



Requester	Gilles Dutertre
Request Date	April 1, 2020
Situation	Mali
FSS Examiner	Forensic Officer Amy Hak
Date of Report	April 09, 2020
Relevant Reference	Area of Timbuktu, Mali
Request:	Forensic Video Analysis Image Comparison Analysis
Location 7	Addendum to Forensic Video Analysis report registered under MLI-OTP-0069-9281 This additional image comparison analysis refers to Location 7) Hôtel La Maison.

**AmyLynn Hak, Forensic Officer (Certified Forensic Video Analyst)
Forensic Science Section, Investigation Division
Officer of the Prosecutor, International Criminal Court**

Table of Contents

1. Introduction, Initial Information and Request	2
2. Technical Examination	3
3. Forensic Image Comparison	4
4. Evaluation	6
5. Conclusions	7
Annex 7A: Addendum Location 7 Comparison Analysis Charts (PowerPoint Slides)	9
Annex 8: Comparison Analysis Conclusion Scale and Definitions	10
Annex 9: Instructions and Forensic Video Analysis Tools	11
Annex 11: Glossary of Terms and Acronyms	12
Annex 12: Mission Letter	14
Annex 13: Mission Letter Addendum	24

1. Introduction, Initial Information and Request

In April 2020, at the time of this report, I am working as a Forensic Officer in the Forensic Science Section (FSS) of the Office of the Prosecutor (OTP) at the International Criminal Court (ICC). Part of my role in the FSS involves forensic video analysis.¹ I understand that my duty as a Forensic Officer and potential expert witness is to assist the ICC by providing impartial, objective, unbiased, and independent opinions uninfluenced by the requestor of services or any person who might be calling me as a potential witness. I have complied with and will continue to fulfil this duty to the best of my abilities.

On 1 April 2020, I received a mission letter addendum² to the original mission letter³ dated 26 August 2019 from Gilles Dutertre, Senior Trial Lawyer within the OTP of the ICC, that requested an additional forensic video analysis and image comparison be completed in the investigation in the situation of Mali. The addendum letter stated that the questioned videos examined and analysed in my report registered under MLI-OTP-0069-9281, Location 7) Hôtel La Maison, were to be compared

¹ Forensic video analysis is the scientific examination, comparison, and/or evaluation of video in legal matters.

² Annex 13 Addendum Mission Letter dated 1 April 2020.

³ Annex 12 Mission Letter dated 26 August 2019.

to an additional known panorama image MLI-OTP-0069-7347. I was advised that only the questioned videos, which depicted an interior scene, were to be compared to the additional known panorama image and not the questioned still images.

On 1 April 2020, I requested and obtained MLI-OTP-0069-7347 known panorama image from the Information and Evidence Unit (IEU). The panorama image was the only image that I received; the original still images used for the panorama image were not provided. After an email to inquire about the original still images used to create the panorama image, I was advised by Gilles Dutertre to inquire with [REDACTED] Forensic Officer in the ISS of the ICC, who created the panorama image. I was provided with the list of original still image ERN numbers and requested copies of the original still images from the IEU. The ERN numbers were as follows: MLI-OTP-0006-2074 to MLI-OTP-0006-2109 (36 images total). I received copies of the original still images labeled DSC_0538.JPG to DSC_0573.JPG (36 images total) as well as the converted .tif image duplicates, labeled with ERN numbers MLI-OTP-0006-2074 to MLI-OTP-0006-2109. The copies of the original known images, labeled DSC_0538 to DSC_0573, are the best quality versions of the still images and will be used in this image comparison.

2. Technical Examination

The questioned video technical examination was performed and reported on in the report registered under MLI-OTP-0069-9281 and is as follows:

A. Location 7 – Hôtel La Maison

The following questioned video files labelled "Hôtel La Maison" Location 7 were examined for technical integrity: MLI-OTP-0018-0102, MLI-OTP-0018-0249, and MLI-OTP-0018-0289. All three video files were interlaced scanned and were deinterlaced according to the information provided in the metadata information as indicated in Annex 1.⁴ MLI-OTP-0018-0102 and MLI-OTP-0018-0249

⁴ Annex 1: Technical Information of Multimedia Files_MALI (Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet).

were resized to display at the correct aspect ratio. MLI-OTP-0018-0249 was edited to combine several different clips of video. MLI-OTP-0018-0289 also consisted of several video clips combine into one video file and appeared to have been transcoded to an incorrect 16:9 aspect ratio. Therefore, the video was cropped and resized to correctly display video. Still images were captured from the videos, clarifications (brightness and contrast) were made if necessary and used in the image comparison charts.

3. Forensic Image Comparison

See original report registered under MLI-OTP-0069-9281 for general information regarding image comparison.

A. Location 7 – Hôtel La Maison

Questioned Multimedia Content Analysis

This section of the report should be read in conjunction with Annex 7A.⁵

Questioned Videos: MLI-OTP-0018-0102, MLI-OTP-0018-0249, and MLI-OTP-0018-0289

Class characteristics of these videos included an interior room without furniture. The walls were light in colour and there were electrical sockets at various heights and locations. There was a bright, backlit, window noted in all three videos. There was a [REDACTED]

Individualizing characteristics included damage to the walls, window frame and electrical sockets. Individualizing characteristics of this event included [REDACTED]

⁵ Annex 7A Addendum Location 7 Comparison Analysis Charts

Comparison Analysis of Questioned Multimedia with Known Imagery

MLI-OTP-0018-0102 was compared with known image DSC_0548 in Annex 7A, slide 12. Similar class characteristics included the light coloured walls and the relative the positions of the window and the electrical socket (noted with white circle).

MLI-OTP-0018-0249 was compared with known image DSC_0548. Similar class characteristics included the light coloured walls, relative position and size of the window, and position of both electrical sockets (noted with blue and white circles). [Annex 7A, slide 13 and 15]

Similar individualizing characteristics included the position of two areas of damage to the lower right side of the window frame, (noted with orange arrows). [Annex 7A, slide 13]

MLI-OTP-0018-0249 was compared with known image DSC_0539. An attempt was made to compare the damage to the wall, however there are many more areas of damage on the known wall than is noted in the questioned image and the known image does not show the same area of the wall under the window. [Annex 7A, slide 14]

MLI-OTP-0018-0289 was compared with known image DSC_0548. Similar class characteristics included the light coloured walls and the position of the electrical socket (noted with a white circle). [Annex 7A, slide 16]

Individualizing characteristics, dark spots or damage to the walls and lower right corner of the window, were noted in MLI-OTP-0018-0289. The damage to the lower right corner of the window is rounded around the corner. There is an area of rounded damage observed in the known image DSC_0548, as well (both marked with orange arrows). [Annex 7A, slide 17] The multitude of damage and dark spots observed in the known image made a comparison analysis of the spots in the questioned image unfeasible.

4. Evaluation

A. Location 7 – Hôtel La Maison

Questioned videos MLI-OTP-0018-0102, MLI-OTP-0018-0249 and MLI-OTP-0018-0289 all appeared to be the same interior room. MLI-OTP-0018-0102 and MLI-OTP-0018-0249 both showed a wide field of view that included the window and a portion of a [REDACTED] [Annex 7A, slides 3 to 7]. [REDACTED] in all three videos, which enables the third video (MLI-OTP-0018-0289) to be included in this location and event despite the narrow field of view that does not include the window [REDACTED] in all of the clips [Annex 7A, slides 8 to 10]. The class characteristics of the carpet were similar in all three questioned videos, as well.

Many class characteristics are in agreement and noted in the image comparison section of this report. A notable difference in the questioned videos when compared to the known images was the lighting conditions regarding the window. The window noted in the questioned videos was backlit (bright light from the window causes details of the window to be overexposed) and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] the window in some of the questioned video clips, whereas the lighting in the known images was such that the window frame and details were visible [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Due to the overexposed lighting on the window, details of the window frame could not be compared.

Individualizing characteristics were noted in the questioned videos including some dark spots or areas of damage on the walls. These areas were compared to the known images, however there were so many areas of spots and/or damage on the walls in the known images that a comparison was unfeasible. There was also damage, possibly rust or dirt, noted on the top of the electrical sockets in the known images. These individualizing characteristics were not viewed in the questioned images, possibly due to lower resolution of the questioned videos or more likely, however, is that the damage, dirt accumulation or the formation of rust may have occurred to the walls and sockets during the time in between questioned video capture and known still image capture. [Annex 7A, slides 13 to 16]

There were two darker areas noted on the lower right side of the window (marked with orange arrows). The shapes of the damage were not the same in the questioned videos as in the known images in slide 13, however the spots were in the same relative location. The difference in shape could be due to a loss of detail due to over exposure from the backlit window. A different view of the damage to this area of the window showed a similar rounded shape of damage in slide 17 when compared to know image DSC_0548. It is again, more likely that the differences in shapes and existence of many more spots of damage in the known images are due to the passage of time between questioned video and still image capture.

5. Conclusions

This section of the report should be read in conjunction with Annex 8.⁶

A. Location 7 – 11ôtel La Maison

There is evidence to support that MLI-OTP-0018-0102, MLI-OTP-0018-0249 and MLI-OTP-0018-0289 all depict the same location and event (lifecycle).

There is evidence to support that MLI-OTP-0018-0102, MLI-OTP-0018-0249 and MLI-OTP-0018-0289 depict the same location as depicted in known images DSC_0539 and DSC_0548.

⁶ Annex 8: Comparison Analysis Conclusion Scale and Definitions

I hereby certify that this is a report of the results of an examination performed by me. My professional experience is outlined in my *curriculum vitae* (Annex 10 of original report registered under MLI-CTP-0069-9281).




AmyLynn Hak, Forensic Officer
Certified Forensic Video Analyst (CFVA)

End of report.

Annex 7A; Addendum Location 7 Comparison Analysis Charts (PowerPoint Slides).

See external files for Annex 7A.

Annex 8: Comparison Analysis Conclusion Scale and Definitions



Descriptions of Identification Support

Inconclusive:

Not enough evidence for either identification or exclusion. Limited evidence to support or exclude falls near inconclusive.

Evidence to Support Identification:

Class characteristics are present in both questioned and known item. Class characteristics are similar and in agreement between the questioned item and the known item.

Strong Evidence to Support Identification:

Class characteristics are present in both questioned item and known. Class characteristics are similar and in agreement between the questioned item and the known item.

Individualizing characteristics are noted in questioned item and known. Individualizing characteristics are similar and in agreement between the questioned and the known item.

Very strong evidence to support falls near a positive identification.

Positive Identification:

There is an abundance of both class and individualizing characteristics that are similar and in agreement with the known item. All characteristics agree. The questioned item is in fact one and the same as the known item.

Annex 9: Instructions and Forensic Video Analysis Tools

This report should be read alongside Annex 1, Microsoft Excel spreadsheet detailing pertinent technical information relating to the questioned multimedia files and Annexes 2-7, Microsoft PowerPoint slides that illustrate and explain the comparison analyses.

The files will run better if they are copied and saved to your computer's hard drive rather than accessing them from a removable hard drive or USB drive. The comparison analysis charts are digital and are intended to be viewed on a monitor (computer or television), rather than printed on paper, for the best possible image quality.

Forensic Video Analysis Tools Used

Adobe Creative Cloud Applications
Version 5.0.0.354

Microsoft Office
Word: Version 16.31 (19111002)
PowerPoint: Version 16.31 (19111002)
Excel: Version 16.32 (19120802)

Annex 11: Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Terms	Definition
Aspect Ratio	The aspect ratio of an image describes the proportional relationship between its width and height.
Authentication	Authentication is the process of substantiating that the data is an accurate representation of what it purports to be.
Display Aspect Ratio	The aspect ratio that the video should be played back at to retain accurate shapes and sizes of content in the video frame.
Forensic Video Analysis	Forensic Video Analysis is the scientific examination, comparison and /or evaluation of video in legal matters.
Geolocation	Geolocation is the process of finding, analyzing and providing the identification or estimation of the real-world geographic location of an electronic device, such as mobile phone or video camera. Geolocation commonly uses Global Positioning System (GPS) and other related technologies and analyses to assess and specify geographical locations.
Hash Value	A hash value is an alphanumeric chain representing a 'signature' of a digital file. A has value, sometimes refered to as a checksum, is the result of a mathematical function known as a hash algorithm that takes an input and maps this into a fixed property that makes it almost impossible to find two files that have different content and that compute to the same shah value.
Image Comparison Analysis	image comparison analysis is the process of comparing images of questioned objects or persons to known objects or persons or images thereof, and making an assessment of the correspondence between features in these images for rendering an opinion regarding identification or elimination.
Interlaced/Deinterlaced	An interlaced signal or scan contains two fields of a video frame that are captured consecutively, (even field scanned first and then odd field). Interlaced video signals are commonly found in analog television. Deinterlacing is the process of converting the interlaced video into a non-interlaced or progressive form.
Metadata	Metadata is basic information pertaining to a file, for example the file size, file type, date and other technical information.
Multimedia	Multimedia is the integration of multiple forms of media, including text, graphics, audio, animations, video, and still images.
Pixel Aspect Ratio	Pixel aspect ration refers to the aspect ratio of the pixels themselves.
Progressive	Progressive scan is one of two methods used to "paint" an image (the other is an interlaced scan), where the lines are drawn one at a time in sequential order.
Storage Aspect Ratio	The aspect ratio that the video file is stored at when coded, which is often not the same as the display aspect ratio.
Transcode	Transcoding is the digital-to-digital conversion from one form of coded representation to another.
Video	Video is the electronic representation of a series of still images used to capture and recreate either a stationary or moving scene in the real world.

Acronyms	Definition
DAR	Display Aspect Ratio
FSS	Forensic Science Section
ICC	International Criminal Court
IEU	Information and Evidence Unit
OTP	Office of the Prosecutor
PAR	Pixel Aspect Ratio
SAR	Storage Aspect Ratio



**MISSION
LETTER**

Ms Amy Hak
Forensics Science
Section Office of the
Prosecutor International
Criminal Court The
Hague

Re : Investigation in the situation of
Mali Date : 26 August 2019

Dear Ms Hak,

You are kindly requested, to the extent to which your expertise permits, to conduct an analysis for certain imagery taken in the area of Timbuktu that are referred to in the chart in the annex to this letter.

Your analysis should consist of a comparison of images listed in the column entitled "Questioned Material" against the images listed in the column entitled "Reference material" in the above mentioned annex. In order to set priorities, assets listed in the "Questioned Material" column have been divided into two categories, *i.e.* "Priority 1" (marked in bold) and "Priority 2".

Basing yourself on the reference material and other means necessary, such as *e.g.* *Google Earth*, the analysis should allow the geolocation of all the questioned material listed in the annex.

Should you face any trouble identifying the geolocation of some of the assets listed under “Questioned Material”, you are allowed to use other assets contained in the same category for which you were able to determine the geolocation by using the reference material or any other means.

Dude: Waalsdorperweg 10, 2597 AK, The Hague, The Netherlands – La Haye, Pays Bas Telephone –
Téléphone +31(0)70 515 85 15 / Facsimile – Télécopie +31(0)70 515 87 77

www.icc.cpl.int

You are requested to present your analysis in an expert report. The report should preferably follow the structure as outlined below:

- (i) An introduction, indicating what your mission and instructions are;
- (ii) The methodology used in preparing the report, including (a) details on the material and computer software you used; (b) the source and quality of the images, (c) how you analysed the imagery, including the visual indicators you used and explaining the scope for and/or limitations in analysing the imagery in question;
- (iii) Your analysis of the imagery, containing at least for each site:
 - (a) the type of monuments depicted in the images together with the GPS coordinates to the extent possible;
 - (b) your assessment of the sites depicted in the imagery by way of comparing the images available to you. We ask you to structure your report on a site-by-site basis, incorporating for each site a contextual view identifying the location, and a close-up view of the images you analysed (with your mapping of points of comparison on the images);
 - (c) You are also asked to address any issues you might encounter with the materials listed in the chart annexed to this letter and if any, to clarify what the margin of error is in each case;
- (iv) General conclusions, providing an overview of the results you have obtained;
- (v) A glossary, in order to make sure that all technical terms and abbreviations will be understandable to a large audience.

You are also requested to attach to your expert report:

- (i) The present letter of instructions;

(ii) A statement acknowledging that you personally performed the analysis (in case you would need to resort to other people' input, these individuals would also need to provide such a statement explaining their exact contribution to the mission and provide their *curriculum vitae*);

(iii) Your *curriculum vitae*, emphasizing in particular prior experience you have in this field and if applicable, prior reports and/or testimonies you might have prepared for judicial bodies in relation to this area of expertise.


This mission letter allows you to access all the relevant materials ¹ within the Information and Evidence Unit (IEU) vault.

We ask that you submit your expert report by 30 November 2019 and that you treat the information contained in these instructions as confidential. In the event where that deadline would be unfeasible, kindly prepare a report containing at least your results for the "Priority 1" assets and we shall set a new deadline for the remaining "Priority 2" assets.

Would you have any doubt as to your actual task or instructions to be followed, please do not hesitate to contact us for clarifications.

Yours sincerely,

Gilles Dutertre



P/O Sarah Coquillaud Senior

Trial Lawyer

¹ Namely all the materials listed as questioned material and reference material, to be found under MLI-OTP-0068-3199, MLI-OTP-0067-1859 and MLI-OTP-0068-3199 together with their respective reports registered under MLI-OTP-0064-0806, MLI-OTP-0066-0559 and MLI-OTP-0069-1320, as well as all the individual videos and photographs that were used to built the drone images and the panoramas (see MLI-OTP-0064- 080)

ANNEX

MLI-OTP-0078-0950

MLI-OTP-0078-0950

Name and Site Number ¹	Reference Material			Questioned Material ²
	Drone Imagery	Panoramas	Photographs	
Gouvernorat (11)	Drone_Site11	[Group 0]-MLI_1921_-_MLI-OTP-0060-3953_MLI_1934_-_MLI-OTP-0060-3960-14 images_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_2085_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4117_MLI_2115_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4147-31 images_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_2118_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4150_MLI_2144_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4176-27 images_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_2218_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4180_MLI_2223_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4185-6 images_CRP		MLI-OTP-0069-3704 MLI-OTP-0069-3706 MLI-OTP-0069-3709 MLI-OTP-0069-3710 MLI-OTP-0069-3711 MLI-OTP-0069-3712 MLI-OTP-0069-3713 MLI-OTP-0069-3714 MLI-OTP-0069-3715 MLI-OTP-0069-3716 MLI-OTP-0069-3721 MLI-OTP-0069-3722 MLI-OTP-0069-3723 MLI-OTP-0069-3724 MLI-OTP-0069-3767
BMS	Drone_Site13		MLI-OTP-0006-1429	MLI-OTP-0001-7237

¹ Site numbers are related to previous mission letters where each site was attributed the said number.

² Within the questioned material category, Priority 1 assets are marked in **bold** – any other assets not in bold is considered to be Priority 2.

(13)		<p>[Group 0]-MLI_4474_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4330_MLI_4499_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4355-26 images_PIX_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_1581_-_MLI-OTP-0060-1540_MLI_1730_-_MLI-OTP-0060-1586-77 images_PIX_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_4859_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4715_MLI_4862_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4718-4 images_CRP [Group 4]-MLI_4564 - MLI-OTP-0060-4420_MLI_4590 - MLI-OTP-0060-4446-27 images_PIX_CRP [Group 5]-MLI_4593_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4449_MLI_4636_-_MLI-OTP-0060-4492-44 images_PIX_CRP [Group 6]-MLI_1639_-_MLI-OTP-0060-1495_MLI_1677_-_MLI-OTP-0060-1533-39 images_PIX_CRP</p>	<p>MLI-OTP-0006-1430 MLI OTP 0006 1431 MLI-OTP-0006-1433 MLI-OTP-0006-1435 MLI OTP 0006 1436 MLI-OTP-0006-1441 MLI-OTP-0006-1442 MLI OTP 0006 1445 MLI OTP 0006 1468 MLI-OTP-0006-1510 MLI OTP 0006 1511 MLI-OTP-0006-1514 MLI-OTP-0006-1598 MLI-OTP-0006-1599 MLI-OTP-0006-1600 MLI-OTP-0006-1661 MLI-OTP-0006-1689</p>	<p>MLI-OTP-0001-7251 MLI OTP 0001 7252 MLI-OTP-0001-7258 MLI-OTP-0001-7260 MLI OTP 0001 7604 MLI-OTP-0001-7612 MLI-OTP-0012-1724 MLI-OTP-0012-1726 MLI-OTP-0018-0091 MLI-OTP-0018-0092 MLI-OTP-0018-0379 MLI-OTP-0018-0438 MLI-OTP-0041-0605 MLI-OTP-0041-0612 MLI-OTP-0060-0404 MLI-OTP-0060-0405 MLI-OTP-0060-0407</p>
Hôtel Bouctou (14)	Drone Site17 Drone_Site14	<p>[Group 4]-MLI_2315_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5591_MLI_2339_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5615-25 images_PIX_CRP [Group 5]-MLI_2342_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5618_MLI_2369_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5645-28 images_CRP [Group 7]-MLI_2394_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5670_MLI_2417_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5693-24 images_CRP [Group 9]-MLI_2453_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5728_MLI_2479_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5754-27 images_CRP [Group 12]-MLI 2539 - MLI-OTP-0060-5814_MLI 2572 - MLI-OTP-0060-5847-34 images_CRP</p>		MLI-OTP-0012-1907

Petit marché (15)	Drone_Site15	[Group 0]-MLI_2745_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5957_MLI_2749_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5961-5 images_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_2756_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5968_MLI_2757_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5969-2 images_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_2759_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5971_MLI_2763_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5975-5 images_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_2764_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5976_MLI_2777_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5989-14 images_PDX_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_2782_-_MLI-OTP-0060-5994_MLI_2790_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6002-9 images_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_2998_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6209_MLI_3010_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6221-13 images_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_3011_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6222_MLI_3021_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6232-11 images_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_3022_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6233_MLI_3033_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6244-12 images_CRP		MLI-OTP-0018-0056 MLI-OTP-0018-0184 MLI-OTP-0018-0190 MLI-OTP-0018-0284 MLI OTP 0018 0307 MLI-OTP-0018-0401 MLI-OTP-0018-0483 MLI-OTP-0018-0484 MLI OTP 0018 0485 MLI-OTP-0018-0744
Hôtel Azalaï (17)	Drone_Site17	[Group 0]-MLI_3113_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6398_MLI_3147_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6426-29 images_PDX_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_3303_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6581_MLI_3333_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6611-31 images_CRP [Group 2]-MLI_3366_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6644_MLI_3393_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6671-28 images_CRP [Group 4]-MLI_3213_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6491_MLI_3239_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6517-27 images_CRP [Group 6]-MLI_3273_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6551_MLI_3301_-_MLI-OTP-0060-6579-29 images_CRP [Group 10]-MLI_3847_-_MLI-OTP-0060-7121_MLI_3876_-_MLI-OTP-0060-7150-30 images_PDX_CRP		MLI-OTP-0012-1545 MLI-OTP-0012-1549 MLI-OTP-0018-0328 MLI-OTP-0018-0385 MLI-OTP-0018-0394 MLI OTP 0018 0395 MLI-OTP-0018-0643 MLI-OTP-0018-0644 MLI-OTP-0018-0648 MLI-OTP-0018-0649 MLI-OTP-0018-0650 MLI OTP 0018 0651 MLI-OTP-0018-0652

				MLI-OTP-0018-0653 MLI-OTP-0018-0658 MLI OTP 0018 0661 MLI-OTP-0069-3577 MLI OTP 0069 3578 MLI-OTP-0069-3579 MLI-OTP-0069-3580 MLI OTP 0069 3581 MLI OTP 0069 3646 MLI-OTP-0069-3649 MLI OTP 0069 3650
Place Sankoré (18)	Drone Site18	Group 0]-MLI_4907_-_MLI-OTP-0060-7741_MLI_4949_-_MLI-OTP-0060-7783-43 images_PIX_CRP Group 0]-MLI_4952_-_MLI-OTP-0060-7786_MLI_4987_-_MLI-OTP-0060-7821-36 images_PIX_CRP Group 0]-MLI_4988 - MLI-OTP-0060-7822 MLI 5018 - MLI-OTP-0060-7852-31 images_PIX_CRP Group 0]-MLI 5020 - MLI-OTP-0060-7854 MLI 5053 - MLI-OTP-0060-7887-34 images_PIX_CRP Group 0]-MLI 5054 - MLI-OTP-0060-7888 MLI 5094 - MLI-OTP-0060-7928-41 images_PIX_CRP		MLI OTP 0001 6954 MLI OTP 0018 0243 MLI-OTP-0018-0244 MLI-OTP-0018-0245 MLI-OTP-0018-0246 MLI-OTP-0018-0247 MLI-OTP-0018-0248 MLI-OTP-0018-0251 MLI-OTP-0018-0252 MLI-OTP-0018-0253 MLI OTP 0018 0254 MLI-OTP-0018-0255

				MLI-OTP-0018-0256 MLI-OTP-0018-0286 MLI-OTP-0018-0291 MLI-OTP-0018-0292 MLI-OTP-0018-0408 MLI-OTP-0039-0574
Hôtel La Maison (19)	Drone_Site19	[Group 0]-MLI_5393_- MLI-OTP-0060-8232_MLI_5446_- MLI-OTP-0060-8285-54 images_PIX_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_5497_- MLI-OTP-0060-8336_MLI_5545_- MLI-OTP-0060-8384-49 images_PIX_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_5605_- MLI-OTP-0060-8444_MLI_5658_- MLI-OTP-0060-8497-54 images_PIX_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_5662_- MLI-OTP-0060-8501_MLI_5727_- MLI-OTP-0060-8566-66 images_PIX_CRP [Group 0]-MLI_6151_- MLI-OTP-0060-8967_MLI_6159_- MLI-OTP-0060-8995-9 images_CRP [Group 0] MLI_6255_- MLI-OTP-0060-9091_MLI_6262_- MLI-OTP-0060-9098-8 images_CRP	MLI-OTP-0006-1456 MLI-OTP-0006-2057 MLI-OTP-0006-2081 MLI-OTP-0006-2082 MLI-OTP-0006-2083 MLI-OTP-0006-2084 MLI-OTP-0006-2085 MLI-OTP-0006-2086	MLI-OTP-0001-7369 MLI-OTP-0001-7382 MLI-OTP-0001-7469 MLI-OTP-0018-0102 MLI-OTP-0018-0249 MLI-OTP-0018-0289



ADDENDUM TO MISSION LETTER

Ms Amy Hak
Forensics Science Section
Office of the Prosecutor
International Criminal Court
The Hague

Re : Investigation in the situation of Mali

Date : 1 April 2020

Dear Ms Hak,

You are kindly requested, to the extent to which your expertise permits, to conduct an analysis for certain imagery taken in the area of Timbuktu that are referred to in the chart in the annex to this letter.

The questioned materials have already been dealt with in your report registered under MLI-OTP-0069-9281. They now need to be analysed against a new reference material which consist in a panorama of the inside of the building Hôtel La Maison.

You are requested to perform your analysis and present it in an expert report following the guidelines previously set out in your mission letter dated 26 August 2019.

We ask that you submit your expert report by 9 April 2020 and that you treat the information contained in these instructions as confidential.

Yours sincerely,

Gilles Dutertre



P/O Sarah Coquillard Senior

Trial Lawyer

Annex

Name and Site Number ¹	Reference Material			Questioned Material ²
	Drone Imagery	Panoramas	Photographs	
Hôtel La Maison (19)	Drone_Site19	MLI-OTP-0069-7347	None	MLI-OTP-0018-0102 MLI-OTP-0018-0249 MLI-OTP-0018-0289

¹ Site numbers are related to previous mission letters where each site was attributed the said number.

² *The questioned materials have already been dealt with in your report MLI-OTP-0069-9281*