

## Summary of the Reparations Order, 8 March 2021

### *The Prosecutor vs. Bosco Ntaganda*

This document is a Summary of the Order on Reparations to Victims under article 75 of the Rome Statute in the case of *The Prosecutor vs Bosco Ntaganda*, prepared for the purposes of outreach and information. Only the written Reparations Order is authoritative.

#### **I. TIMING FOR THE ISSUANCE OF THIS ORDER AND TYPE OF REPARATIONS GRANTED**

In order to contribute towards more expeditious reparations proceedings, and considering that the mandate of two of the Chamber's Judges comes to an end on 10 March 2021, including that of Judge Fremr who presided over the trial, the Chamber has decided to issue this Reparations Order prior to the issuance of the appeals judgment on the conviction and sentence.

In that respect, the Chamber recalls (i) the victims' right to prompt reparations; (ii) that the crimes for which Mr Ntaganda was convicted took place almost two decades ago and most victims have received little to no assistance so far; and (iii) that, due to their particular vulnerability, some victims may require urgent assistance.

After detailed consideration of the submissions of parties' and other participants' in the proceedings, Reports from the Registry and Appointed Experts, the Trust Fund for Victims, relevant case file records, and the applicable legal framework, the Chamber concluded that awarding collective reparations with individualised components is the most appropriate course of action in the present proceedings.

The Chamber reached this conclusion in light of the scope of the case, the potentially large number of unidentified eligible victims, the extent of the harm the victims suffered, and the scope, types, and modalities of reparations the Chamber considers appropriate to address such harm, in the circumstances of the case.

The Chamber stresses that in reaching this decision it particularly took into account the victims' wish not to be granted any form of memorialisation or other types of

symbolic reparations, unless they serve practical purposes, and their wish to receive awards aiming at supporting sustainable and long-term livelihood and well-being, rather than simply addressing their needs on a short-term basis.

## II. SCOPE OF THE CASE

As to the background and scope of the case, the Chamber recalls that on 8 July 2019, Mr Bosco Ntaganda, the former Deputy Chief of Staff of the UPC/FPLC, was found guilty of five counts of crimes against humanity and thirteen counts of war crimes, namely: murder and attempted murder; intentionally directing attacks against civilians; rape; sexual slavery; persecution; pillage; forcible transfer, deportation, and ordering the displacement of the civilian population; conscripting and enlisting children under the age of 15 years into an armed group and using them to participate actively in hostilities; intentionally directing attacks against protected objects; and, destroying the adversary's property.

The crimes were committed in the context of (i) at least one non-international armed conflict between the UPC/FPLC and opposing organised armed groups, in the Ituri district of the DRC, from on or about 6 August 2002 to on or about 31 December 2003; and (ii) a widespread and systematic attack against the civilian population conducted by UPC/FPLC between August 2002 and May 2003.

Within that context, the UPC/FPLC committed a series of crimes during a First Operation, in the Banyali-Kilo *collectivité* in November/December 2002, and a Second Operation, in the Walendu-Djatsi *collectivité* in February/March 2003. The UPC/FPLC also conscripted and enlisted children under the age of 15 years between on or about 6 August 2002 and 31 December 2003 and used them to participate actively in the hostilities between on or about 6 August 2002 and on or about 30 May 2003.

## III. PRINCIPLES ON REPARATIONS

Pursuant to article 75(1) of the Statute, the Court shall establish principles relating to reparations, which are to be distinguished from the order for reparations.

The Chamber has adopted the thirteen principles identified by the Appeals Chamber in the *Lubanga* case, as adapted in the *Katanga* and *Al Madhi* cases, as they are of general application. The Chamber has adapted and expanded such principles as detailed in the Order, and has also identified six additional new principles, as necessary in light of the specific circumstances of the case.

The new principles identified by the Chamber are:

**‘Do no harm’.** This refers to the need to take all steps necessary to ensure that access to justice and reparations by victims and affected communities does not lead to further or secondary victimisation; does not create or exacerbate security concerns or tensions among communities; and that victims are not endangered or stigmatised as a result. Particular attention should be paid to victims belonging to more vulnerable groups.

**A Gender-inclusive and sensitive approach to reparations.** This approach should guide every step of the reparation process. It requires the Court to give due consideration and address the specific needs of individuals based on their sex, and their real or perceived gender expression or identity, without discrimination on that basis. This approach should integrate intersectionality as a core component and take into account the existence of previous gender and power imbalances, as well as the differentiated impact of harm for victims.

**Principle related to Sexual and Gender-Based violence.** Sexual and gender-based violence refers to crimes committed against persons because of their sex or gender expression or identity. The principle recognises the Court’s obligation to adopt all necessary measures to ensure that the victims of these crimes come forward and benefit from reparations, and it addresses the potential obstacles, including stigma and ostracism, without reinforcing pre-existing discriminatory patterns. Reparations should recognise especially the grave nature and consequences of these crimes and should reflect and address the multifaceted harm suffered by the victims.

**Prioritisation.** All victims are to be treated fairly and equally. However, priority may need to be given to certain victims who are in a particularly vulnerable situation or require urgent assistance. The Court may adopt measures in order to guarantee equal, effective, and safe access to reparations for particularly vulnerable victims.

**Transformative reparations.** Reparations should strive to be transformative in their design, implementation, and impact. They should have a rectification effect, confronting social exclusion by prioritising a participatory process over outcomes and by challenging unequal power relations.

**No over-compensation.** Reparations may neither ‘enrich’ nor ‘impoverish’ the victim, but adequately repair the harm caused, to the extent possible. Granting multiple modalities of reparations for the same harm suffered by the victims shall not be regarded as an over-compensation.

#### **IV. ORDER FOR REPARATIONS AGAINST MR BOSCO NTAGANDA - ELEMENTS OF A REPARATIONS ORDER**

As determined by the Appeals Chamber, a reparations order must contain, at a minimum, five essential elements. The Chamber will hereafter detail its findings with reference to those elements:

## ELIGIBLE VICTIMS

The present Order is for collective reparations against Mr Ntaganda, to be made through the Trust Fund for Victims pursuant to rules 97(1) and 98(3) of the Rules.

In light of the type of reparations awarded, the Chamber establishes the eligibility criteria for reparations, indicating the characteristics of the categories of eligible victims, in order to enable their identification by the Trust Fund for Victims.

The Chamber stresses that eligibility for reparations is to be determined by reference to the territorial, temporal, and subject matter scope of the crimes for which Mr Ntaganda was convicted.

### A. Direct Victims

Natural and legal persons are eligible for reparations as direct victims if they can demonstrate, at the relevant standard of proof, that they suffered a harm as a result of at least one of the following crimes:

#### i. Victims of the attacks:

Counts 1 and 2: victims of murder and attempted murder as a crime against humanity and as a war crime in Mongbwalu, Nzebi, Sayo, and Kilo in the context of the First Operation, and in Kobu, Sangi, and Bambu in the context of the Second Operation. Specifically (i) in the context of the First Operation: *Abbé* Bwanalonga in Mongbwalu; a woman in front of the health centre in Sayo; people in Mongbwalu and Sayo during *ratissage* operations, including a Lendu woman and persons killed at the *Appartements* camps; two Lendu persons in Nzebi; and Lendu persons, a Ngiti man, a pregnant Lendu woman, and a Nyali man in Kilo; (ii) in the context of the Second Operation: at least two fleeing children in Kobu, and people during the *ratissage* operation that followed; nine hospital patients in Bambu; a woman who was raped and P-0018's sister-in-law in the bushes surrounding Sangi; at least 49 persons in a banana field near the Paradiso building in Kobu; and some men who were raped by UPC/FPLC soldiers in Kobu; and (iii) in the context of the First and Second Operation: the attempted murder of P-0018, P-0019, P-0022, P-0108, and a patient of Bambu hospital.

Count 3: victims of intentionally directing attacks against civilians as a war crime in Mongbwalu and Sayo in the context of the First Operation, and in Bambu, Jitchu, and Buli, in the context of the Second Operation.

Counts 4 and 5: victims of rape as a crime against humanity and as a war crime in Mongbwalu and Kilo in the context of the First Operation, and in Kobu, Sangi, and Buli, in the context of the Second Operation. Specifically (i) in the context of the First Operation: women and girls during and in the aftermath of the UPC/FPLC assault on Mongbwalu including a number of women in the *Appartements* camp and girls in Kilo; and (ii) in the context of the Second Operation: detained women and men in Kobu; women in Sangi; and P-0113 in Buli.

Counts 7 and 8: P-0113 and an 11-year-old girl, as victims of sexual slavery as a crime against humanity and as a war crime, in Kobu and Buli in the context of the Second Operation.

Count 10: victims of persecution as a crime against humanity in Mongbwalu, Nzebi, Sayo, and Kilo in the context of the First Operation, and in Nyangaray, Lipri, Tsili, Kobu, Bambu, Sangi, Gola, Jitchu, and Buli, in the context of the Second Operation.

Count 11: victims of pillage as a war crime in Mongbwalu and Sayo in the context of the First Operation; and in Kobu, Lipri, Bambu, and Jitchu in the context of the Second Operation.

Counts 12 and 13: victims of forcible transfer and deportation as a crime against humanity and ordering the displacement of the civilian population as a war crime in Mongbwalu, in the context of the First Operation; and in Lipri, Tsili, Kobu, and Bambu, in the context of the Second Operation.

Count 17: victims of intentionally directing attacks against protected objects as a war crime, namely against the health centre in Sayo, in the context of the First Operation.

Count 18: victims of destroying the adversary's property as a war crime, in Mongbwalu and Sayo, in the context of the First Operation; and in Lipri, Tsili, Kobu, Jitchu, Buli, and Sangi, in the context of the Second Operation.

ii. Child soldiers victims

Counts 14, 15, and 16: victims of conscription and enlistment of children under the age of 15 years into an armed group between on or about 6 August 2002 and 31 December 2003, and their use to participate actively in hostilities between on or about 6 August 2002 and on or about 30 May 2003, with respect to the participation of children under the age of 15 in the First Operation and in the UPC/FPLC assault on Bunia in May

2003; the use of children under the age of 15 as bodyguards for UPC/FPLC soldiers and commanders; and the use of children under the age of 15 to gather information about the opposing forces and MONUC personnel, as war crimes.

Counts 6 and 9: victims of rape and sexual slavery of child soldiers as war crimes, against children under the age of 15 years incorporated into the UPC/FPLC between on or about 6 August 2002 and 31 December 2003, in Ituri. Specifically, the rape of Nadège, an approximately nine-year-old girl at Camp Lingo and the rape and sexual slavery of P-0883, a girl under 15 years of age, at Camp Bule and Mave, and a girl under the age of 15 years assigned to Floribert Kisembo. However, these findings are, ‘not representative of the number of female UPC/FPLC victims who were subjected to rape and sexual violence, which was a common practice in the UPC/FPLC during this time period’.

iii. Children born out of rape and sexual slavery

The Chamber recalls that a number of victims of rape and sexual slavery, including girls under the age of 15, became pregnant and children were born as a result.

To qualify as a direct victim, a causal link must exist between the harm suffered and the crimes of which an accused is found guilty. For indirect victims, it must be established that, because of the person’s relationship with the direct victim, the loss, injury, or damage suffered by the latter gives rise to their harm.

In light of the circumstances of the case, the Chamber considers that children born out of rape and sexual slavery may qualify as direct victims, as the harm they suffer is a direct result of the commission of the crimes of rape and sexual slavery. In contrast, other children of women and girls who were victims of rape or sexual slavery may be considered indirect victims of the crimes for which Mr Ntaganda was convicted, as they may have suffered harm as a consequence of the harm suffered by the direct victims.

The Chamber notes that recognising children born out of rape and sexual slavery as direct rather than indirect victims, is an acknowledgment of the particular harm they suffered and may constitute an adequate measure of satisfaction, in addition to other forms of reparations that may be awarded to them.

## B. Indirect Victims

As to indirect victims, the Chamber relies on the Appeals Chamber jurisprudence and recognises as indirect victims all categories identified in the *Lubanga* case. The Chamber reiterates that the key consideration is the personal harm. Indirect victims must demonstrate, at the relevant standard of proof, to have suffered harm because of the commission of a crime against the direct victim.

### HARM

To define the harm caused to direct and indirect victims, the Chamber considered all relevant information before it, including the Judgment, the Sentencing Judgment, evidence submitted during the trial and sentencing proceedings, observations by the parties and other participants in the proceedings, including the Registry, the Trust Fund for Victims and the Appointed Experts.

The Chamber has defined the harms suffered as a result of the crimes committed by Mr Ntaganda as follows:

#### a) Harms suffered by the direct victims of the attacks:

- i. Material harm;
- ii. Physical injury and trauma, including memory loss, neurological disturbances, and extensive physical scarring;
- iii. Psychological trauma and the development of psychological disorders, such as, *inter alia*, suicidal tendencies, depression, and dissociative behaviour;
- iv. Psychosocial trauma, due to exclusion from and disintegration of families and communities;
- v. Loss of productivity capacity, reduced standard of living and socio-economic opportunities;
- vi. Interruption and loss of schooling and vocational training;
- vii. Exposure to an environment of violence and fear;
- viii. Loss of childhood;
- ix. Loss of life plan; and
- x. Damage to the health centre in Sayo and loss of adequate healthcare provision to the community that benefitted from it.

#### b) Harm suffered by direct victims of crimes against child soldiers:

- i. Material harm;
- ii. Physical injury and trauma;

- iii. Psychological trauma and the development of psychological disorders, such as, *inter alia*, suicidal tendencies, depression, and dissociative behaviour;
  - iv. Psychosocial trauma, due to exclusion from and disintegration of families and communities;
  - v. Interruption and loss of schooling and vocational training;
  - vi. Separation from families;
  - vii. Loss of childhood;
  - viii. Loss of life plan;
  - ix. Exposure to an environment of violence, fear, and threats;
  - x. Difficulties socialising within their families and communities, including rejection and stigmatization;
  - xi. Difficulties in controlling aggressive impulses; and
  - xii. Non-development of 'civilian life skills' resulting in the victim being at a disadvantage, particularly as regards employment.
- c) Harm suffered by direct victims of rape and sexual slavery, including child soldiers and children born out of rape and sexual slavery:**
- i. Physical, psychological, psychiatric, psychosocial, and economic consequences (including injuries, trauma, ostracism, stigma, and social rejection), in immediate and longer term, in the case of the direct victims of rape and sexual slavery; and
  - ii. Physical, psychological, psychosocial, and economic consequences (including rejection at multiple levels, discrimination, and marginalisation) in the case of children born out of rape and sexual slavery.
- d) Harm suffered by indirect victims:**
- i. Material deprivation that accompanies the loss of the family member's contributions;
  - ii. Loss, injury or damage suffered by person intervening to attempt to prevent the direct victims from being further harmed as a result of the relevant crime;
  - iii. Psychological harm experienced as a result from the sudden loss of a family member, including behavioural disorders, such as trauma, depression, suicidal tendencies and feelings of hatred;
  - iv. Psychological harm and trauma as a result of what they witnessed during or after the attacks;

- v. Psychological, psychosocial, and material harm resulting from aggressive behaviour by former child soldiers reunited with their families and communities; and
- vi. Transgenerational harm of children of direct victims.

Due to the limitations that a summary of the Reparations Order imposes, the Chamber is not able to describe in more detail the great suffering and long-lasting consequences suffered by all victims of the crimes for which Mr Ntaganda was convicted, as elaborated in the Order.

However, the Chamber would like to recall some of the testimonies heard during the trial proceedings. These testimonies exemplify that the crimes of rape and sexual slavery resulted in fear of stigma and ostracism for the victims within their families and communities, as well as fear of abandonment by their partners if information about the crimes would become known.

Testimonies of witnesses heard during the trial proceedings account for victims having ‘difficult[ies] to stay with everybody’, and that the crime affected the victim’s personal development and life plan. A victim also recounted that after her rape she, and I quote, ‘was torn inside and out’, was seriously injured, for a long time, explaining, I quote again, ‘the abuse instilled a lot of fear in me. I could no longer go to school’, and ‘was traumatised in my heart for a very long time.’ An expert witness who interviewed victims of the case testified that ‘typically, women or indeed men who have been sexually violated will feel contaminated, dirty, and unclean, because of the nature of the violation, the very private violation that they have experienced.’ She added that the victims she interviewed felt ‘extreme anger’, which ‘affected their children’.

## **TYPES AND MODALITIES OF REPARATIONS**

As noted above, the Chamber has concluded that collective reparations with individualised components are the most appropriate type of reparations, as they may provide a more holistic approach to address the multiple harms suffered by the large number of victims eligible to receive reparations in this case. In addition, it aims to provide victims with a sustainable and long-term livelihood and well-being rather than simply addressing their daily needs on a short-term basis. It also ensures a more efficient, prompt and practical approach.

At the same time, the Chamber considers that this approach addresses the concerns that victims should receive equal reparations to avoid awards being a source of jealousy, animosity or stigmatisation among the affected communities and between inter-ethnic groups, especially given the unstable security situation on the ground.

It will also ensure that reparations respond to the victims' harms and needs, as determined following the Trust Fund for Victims consultations with the victims at the implementation stage.

The Chamber further notes that collective reparations with individualised components appear the most appropriate type of reparations to address the harm caused by rape and sexual slavery and that suffered by former child soldiers, particularly considering the potential reluctance of these victims to come forward if they were to be singled out for specific awards, due to their rejection and stigmatisation at the family and community levels.

As to the modalities of reparations, the Chamber acknowledges that the multiple, diverse, and multi-faceted nature of the harms suffered by the victims in this case, makes it difficult to reinstate the victims to the situation they were in before the commission of the crimes. In order to address the various harms suffered by the victims in the best manner possible, a combination of different modalities of reparations available should be applied.

The modalities of reparations may include measures of restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, and satisfaction, which may incorporate, when appropriate, a symbolic, preventative, or transformative value. The Trust Fund for Victims is therefore ordered to design a draft implementation plan on the basis of all the modalities of reparations identified in the Order, in consultation with the victims.

The Chamber further notes that priority should be given to individuals who require immediate physical and/or psychological medical care, victims with disabilities and the elderly, victims of sexual or gender-based violence, victims who are homeless or experiencing financial hardship, as well as children born out of rape and sexual slavery and former child soldiers.

## **ORDER AGAINST THE CONVICTED PERSON**

Reparation orders are intrinsically linked to the individual whose criminal liability is established in the conviction and must be proportionate to the harm caused. As such, in light of the principle of accountability of the offender, this order for reparations is made against the convicted person.

## **SCOPE OF LIABILITY**

The Chamber has followed the Appeals Chamber jurisprudence in previous cases, namely, that 'the question of whether other individuals may also have contributed to the harm resulting from the crimes for which the person has been convicted is irrelevant to the convicted person's liability to repair that harm'. In effect, 'it is not, *per se*, inappropriate to hold the person liable for the full amount necessary to repair the

harm'. The focus, in all cases, should be the extent of the harm caused and the cost to repair such harm, rather than the person's role and the mode(s) of liability for which the person was convicted.

Accordingly, the Chamber finds Mr Ntaganda liable to repair the full extent of the harm caused to the direct and indirect victims of all crimes for which he was convicted, regardless of the different modes of liability relied in the conviction and regardless of whether others may have also contributed to the harm.

As to the shared liability of Mr Ntaganda and his co-perpetrators in the crimes for which he was convicted, including Mr Thomas Lubanga, the Chamber considers them all jointly liable *in solidum* to repair the full extent of the harm caused to the victims.

The Chamber took into account the Trust Fund for Victims's submission that the reparation programmes in the *Lubanga* case constitute a collective award aimed at comprehensively repairing the harm suffered by all direct and indirect victims. Accordingly, and considering the principle of 'no over-compensation', the Chamber considers reasonable to adopt, for the purposes of reparations in this case, the reparation programmes ordered by Trial Chamber II in the *Lubanga* case, in relation to the overlapping victims and harms of both cases. As a result, these programmes should be understood to repair the overlapping victims' harm on behalf of both, Mr Lubanga and Mr Ntaganda.

It should be stressed however that this, under no circumstances, diminishes Mr Ntaganda's liability to repair in full the harm caused to all victims of the crimes for which he was convicted. To the contrary, Mr Lubanga and Mr Ntaganda are jointly and severally liable to repair in full the harm suffered by the overlapping victims and both remain liable to reimburse the funds that the Trust Fund for Victims may eventually use to complement the reparation awards for their shared victims.

Regarding the additional harm suffered by the victims of rape and sexual slavery within the UPC/FPLC and victims of recruitment beyond the temporal scope of the *Lubanga* case, for which Mr Ntaganda bears sole liability, additional reparation measures should be implemented.

As to the amount of Mr Ntaganda's financial liability, the Chamber notes that it should focus on the cost to repair the harm, depending on the circumstances of the case and bearing in mind the overall purpose of reparations. Ultimately, the goal is to set an amount that is fair and properly reflects the rights of the victims, bearing in mind the rights of the convicted person. If the available information does not allow the Chamber to set the amount with precision it may, with caution, rely on estimates, after making every effort to obtain calculations that are as accurate as possible.

The Chamber recalls the large scope of the case in terms of the crimes for which Mr Ntaganda was convicted and the potential large number of victims of such crimes eligible to receive reparations. The Chamber notes that it has carefully considered the information and evidence provided by the Registry, the Trust Fund for Victims, the Appointed Experts, and the parties, all of whom have made substantial efforts in helping the Chamber reach accurate estimates as to the number of potentially eligible victims and the cost to repair the harms they have suffered.

The Chamber has concluded that thousands of victims may be eligible for reparations in the present case. However, the Chamber is cognisant of the impossibility to predict in advance how many victims may ultimately come forward to benefit from collective reparations with individualised components during the implementation stage, particularly considering the widespread, systematic, and large-scale nature of the crimes for which Mr Ntaganda was convicted.

The Chamber notes the estimation made by the Appointed Experts that at least 3,500 direct victims are potentially eligible for reparations, but that the number of indirect victims could not be ascertained by them. The Chamber also notes that a total of 2,121 victims were admitted for participation at the trial stage, including 1,837 victims of the attacks and 284 former child soldier victims. The Registry has also reported that, in relation to the victims of the attacks, there may be at least 1,100 new potential applicants. As of December 2020, Trial Chamber II has recognised 933 beneficiaries for reparations in the *Lubanga* case, all eligible for reparations in the *Ntaganda* case. However, the Chamber notes that the numbers detailed above do not reflect the totality of the potential beneficiaries of reparations in this case. It is clear that there is still a significant number of as yet unidentified potentially eligible victims, for which no reliable figures are available. In effect, estimates vary greatly and range from 'at least approximately 1,100' to 'a minimum of 100,000 across all locations affected by Mr. Ntaganda's crimes'.

As to the costs to repair the harm, the Chamber has also relied on the conservative estimates made by the Trust Fund for Victims and the Appointed Experts. The Chamber has equally considered the figures and assessments made by Trial Chamber II in the context of the *Katanga* and *Lubanga* cases, in light of their similarities with the present case, as they relate to crimes committed in Ituri during the same time-frame, and as relevant to the types and modalities of reparations envisaged by the Chamber. Nevertheless, the Chamber notes that the victims of the case suffered different kinds of harm and, in the context of collective reparations with individualised components, the cost to repair the harm for each victim may substantially differ from one to another. Having considered the Appeals Chamber's jurisprudence, the Chamber sets an amount that it considers fair and appropriate, in light of the circumstances of the

case and bearing in mind the rights of the convicted person, based on all the information before it, at this point in time, on the basis of conservative estimates, and weighing the need for accuracy of estimates against the goal of awarding reparations without delay. Taking all the above considerations into account, resolving uncertainties in favour of the convicted person and taking a conservative approach, the Chamber sets the total reparations award for which Mr Ntaganda is liable at USD 30,000,000 (thirty million dollars).

## V. IMPLEMENTATION

In line with the Court's jurisprudence, the Chamber seeks the assistance of the Trust Fund for Victims, for it to 'design the award for reparations' and 'determin[e] the size and nature of the reparation awards'.

Pursuant to rule 98(3) of the Rules and regulations 54 and 69 of the Regulations of the Trust Fund, the Chamber orders the Trust Fund for Victims to prepare a draft implementation plan which should clearly specify the objectives, outcomes, and activities identified as necessary in order to give effect to the Order.

Consultations with victims should take place for the purposes of designing and implementing reparations awards. The Trust Fund for Victims shall rely on the Registry and the Legal Representatives of Victims, as appropriate in light of their mandate and expertise, in order to ensure that the implementation process and consultations with victims comply with all Principles on Reparations, as established in the Order.

The Chamber notes that no property and assets belonging to Mr Bosco Ntaganda have been identified to date and, accordingly, the Chamber finds him indigent for the purposes of reparations.

Noting Mr Ntaganda's indigence, the Chamber encourages the Trust Fund for Victims to complement the reparation awards to the extent possible and engage in additional fundraising efforts as necessary to complement the totality of the award.

**FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS, THE CHAMBER HEREBY, UNANIMOUSLY ISSUES** an Order for Reparations against Mr Ntaganda;

**ORDERS** collective reparations with individualised components to be awarded to direct and indirect victims of the crimes for which Mr Ntaganda was convicted, as specified in the Order;

**ASSESES** Mr Ntaganda's liability for these reparations at USD 30,000,000;

**SETS** the deadline for the TFV to submit its general draft implementation plan by 8 September 2021, and the deadline for the TFV to submit an urgent plan for the priority victims by 8 June 2021, at the latest;

**FINDS** Mr Ntaganda indigent for the purposes of reparations at the time of the present Order;

**REQUESTS** the Presidency's assistance, with the support of the Registry, to continue exploring whether Mr Ntaganda possesses any undiscovered assets and to monitor Mr Ntaganda's financial situation on an ongoing basis; and

**VACATES** the deadline for the Registry to report to the Chamber, as set out in the First Decision.