04-01/15	2 026	4 100	N/A	N/A
Al-Mahdi Case – ICC/01/15-01/15	N/A	8	N/A	139 ⁴³

³⁹ No order or decision by the Chamber as of 30 September 2017; the figure provided accounts for the reparation forms filed on the record of the case.

⁴⁰ 297 victims eligible to receive reparations as per Chamber order of 24 March 2017.

⁴¹ Approximate figure; no order or decision by the Chamber as of 30 September 2017. The figure provided accounts for victims presently admitted to participate in the proceedings and those applicants who filed separate application forms for reparations, which have been transmitted to the Defence, in accordance with rule 94 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (Annex I to the Registry's observations pursuant to Trial Chamber Order ICC-01/05-01/08-3410 of 22 July 2016 – ICC-01/05-01/08-3460-Conf-AnxI).

⁴² The *Gbagbo* case and the *Blé Goudé* case were joined after the confirmation of charges in each case; thus no "Pre-trial" phase in the joint case.

⁴³ No order or decision by the Chamber as of 30 September 2017; the figure provided accounts for the reparation forms filed on the record of the case.

B. Victim legal representation - number of victims represented by the OPCV and/or external victims' representatives per case at trial

Case	Number of Victims Represented by External Victims' Representatives⁴⁴	Number of Victims Represented by the OPCV⁴⁵
Lubanga Case – ICC-01/04-01/06	151	283
Katanga Case – ICC-01/04-01/07	283	37
Ntaganda Case – ICC-01/04-02/06	0	2 142
Bemba Case – ICC-01/05-01/08	5 229	488
Gbagbo and Blé Goudé Case – ICC-02/11-01/15	0	728
Ongwen Case – ICC-02/04-01/15	2 598	1 516
Al-Madhi Case – ICC-01/12-01/15	139	0

⁴⁴ As of 30 September 2017.

⁴⁵ As of 15 September 2017.

C. Number of field trips of Court-appointed legal representatives of victims

1. Number of field trips of court-appointed legal representatives of victims (OPCV Counsel and field assistants)

The table lists all trips undertaken for the purpose of legal representation by members of the OPCV, whether they are based in The Hague (lead counsel) or in the field (assistant field counsel or field counsel). Local trips are underlined (local trips are understood as trips within the same situation country) and international are indicated in **bold** (international trips are understood as trips across continents and within Europe). It must be noted that the number of *trips* cannot equal the number of *missions* undertaken since in some instances several members of the OPCV travelled together to undertake a common mission.

Cases	Number of field trips of OPCV Court-appointed legal representatives of victims								Comments
	2017 ⁴⁶		2016		2015		2014		
Ongwen	2	<u>5</u>	6	<u>6</u>	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	The field counsel is based in Kampala and needs to travel to the Gulu area. She sometimes to The Hague
	6 missions		9 missions		1 mission				
Gbagbo & Blé Goudé	2	N/A	6	N/A	8	N/A	10	N/A	The assistant field counsel is based in Abidjan so no local trips are warranted. He sometimes travels to The Hague.
	2 missions		4 missions		6 missions		7 missions		
Ntaganda	8	<u>8</u>	9	<u>9</u>	17	<u>10</u>	16	<u>17</u>	2 counsel, assisted by 2 field counsel, are appointed and undertake different missions. The two field counsel are based in DRC but not in Bunia and sometimes travel to The Hague.
	11 missions		11 missions		19 missions		21 missions		
Bemba (reparations)	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No field counsel appointed yet
	2 missions								
Katanga (reparations)	N/A	<u>1</u>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	1 mission								
Lubanga (reparations)	3	<u>4</u>	3	<u>2</u>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The field counsel is based in DRC but needs to travel to Bunia. She sometimes travels to The Hague.
	4 missions		4 missions						

⁴⁶ Up to 15 October 2017.

2. Number of field trips of court-appointed external legal representatives of victims

Local trips are underlined (local trips are trips within the same situation country) and international are indicated in **bold** (international trips are trips from The Hague or elsewhere to the field).

Cases	Number of field trips of Court-appointed legal representatives of victims								Comments
	2017		2016		2015		2014		
Ongwen	2	<u>7</u>	1		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3 team members (Counsel & 2 field assistants), located in the field, travelled on mission within Uganda
	7 missions		1 mission		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Bemba (reparations)	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	N/A	2	N/A	Counsel and team members travelled from The Hague
	4 missions		5 missions		4 missions		2 missions		
Katanga (reparations)	8	<u>3</u>	3	<u>3</u>	3	<u>5</u>	11	<u>4</u>	Counsel and team members travelled from Brussels and The Hague. One staff is located in the field
	8 missions		5 missions		9 missions		11 missions		
Al Mahdi ⁴⁷	3		4		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Counsel travelled from The Hague and once from Paris
	3 missions		4 missions		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

⁴⁷ New team as of June 2016

D. Number of appointments and missions undertaken by Duty/ad hoc Counsel/ and Rule 74 Counsel 2012-2017

			<i>Situation breakdown</i>							
Year	Appointments	Trips to the field	<i>CIV</i>	<i>DRC</i>	<i>CAR</i>	<i>MLI</i>	<i>UGA</i>	Appointment to counsel in the field	% of trips required for appointments	Comments
2012	25	24	5	11	4	0	0	1	96%	The lower the percentage, the less field trips have become necessary due to appointment of counsel in the field for relevant assignments
2013	45	22	5	9	8	0	0	23	47%	
2014	44	28	9	6	2	6	0	16	60%	
2015	59	34	13	5	9	2	2	25	54%	
2016	48	24	11	9	15	9	4	24	50%	
2017	67	23	24	3	5	16	19	44	65%	

II. Reparations and assistance

A. Number of victims for each case benefitting from reparations projects during the reporting period

None, as no reparations have started as of yet.

B. Number of victims benefitting from assistance mandate-related TFV projects vs. overall number of victims

DRC / Uganda	Until 2016	Comments
Number of victims benefitting directly	70,667	There is no comparator available as to the total number of victims potentially eligible for assistance in the northern Uganda and DRC situations
Number of victims benefitting indirectly	230,641	

DRC / Uganda / CIV	Until 30 September 2017	Comments
Number of victims benefitting directly	101,970	
Number of victims benefitting indirectly	260,626	

Relevant comparator	Relevant value	Comments
Number of locally based TFV implementing partners 2008-2016	31	In the DRC and Uganda situations
Amount of financial resources available at the TFV in 2016	€12.7 million	
Amount of TFV reparations reserve of the TFV in 2016	€5 million	
Amount of TFV complement to payment of reparations awards	€1 million	Lubanga case; allocated from reparations reserve; not yet spent pending approval of DIP
Amount of TFV non-obligated TFV resources	€725,000	As at October 2016

Relevant comparator	Relevant value	Comments
Number of locally based TFV implementing partners 2008-2017	31	From 2008 TFV contracted 31 implementing partners. However only 9 are still active in Uganda .In DRC 5 that was 5 active in last year reporting period closed in May 2017. A next programme cycle is underway to select new projects and implementing partners through an extensive competitive bidding procedure.
Amount of financial resources available at the TFV in 2017	€16.7 million	
Amount of TFV reparations reserve of the TFV in 2017	€5.5 million	
Amount of TFV complement to payment of reparations awards	TFV Board of Directors commitments to complement reparations awards: €1 million in the <i>Lubanga</i> case USD 1 million in the <i>Katanga</i> case	TFV Board of Directors is yet to decide on complement in Al Mahdi case, where the Court has set liability at €2.3 million, declaring Mr Al Mahdi indigent
Amount of TFV non-obligated TFV resources	€0.75 million	

III. ICC field presence

Number of ICC situations in which the Court has established a field office⁴⁸

		2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
DRC⁴⁹	Field Office	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Field Forward Office (Bunia)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Uganda	Field Office	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Field Forward Office											
Cote d'Ivoire	Field Office	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
	Field Forward Office											
CAR	Field Office	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Field Forward Office											
Kenya	Field Office	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
	Field Forward Office											
Sudan (From Chad)⁵⁰	Field Office (Abeche)							Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Field Forward Office (N'Djamena)							Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Libya	Field Office											
	Field Forward Office											
Mali (Low footprint)	Field Office	Yes	Yes	Yes								
	Field Forward Office											
Georgia (2017) (low footprint)⁵¹	Field Office											
	Field Forward Office											

⁴⁸ Either in-country or nearby when country option is not possible due to security concerns.

⁴⁹ There are two Field Offices : Kinshasa since 2005 and Bunia since 2006.

⁵⁰ Established presence in Chad. The main Field Office opened in Abeche in 2005. In 2006, the Court opened a smaller forward field office in N'Djamena. The Court remained in country until December 2011.

⁵¹ Field Office in Georgia will be opened during the last quarter of 2017.

IV. In-country outreach and public information

A. Number of events organized by the Court's Outreach Unit, and the level of participation

Situation country		2014	2015	2016 ⁵²	2017 ⁵³
DRC	Events	192	126	81	66
	Population reached directly	15 818	7 802	3 412	3 968
Uganda	Events	60	136	101	114
	Population reached directly	1 150	9 850	39 091	33 130
CAR	Events	1	14	148	17
	Population reached directly	22	554	1 260	608
Côte-d'Ivoire	Events	6	136	4	12
	Population reached directly	266	1 313	262	678
Kenya	Events	31	7	5	N/A
	Population reached directly	1 125	101	169	N/A
Mali	Events	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Population reached directly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Libya	Events	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Population reached directly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	Events	N/A	N/A	10	12
	Population reached directly	N/A	N/A	165	148

B. Number of hours of radio and TV broadcasts of audio-visual productions on the ICC

Situation country	2014	2015	2016 ⁵⁴	2017 ⁵⁵
DRC	182	42	106	94
Uganda	88	100	152	17
CAR	19	146	195	76
Côte-d'Ivoire	2,5	25	0	211
Kenya	29	2	3	N/A
Mali	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Libya	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	N/A	N/A	0	0

⁵² The values of last year's report have been updated as of 31 December 2016.

⁵³ As of 30 September 2017.

⁵⁴ The values of last year's report have been updated as of 31 December 2016.

⁵⁵ As of 30 September 2017.

C. Estimated population reached through radio and television

(number of projections of video programmes)

Situation country	2014	2015	2016 ⁵⁶	2017 ⁵⁷
DRC	107	71	43	107
Uganda	0	6	25	38
CAR	2	26	33	83
Côte-d'Ivoire	8	19	0	10
Kenya	31	10	0	N/A
Mali	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Libya	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	N/A	N/A	0	9

D. Number of interviews given in the field to local media⁵⁸

Situation country	2014	2015	2016 ⁵⁹	2017 ⁶⁰
DRC	417	217	289	107
Uganda	4	186	101	38
CAR	15	55	144	83
Côte-d'Ivoire	21	54	0	10
Kenya	221	36	40	N/A
Mali	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Libya	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	N/A	N/A	8	9

⁵⁶ The values of last year's report have been updated as of 31 December 2016.

⁵⁷ As of 30 September 2017.

⁵⁸ The values do not include interviews given at the HQ to local media.

⁵⁹ The values of last year's report have been updated as of 31 December 2016.

⁶⁰ As of 30 September 2017.