

11 December 2020
Revised version

Report of the Court on Key Performance Indicators

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	3
II. Methodology and general considerations.....	3
III. Judicial and prosecutorial goals	4
IV. Cooperation and complementary goals	7
V. Organisational performance goals	11
VI. Next steps.....	11
Annex I – Judicial and prosecutorial performance goals.....	12
Annex II – Cooperation and complementarity goals.....	48
Annex III – Organisational performance goals.....	50

I. Introduction

1. This report on performance indicators for the International Criminal Court (“Court” or “ICC”) is part of the continuing effort of the Court to improve its efficiency 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”.¹
2. Reports by the Court on Key Performance Indicators (“KPIs”) have been issued in November 2015 (“2015 Report”), November 2016 (“2016 Report”), November 2017 (“2017 Report”), and November 2019 (“2019 Report”). No Report on KPIs was issued by the Court in 2018 due to the change of leadership in the Presidency and the Registry, and the need to revisit KPIs in light of the consultations among the three organs to adopt new strategic plans in 2019. However, the 2019 Report included retroactively the data for 2018 in order to provide a continuous, long-term picture.
3. This report therefore builds on the 2019 Report, which was preceded by the adoption, on 17 July 2019, of the new Strategic Plans of the Court, the Office of the Prosecutor (“OTP”), and, for the first time, the Registry, all of them for the period 2019-2021. The three plans recognize the importance of evaluating the implementation of the goals in the respective plans through Key Performance Indicators (“KPIs”), which each having their own timeline for reporting.
4. The representatives of the three organs of the Court at a meeting of the Study Group on Governance (the “Study Group” or “SGG”), held on 24 September 2020, reaffirmed this commitment.²

II. Methodology and general considerations

5. Given that most of the Court-level indicators relate to activities performed or assisted by the Registry owing to its mandate,³ leadership in collecting and putting together the relevant data has been assumed by the Registry, in consultation with the other two organs of the Court.
6. The Registry Strategic Plan 2019-2021 (“RSP”) provides that the Registry will collect Court-level performance data in relation to the goals set out in the Court’s strategic plan (“ICCSP”):
 - a) Judicial and prosecutorial performance goals;
 - b) Cooperation and Complementary goals; and
 - c) Organizational performance goals.
7. This report covers the period up to 30 September 2020, unless otherwise specifically indicated, and contains the relevant data, assessment, actions taken and envisaged concerning the KPIs. For the first time, the report includes data regarding timelines for the issue of certain decisions

¹ ICC-ASP/13/Res.5, Annex I, para. 7(b).

² Report of the Bureau on the Study Group on Governance, -- November 2020, paras. 21 to 35.

³ Other contributors to the present report include the Office of Public Counsel for the Defence, the Office of Public Counsel for Victims and the Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims.

adopted by the Judiciary at the Retreat held in October 2019 as well as data on Cooperation and Complementary goals, which were not part of the previous reports.

III. Judicial and prosecutorial performance goals

Expediency and fairness of the proceedings

8. The Report presents the information on the basis of the case phases set out below, using pre-defined indicators which seek to measure both expediency and fairness.⁴ While these seven phases are the most visible and generate most of the workload for Chambers, the parties and participants as well as the Registry, significant other work takes place before the Pre-Trial Chambers. For instance, prior to phase 1 (confirmation), the Pre-Trial Chambers address the following: requests for authorization to open an investigation, review of the Prosecutor's decision not to investigate, requests for issuance of an arrest warrant / summons to appear, cooperation issues, and proceedings related to admissibility challenges. 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. Sentencing and reparations proceedings may also proceed in parallel.

9. The key phases used to reflect the Judiciary's activities are:

Phase 1 – **Confirmation**: between first appearance and the decision on the confirmation of charges;

Phase 2 – **Trial preparation**: between the decision on the confirmation of charges and the first day of the opening statements;

Phase 3 – **Trial**: between the first day of the opening statements and the last day of the closing submissions;

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;

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;

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;

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.

⁴ Within each of these phases, the indicators outlined in the 2019 Report, have continued to be used for purposes of the present Report.

10. Indicators are to be taken and understood in context. The distinct features of each case and different procedural approaches taken by the various Chambers need to be taken into consideration when reading the numbers.⁵
11. Values are inherently quantitative: on their own they cannot account for the reality or complexity of a case. For instance, the number of charges brought against an accused does not necessarily mean that a trial is inherently more complex; conversely, a limited number of charges is not necessarily indicative of a comparatively simpler trial or of a reduced workload. The same holds true in respect of the number of grounds of appeal: it is based on the manner in which the parties present them and may not necessarily reflect the complexity of final appeals. Yet, the selected indicators, when taken in context, provide a relevant insight into the life arising out of the cases before the Court and ultimately lead to a better understanding of its workload.
12. Lastly, whilst the duration of the various phases of a case and overall are often seen as an indicator of efficiency, the Court's Statute mandates the Chambers to ensure both expeditiousness and fairness of the proceedings. As to the former, the Judiciary adopted timelines for the issue of certain decisions at its last Retreat held in October 2019. These deadlines have been incorporated in the present report.

Update on cases

13. Since the last Report, the following significant developments have occurred:
 - Following the issuance of the guilty verdict in *Ntaganda*, the sentencing (phase 5) was completed in *Ntaganda* on 7 November 2019, with appeals proceedings now pending, while the reparations phase (phase 6) commenced and is ongoing.
 - Proceedings in two new cases started: in *Al Hassan*, the trial opened on 14 July 2020, as scheduled, and the Prosecution's presentation of evidence began on 8 September 2020. In *Yekatom and Ngaïssona*, charges were confirmed on 11 December 2019, and the trial is set to commence on 9 February 2021.
 - The implementation phase of reparations is ongoing in the *Lubanga, Katanga, Al Mahdi* cases, following the completion of the reparations phase as defined for the purposes of this report.
 - Finally, the *Gbagbo & Blé Goudé* and *Ntaganda* cases remain at the appeals phase of the proceedings (phase 7). More detailed narratives are provided below.
14. ***The Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga.*** Having served his sentence in full, Thomas Lubanga Dyilo was released on 15 March 2020. Trial Chamber II remains seized of the implementation plans for symbolic collective reparations and collective service-based reparations, approved on 21 October 2016 and 6 April 2017, respectively. The process for locating new applicants and determining their eligibility for reparations as approved by Trial Chamber II on 7 February 2019 is ongoing.
15. ***The Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga.*** Trial Chamber II remains seized of the implementation of its reparations order issued on 24 March 2017.

⁵ It should also be noted that interlocutory appeals which arise from the Pre-Trial or Trial Chambers' decisions during phases 1-3 are not itemized by case: their potential impact on the timeline of the cases is therefore not apparent.

16. *The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba*. On 18 May 2020, Pre-Trial Chamber II rejected the claim for compensation and damages filed by Mr Bemba. These proceedings are now concluded.
17. *The Prosecutor v. Laurent Gbagbo & Charles Blé Goudé*. Following the notice of appeal filed by the Prosecutor on 16 September 2019, appeal proceedings are currently pending. Mr Gbagbo and Mr Blé Goudé are no longer detained at the ICC Detention Centre.
18. *The Prosecutor v. Al Mahdi*. On 4 March 2019, Trial Chamber VIII approved the Trust Fund for Victims's updated reparations implementation plan; the implementation of reparations remains ongoing.
19. *The Prosecutor v. Bosco Ntaganda*. Mr Bosco Ntaganda was found guilty by Trial Chamber VI on 8 July 2019 of five counts of crimes against humanity and thirteen counts of war crimes committed in Ituri (eastern Republic Democratic of the Congo) in 2002-2003. On 7 November 2019, Trial Chamber VI sentenced Mr Ntaganda to a total of 30 years of imprisonment. Appeals proceedings against the conviction and sentencing decision are pending. Submissions on reparations were received in February, September and October 2020, as ordered by Trial Chamber VI. On 30 October 2020, four experts appointed by the Chamber submitted their reports. Final submissions by the parties and the TFV are expected by 18 December 2020.
20. *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. The trial, which commenced in December 2016, concluded the presentation of evidence stage on 6 December 2019. The parties and participants submitted their closings briefs on 24 February 2020 and closing statements were heard from 10 to 12 March 2020. The Chamber has been in deliberation since 13 March 2020. The judgment is scheduled to be delivered in February 2021.
21. *The Prosecutor v. Al Hassan*. Mr Al Hassan is charged with war crimes and crimes against humanity allegedly committed in Timbuktu (Mali) and its region by armed groups Ansar Eddine / Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, between April 2012 and January 2013. Following the decision confirming the charges of 30 September 2019, Trial Chamber X was constituted and assigned the case on 21 November 2019. The trial opened on 14 July 2020, as scheduled. The Prosecution's presentation of evidence began on 8 September 2020 and is ongoing. As at 30 September 2020, the Chamber had heard the testimony of 11 witnesses.
22. *The Prosecutor v. Alfred Yekatom and Patrice-Edouard Ngaïssona*. On 11 December 2019, Pre-Trial Chamber II confirmed the charges against Mr Yekatom in full and against Mr Ngaïssona in part and committed them to trial. It found that there are substantial grounds to believe that they are each responsible for a number of war crimes and crimes against humanity allegedly perpetrated in various locations in the Central African Republic between December 2013 and August 2014. On 14 May and 1 June 2020, Pre-Trial Chamber II rejected the Prosecution's requests to amend the decision confirming the charges. On 16 March 2020, Trial Chamber V was constituted and assigned the case. On 9 July 2020, Trial Chamber V held its first status conference and subsequently set the trial commencement date to 9 February 2021. Preparation for trial is ongoing.

Improving the expeditiousness of the proceedings: deadlines for decisions

23. With regard to the need for efficiency, the judges decided to adopt deadlines for the issuance of certain decisions and related procedural steps. For example, the judges decided that:
- (i) The written decision under Article 74 of the Statute shall be delivered within 10 months from the date the closing statements end;
 - (ii) The closing statements shall begin within 90 days from the date the Presiding Judge declares the submission of evidence to be closed under Rule 141(1); and
 - (iii) The written decision under Article 76 shall be delivered within four months of the date of the decision on conviction.

These deadlines were included in the fourth edition of the Chambers' Practice Manual in November 2019.

Publicity of the proceedings

24. The two indicators selected to reflect the publicity of the proceedings (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.
25. The trial chambers usually issue public redacted versions of their decisions at the time of filing the original decision, except in the limited instances when this is not possible due to the nature of the issues addressed. Some public redacted versions of decisions are filed at a later stage, or their reclassification ordered, when the information no longer requires protection or during the review of the trial case record which is undertaken once the trial has concluded with a view to making the record as public as possible. As the indicator relating to the level of classification of the decisions only covers the relevant time-period for the report, it does not necessarily reflect the complete extent of publicity of the decisions. The use of private hearings is monitored closely by the Trial Chambers in the course of the trial, taking into account the need to protect confidential information to protect victims and witnesses. As for decisions, portions of confidential transcripts of hearings may be reclassified at a later stage.

Victims' participation

26. The KPIs related to victims and measuring: (i) meaningful victim participation; (ii) reparations and assistance; (iii) the Court's field presence; and (iv) in-country outreach and public information are placed under Judicial and Prosecutorial performance goals.

IV. Cooperation and complementarity goals

Cooperation

27. Relevant strategic goals for the cooperation related performance indicators are goal 4 of the ICC Strategic Plan, Strategic goal 2 of the OTP Strategic Plan and objective a) of the Division of External Operations (paragraph 22) of the Registry Strategic Plan – which are directly linked to

increasing cooperation and developing modalities of cooperation and operational support in the context of investigative, prosecutorial and judicial activities. Relevant Strategic goals for complementarity are ICCSP goal 5 as well as OTP goal 6.

28. In the 2019 report no indicators were included for Cooperation and Complementary goals, as these goals had no prior indicators developed or data collected as part of the previous years' reporting, unlike the other goals regarding judicial and organisational performance where the data was already measured and indicators developed. Instead, it was explained (in para 31) that in 2020, the goals in the ICCSP would be measured, consultation would take place with clients, and indicators would be devised for matters in which cooperation from States is required, with the aim to fill the gap relating to cooperation and complementarity goals. Furthermore, it was indicated that KPIs would also be identified regarding the positive impact that the Court may be having both in situation and non-situation States.
29. Unlike the judicial and organisational performance goals, the challenge resides in developing indicators in a way that they would measure the Court's performance as a contribution towards achieving its strategic goals, rather than that of cooperation partners. Both cooperation and complementarity goals by definition depend partly on external circumstances and do require interaction with and action from external actors and stakeholders. They are also not specific, scientific goals, and as such, their measurement and analysis, in particular as regards impact, requires both subjective and qualitative elements. While the Court's performance is the subject of the assessment in this report, separately, States might wish to analyse also the converse position – their cooperation with the Court.
30. Over the past years, the Court has developed different sets of data in particular regarding cooperation, which can be a useful starting point for performance measurement. This aggregated data has been shared for the first time in the Court's 2020 cooperation report to the ASP.⁶
31. To support and track their cooperation activities within their respective mandates and responsibilities in the field of cooperation, both the OTP and the Registry have created internal databases to store and keep track of the requests for cooperation and assistance they send to, or receive from, a variety of stakeholders. These databases have allowed both organs to provide overall quantitative data regarding the number of requests sent for each reporting period, to what number of stakeholders, the number of responses received, the average time required for their execution, as well as the number of requests for judicial assistance they received from States. Over the years, the Court has further refined its tracking and analysis of these requests by the type and complexity of the requests; hence the replies received as well as the databases have evolved accordingly.
32. The data collected describes the Court's efforts in terms of numbers and types of requests sent. Notwithstanding the very high number of requests as well as the variety of the types of support requested from States by the different organs of the Court, and, most notably the OTP and the Registry, overall, cooperation has been forthcoming and positive. Nevertheless, the Court continues to experience challenges in the execution of some of its requests, particularly those that seek to obtain large pools of information, or certain technical or sensitive requests, as well as cooperation regarding Defence-related requests and voluntary cooperation concerning release and

⁶ ICC-ASP/19/25.

interim release. The Court continues to dedicate much time and efforts to consulting with the relevant authorities and identifying suitable procedures that would allow for a diligent execution of its requests, pursuant to Part 9 of the Rome Statute and applicable national legislations, for all its various types of requests.

33. Regarding joint or parallel efforts on cooperation raised by the OTP and the Registry, they have both continued to develop their respective practices for the requests for assistance sent, so that their execution and implementation would be facilitated as much as possible, for example through prior consultations. They have also continued their common efforts to devise and implement strategies to facilitate the arrest of suspects within the inter-organ working group on arrest strategies created in March 2016, which has been reinforced since. In the field of financial investigations, the OTP and the Registry have continued to approach several State Parties on a bilateral basis to explore ways to access information in a timely manner and identify focal points among the relevant authorities and fast track channels to ensure the preservation of relevant information. Both organs continued their efforts to exchange good practices with States in order to improve the Court's requests and explain its specific mandate to States.

Complementarity

34. The OTP Strategic Plan 2016-2018 already included a “coordinated investigative and prosecutorial strategy to close the impunity gap” (goal 9), which has been followed by Goal 6 in its current Strategic plan 2019-2021, to “Further strengthen the ability of the Office and of its partners to close the impunity gap” and has also informed the Court's Strategic Goal 5, which aims to “[d]iscuss and devise with States and other stakeholders new strategies to increase the ability of the Rome Statute System to address the shared responsibility to close the impunity gap, including through encouraging the domestic implementation of the Rome Statute and other measures of complementarity by States Parties (including providing support and assistance to victims), as well as developing a strategy for the completion of situations under investigation.”
35. The performance indicator for the OTP to monitor its strategic goal 6, tracks the percentage of incoming requests for assistance (RFA) that have received a substantive response from the Office within three months of receipt, as this is the current target that the OTP strives to meet for all such requests. In the future, the timeline could be reduced to two months, in light of the experience obtained. It is worth noting that even in this field, the timeline to provide the substantive response to an incoming request for assistance may also depend on external factors including the consent of the sources to have their documents shared in line with the Rome Statute Art 93(10)'s requirements. The increase over years in requests for assistance demonstrates the recognised need and the added value that the OTP brings to investigations and prosecutions at the national level. In recent years, it is observed that new investigations have been started by States, and in some cases, investigations progressed, or achieved results, based on the information provided by the OTP. The opportunity of coordinated investigations between different States and the OTP is increasing its ability and the ability of its partners to investigate Rome Statute and related crimes, jointly contributing to the aim of closing the impunity gap. It is therefore an appropriate performance indicator also for the Court's Strategic goal purposes.
36. Additional performance indicators for this Goal are currently being considered by the Court, jointly and separately by its organs in line with their different mandates, encompassing both

qualitative aspects (reporting, impact assessment of activities, statements, policies, advice provided, population research) and quantitative measures (volume of activities, number of cases supported, etc.). In this work the Court aims to focus mainly at measuring those factors that are largely in its control, or that it has the ability to influence.

37. As is the case with cooperation, the complementarity activities taking place outside the Court, and notably those taken by domestic actors, could also be measured through these indicators. In future work it will be pertinent to consider in the performance measurement context, the 2012 Court report on complementarity.⁷ As one concrete example, the Rome Statute domestic legislation implementation rate, or other legislative measures aimed at closing the impunity gap, such as the inclusion of international crimes or on specific issues such as sexual and gender-based crimes or crimes against or affecting children, or participation in the mutual legal assistance regimes, would be relatively easy to monitor and measure by States themselves. There is also a linkage to the Court's performance in that there are (ad hoc) instances where the Court's participation in high-level events may have either triggered such legislative developments, or had an impact on the content of relevant legislations.
38. An even broader view of the Court's performance could be taken with the consideration to measuring, for instance, its preventive or catalytic impact on situations under preliminary examination or investigation. This could include the extent to which victims' expectations are met; the development of investigative and prosecutorial strategies in the national context, or the evolution of crimes in such settings. However, measuring the success in closing (or even "narrowing") the impunity gap in a quantitative, target-based manner could prove to be particularly challenging because (a) impact depends primarily on the implementation of certain measures by domestic actors and not on specific targets set and controlled by the Court, and (b) impact is rather a matter of a qualitative, at times anecdotal, assessment by members of staff working on certain situations.
39. While it might be difficult, if not impossible, to isolate the Court's impact from that of many other actors, this could be an interesting avenue for States and the Court to explore, for example through joint research with suitable partners. Areas to consider in this regard are measurable indicators that would be relevant and feasible in order to assess the Court's impact in the long term. Indeed, as seen from the experience of other international criminal jurisdictions, the overall impact of the delivery of justice needs to be measured over time with significant experience and activity, and thus year-to-year indicators might neither be suitable nor capable of providing an accurate reading of the Court's impact.
40. In any case, additional performance indicators for this Goal are currently being considered by the Court, jointly and separately by its organs, in line with their different mandates, encompassing both qualitative aspects (reporting, impact assessment of activities, statements, policies, advice provided, population research) and quantitative measures (volume of activities, number of cases supported, etc.).
41. As explained at the SGG meeting on 24 September 2020, the Court is still in the process of discussing and developing performance indicators regarding cooperation and complementarity. The present report includes for the first time a set of indicators that address these two essential

⁷ ICC-ASP/11/39.

aspects of the work of the Court, which will be further developed and complemented in future issuances of the report.

V. Organisational performance goals

42. As regards Organizational performance goals, the report maintains selected internal indicators that were included in previous reports. These performance indicators focus on four main areas: (i) accessibility of ICC-related information; (ii) budget implementation; (iii) human resources issues of a Court-wide significance; and (iv) procurement. Indicators related to security in two main areas: (i) physical and asset security (in the field and at headquarters); and (ii) information security (in the field and at Headquarters) have now been included as part of the Organisational performance goals.
43. The Court continues to work to achieve progress both in relation to adequate geographical representation and regarding gender balance for the most senior professional levels (P-4 and above). This is one of the strategic priorities in the Court's and organ-specific Strategic Plans 2019-2021. A number of initiatives have been put in place to this end.
44. In terms of geographical representation, the Court has taken a customized approach and has cooperated closely with several of the most under-represented States in order to increase the ICC's profile as an employer in the relevant national frameworks and also to create concrete opportunities for the nationals of those States to obtain working experience at the ICC. This has resulted in the conclusion of several agreements on the Junior Professional Officers (JPO) programmes.
45. In terms of gender balance, a mentorship programme for women at the ICC has been established in order to facilitate their career development and priority to women has been given in the leadership development programmes.
46. While it may take some time before these and other measures planned result in increased geographical and gender share and are therefore reflected in the KPIs, the Court is confident that it is creating a momentum for a gradual and steady improvement in these important areas.

VI. Next steps

47. On 30 September 2020, the *Independent Expert Review of the International Criminal Court and the Rome Statute System* issued its Final Report. In it, the experts made several observations and recommendations in relation to key performance indicators.⁸
48. The Court has taken note of the report and the recommendations on key performance indicators and will work, in consultation with its States Parties through the Study Group, in further improving successive issuances of its report on key performance indicators.

⁸ IER Report, dated 30 September 2020, paras. 354 to 369, and recommendations R144 to R148, pages 114 to 118.

Annex I – Judicial and prosecutorial performance goals

A. Phase 1 – Confirmation	14
B. Phase 2 – Trial Preparation	19
C. Phase 3 – Trial.....	21
D. Phase 4 – Trial Deliberations.....	26
E. Phase 5 – Sentencing	27
F. Phase 6 – Reparations	28
G. Phase 7 – Appeals.....	30
H. Interlocutory appeals	31
I. Overall disclosure figures	32
J. Duration of the phases for previous cases	33
K. Indicators of publicity.....	37
L. Transcripts, translation and interpretation.....	37
M. Volume of witness-related services delivered	38
N. Victim Participation.....	39
1. <i>Indicators per phase of a case – number of victims participating by phase of proceedings as of 30 September 2020.....</i>	39
2. <i>Victim legal representation – number of victims represented by the OPCV and/or external victim’s representatives per case at trial.....</i>	40
3. <i>Number of field trips of court-appointed legal representatives of victims (OPCV Counsel and field assistants</i>	41
4. <i>Number of field trips of court-appointed external legal representatives of victims.....</i>	41
5. <i>Number of appointments and missions undertaken by Duty/ad hoc Counsel/and Rule 74 Counsel.....</i>	42
O. Reparations and assistance	43
1. <i>Number of decisions taken by the Board of Directors on victims’ eligibility.....</i>	43
2. <i>Number of victims for each case benefitting from reparations projects during the reporting period</i>	43

3. <i>Number of victims benefitting from assistance mandate-related TFV projects vs. overall number of victims</i>	43
P. ICC Field Presence.....	45
Q. In-country outreach and public information.....	46
1. <i>Events organized by the Court’s Outreach Unit, and the level of participation</i>	46
2. <i>Hours of radio and TV broadcasts of audio-visual productions on the ICC</i>	46
3. <i>Estimated population reached through radio and television</i>	47
4. <i>Interviews given in the field to local media</i>	47

A. PHASE 1 – CONFIRMATION

Between the 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		The cases of Mr Gbagbo and Mr Blé Goudé were joined on 11 December 2015, after the confirmation of charges in the respective cases.		1				5			
Time lapse between transfer of suspect in ICC custody and assignment / appointment of permanent counsel	16 days		Transfer: 21 January 2015 Appointment: 6 February 2015		27 days		Transfer: 22 March 2013 Appointment: 18 April 2013 *** Mr Ntaganda confirmed the counsel who had assisted him during the first appearance.		0 day (L. Gbagbo) 4 days (C. Blé Goudé)		L. Gbagbo Transfer: 22 March 2013 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 the 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 F. 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			
Number of motions / number of pages contained in the motions / number of pages contained in the annexes	Prosecution	80	1,070	*	92	992	*	223 /19	1,606/ 270	*	L. Gbagbo: 179 / 1,388 pages C. Blé Goudé: 44 / 218 pages	56	888	*	105	597	*			
	Defence	38	370	*	42	794	*	202	3,058	*	L. Gbagbo: 170 / 2,848 pages C. Blé Goudé: 32 / 210 pages	4	36	*	240	3,401	*			
	Victims	4 (External LRV)	44	*	1 (LRV)	6	*	40	610	*	L. Gbagbo: 36 / 564 pages C. Blé Goudé: 4 / 46 pages	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A			
		7 (OPCV)	74	*	14 (OPCV)	205	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*	*	*			
Others (including Registry)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*	*	*				
Participating victims	Number of applications ⁹	2048			1200			N/A			Not applicable as there was no Pre-Trial stage in the joint case. Victims authorized to participate at Pre-Trial in the Gbagbo case (199) were also admitted at Pre-Trial in the Blé-Goudé case.	N/A			N/A					
	Number of victims authorised to participate	2,026			1,119			*				N/A		Admission of guilt. There was no application process and therefore no participating victims at this stage of the proceedings.	N/A			There were no participating victims in this case.		

⁹ Corresponds to number of victims applications transmitted in the record of the case.

							Victims authorized to participate at Pre-Trial in the Blé-Goudé case (470) were also admitted at Pre-Trial in the Gbagbo case.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Indicators	Al Hassan			Yekatom & Ngaïssona			Abd Al Rahman(Ali Kushayb)	
	Data	Comments		Data	Comments		Data	Comments
Number of suspects	1			2	The Yekatom and the Ngaïssona cases were joined on 20 th February 2019, pursuant to Decision ICC-01/14-01/18-87		1	
Time lapse between transfer of suspect in ICC custody and assignment / appointment of permanent counsel	16 days	<p>Transfer: 31 March 2018.</p> <p>Appointment: Mr Yasser Hassan has been appointed as his duty Counsel on 3 April 2018 and as Counsel on 16 April 2018.</p> <p>Pursuant to his request for withdrawal filed 24 April 2019, Ms Melinda Taylor has been appointed as his Counsel on 2 May 2019</p>		2 days (Yekatom)	<p>A. Yekatom Transfer: 17 November 2018.</p> <p>Appointment : Mr Morouba has been appointed as his Counsel on 19 November 2018. Pursuant to his suspension on 20 November 2018, the Chamber appointed the OPCD to represent Mr Yekatom. Mr Morouba's filed his request for withdrawal on 27 November 2018.</p> <p>Mr Bourgon has been appointed as his Counsel on 29 November 2018. Pursuant to his request for withdrawal, Ms Mylène Dimiri, who joined the Defence team on 3 December 2018, has been appointed as Counsel on 6 August 2019</p> <p>P. Ngaïssona Transfer: 23 January 2019</p> <p>Appointment: Mr Plouvier has been appointed as his Counsel on 24 January 2019.</p> <p>He filed his request for withdrawal on 5 February 2019, that became effective on 12 February 2019.</p> <p>On 15 February 2019, Mr Knoops has been appointed as his Counsel.</p>		10 days (duty Counsel appointed 3 days after his transfer was confirmed as permanent Counsel)	<p>Transfer : 9 June 2020</p> <p>Appointment: Mr. Cyril Laucci has been appointed as his duty Counsel on 12 June 2020 and as Counsel on 19 June 2020.</p>
Number of charges confirmed	13	The Decision confirming the charges has been appealed but the appeal was rejected by the Chamber		42	Overall number, not accused specific.			The commencement of the confirmation of charges hearing initially set for Monday, 7 December 2020 has been postponed until 22 February 2021
Number of motions / number of pages contained in the motions / number of pages contained in the annexes	Prosecution	189	2510p		108	913p		See below page 17
	Defence	102	1113p		Def N: 41 Def Y:57	510p 347p		
	Victims	5	63p		8	95p		
	OPCV				3	16p		
	Others (including Registry)	56	371p		57	385p		
	OPCD				1	5p		
Participating victims	Number of applications	891			1096		N/A	No transmission of applications to date.
	Number of victims authorised to participate	882			1085		N/A	

PHASE 1 – CONFIRMATION (continued)
Between the 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	Oral	*	*		*		*		*	
	In writing	116	The number includes some decisions and orders copied from the <i>Kony et al.</i> case when the case was severed.	82		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)	Prosecution	1,658 items 12,534 pages		2,081 items		3,817 items (L. Gbagbo) 2,425 items (C. Blé Goudé)		593 items		715 items 2,286 pages
	Defence	*		*		776		0		187 Mr Arido: 86 items Mr Kilolo: 101 items
Number of hearing days used	Confirmation hearing	5		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		4		7 (L. Gbagbo) 3 (C. Blé Goudé)		1		6
Number of languages supported in the courtroom	3 French, English, Acholi		3 English, French, Kinyarwanda		2 French, English		3 English, French, Arab		2 English, French	
Scheduled confirmation hearing date achieved	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	Initially set for 12 September 2013; Postponed to 10 February 2014	No	L. Gbagbo: Initially set for 19 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. C. Blé Goudé: Initially set for 18 August 2014, but postponed to 22, then 29 September 2014, due to parties' requests regarding the collection of evidence / time to investigate.	No	Initially set for 18 January 2016, the hearing took place 1 March 2016, at the request of the defence	No	For proceedings under Article 70, no hearing is required; proceedings were held in writing. The confirmation of charges calendar was amended three times due to <i>inter alia</i> the time the Dutch authorities needed to make intercepted communications to the Court.
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	14 months, 15 days	Date of first appearance: 26 March 2013 *** Decision on the confirmation of charges: 9 June 2014	L. Gbagbo: 30 months, 8 days C. Blé Goudé: 8 months, 15 days	L. Gbagbo 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 initial 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. Kilolo, F. Babala): 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

Indicators		Al Hassan From 21/11/2019 (assignment to Trial Chamber X) to 30/09/2020		Yekatom First appearance 23 November 2018 DCC: 11 December 2019 Ngaïssona : First appearance 25 January 2019 DCC: 11 December 2019		Abd Al Rahman First appearance: 15 June 2020 Confirmation of charges hearing provisionally set for 7 December 2020 No decision yet on confirmation of charges	
		Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments
Decisions and orders	Oral	8					
	In writing	103 /1854 p		83 Decisions 906 p		29/269p (from 15 June 2020 to 30 SEPT 2020)	
	By email (where applicable)	444		12		16	
Amount of evidence submitted for the purpose of the confirmation of charges (number of items / pages)	Prosecution	20383 items 66009 pages		8088 items 45441 pages	Only the Defence for Mr Ngaïssona submitted evidence	852 documents, 6288 pages	
	Defence	0		17 items 91 pages			
Number of hearing days used	Confirmation hearing	5		6		N/A	
	Others	2		3		2	
Number of languages supported in the courtroom		3	French, English and Arabic	3	French, English and Sango	French, English and Arabic	
Scheduled confirmation hearing date achieved		8	8-17 July 2019	5	19-25 September and 11 October 2019.	N/A	
Absolute duration of the phase		17 months, 26 days	Date of first appearance: 4 April 2018. *** Decision on the confirmation of charges: 30 September 2019. Defence request for leave to appeal filed on 7 October 2019 was rejected	Yekatom : 1 year, 18 days Ngaïssona : 10 months, 16 days	Date of first appearance Alfred Yekatom: 23 November 2018 Patrice-Edouard Ngaïssona: 25 January 2019 *** Decision on the confirmation of charges: 11 December 2019	Ongoing from 15 June 2020	

B. 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	*	200	1,764	*	131	946	*	34	384	*	113	981	*
	Defence	30	291	*	113	1,100	*	209	2,792	*	10	91	*	215	2,154	*
	Victims	LRV 6	86	*	LRV 5	38	*	22	259	*	6	39	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
		OPCV 5	62	*	22	259	*									
	Others (including Registry)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Decisions and orders	Oral	3			11			*			*			*		
	In writing	32			100			*			*			*		
	By email (where applicable)	*			*			*			*			*		
Amount of disclosed material by the parties (number of items / pages)	Prosecution	18,613	126,141		12,886	102,415		11,088	72,018		12,496	36,704		3,034	8,824	
	Defence	68	331		1	2		95	941		2	8		350	1,794	
	Other	*	*		*	*		*	*		*	*		*	*	
Number of hearing days used		1			12			9			1			1		
Scheduled trial start date achieved		Yes			No			No			Yes			Yes		
Absolute duration of the phase		8 months, 11 days			14 months, 25 days			L. Gbagbo: 19 months, 17 days C. Blé Goudé: 13 months, 18 days			4 months, 30 days			10 months, 19 days		
		Decision on the confirmation of charges: 26 March 2016 *** First day of opening statements: 6 December 2016			Decision on the confirmation of charges: 9 June 2014 *** First day of opening statements: 2 September 2015			L. Gbagbo's trial was set to start on 7 July 2015. Cases of L. Gbagbo and C. Blé Goudé were joined on 11 March 2015. The joint trial was set to commence on 10 November 2015 but began on 28 January 2016. L. Gbagbo Decision on the confirmation of charges: 12 June 2014 First day of opening statements: 28 January 2016 *** C. Blé Goudé Decision on the confirmation of charges: 11 December 2014 First day of opening statements: 28 January 2016			Decision on the confirmation of charges: 24 March 2016 *** First day of opening statements: 22 August 2016			Decision on the confirmation of charges: 11 November 2014 *** First date of opening statements: 29 September 2015		

Indicators		Ongwen			Al Hassan		Yekatom & Ngaïssona Between 11 December 2019 to 30 sept 2020 for the purpose of this report						
		Data		Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments					
Number of accused persons		1				1		2					
Number of charges		70				13		42					
Number of motions / number of pages contained in the motions / number of pages contained in the annexes	Prosecution	53	837	*	from 30sept 2019 to 14 July 2020	1663p	Between 11 December 2019 to 30 sept 2020 for the purpose of this report	677p					
	Defence	30	291	*		210			82				
	Victims	LRV	6	86		*		112	1396p	Def N:37 Def Y:42 Duty: 1	451p 411p 12p		
		OPCV	5	62		*		20	170p	Vict/OPCV:16	268p		
	Others (including Registry)	*	*	*				39	313p	41	305p		
Decisions and orders	Oral	3				14		Court clerks					
	In writing	32				100	1193p	62	796p				
	By email (where applicable)	*				411		87					
Amount of disclosed material by the parties (number of items / pages)	Prosecution	18,613	126,141		Ecourt from 30sept 2019 to 14 July 2020	57340p	Ecourt – from 11 December 2019 to 30 September 2020	7794	25205p				
	Defence	68	331							12387		3	32p (D29)
	Other	*	*							68	1390p		
Number of hearing days used		1				5		1					
Scheduled trial start date achieved		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	9 months, 14 days	Decision on the confirmation of charges : 30 September 2019 First day of opening statement : 14 July 2020	If confirmed : 9 February 2021 1 year, 1 month, 9 days	Decision on the confirmation of charges : 11 December 2019 First day of opening statement : Scheduled on 9 February 2021					

C. PHASE 3 – TRIAL

Between the first day of the opening statements and the last day of the closing submissions

Indicators	Ongwen <i>Between 6 December 2016 to 14 March 2020</i>		Ntaganda <i>2 September 2015 to 30 August 2018</i>		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	
Time allocated for opening statements	12.36 hours	5 hours for the Prosecution 2.5 hours for the LRVs 4 hours 46 minutes for the Defence	9 hours	4 hours for the Prosecution 4 hours for the Defence 1 hour to be divided between two LRVs	8 hours	3 hours for the Prosecution 3 hours for each Defence team 2 hours for the LRV		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 Kiloto 1.5 hours for Mr Mangenda 1.5 hours for Mr Babala 1.5 hours for Mr Arido
Time allocated for closing submissions	10-12 March 2020 11.03 hours	Prosecution Defence LRVs	14,5 hours	See ICC-01/04-02-06-2308, para. 6: “[...] the Chamber decides to grant the parties five hours each for the presentation of their respective closing statements, as well as half an hour each for any submissions in response, or reply, as appropriate. The Legal Representatives shall have one hour each to present their closing statements and the accused shall have a maximum of 30 minutes to make an unsworn statement.”	33h55min	1 - 3 October submissions by the OTP and LRV 12 – 22 November submissions by the Defence teams	*		14 hours	4 hours for the prosecution 2 hours per defence team
Number of hearing days scheduled	349	As of 16 January 2017 until 12 March 2020	318	No cumulative data available before November 2016 The data available from January 2017 until September 2019.	165	No cumulative data available before November 2016 The data available from January 2017 until September 2019.	1	No cumulative data available before November 2016 The data available from January 2017 until September 2019.	4	No cumulative data available before November 2016 The data available from January 2017 until September 2019.
Number of hearing days used	232	As of 16 January 2017 until 12 March 2020	249	As of March 2013 until 30 December 2018	230	As of July 2015 until 30 September 2019	8	As of September 2015 until 30 September 2019	59	As of October 2013 until 30 September 2019
Number of witnesses	Heard in Physical presence	96		71	This includes the 8 victims who gave their views.	66		3		13
	Heard via video-link	35		22		16		0		6
	Testimony introduced in writing 68-2	49		21		2		2		8
	Hybrid (testimony introduced in writing but witness present in court) 68-3	25		24		20		0		5
Average time per witness	6 h05min		7 hours, 56 minutes (victims included)		9 hours		2 hours		5 hours	

Indicators	<i>Ongwen</i> <i>Between 6 December 2016 to 14 March 2020</i>				<i>Ntaganda</i> <i>2 September 2015 to 30 August 2018</i>				<i>Gbagbo & Blé Goudé</i>			<i>Al Mahdi</i>			<i>Bemba et al.</i>									
	Data		Comments		Data		Comments		Data	Comments		Data	Comments		Data	Comments								
Percentage of witnesses benefitting from protective measures	45.8%				76%				24,4%			67%			63%									
Number of witnesses brought to headquarters	104				71				66			3			13									
Participating victims	Number of applications ¹⁰		4,139				2,396		727			9			This case has reached the reparation phase. 218 reparation forms have been accepted at reparations phase, as per TFV administrative decisions.									
	Number of victims authorised to participate		4,095				2,132		716			8												
Number of victims allowed to present views and concerns					8				No case to answer at the end of the Prosecution case			0			N/A									
Number of motions/ Number of pages contained in motions/ Number of pages contained in the annexes	Prosecution		231	1522p			456 410	8,800 3947p	6,267				348	5,143	5,106				1	3	*			
	Defence Duty Counsel		223 32	2162p 166p			296 365 7	2,936 3403p 33	1,333				122	1,621	1749				3	59	*			
	Victims OPCV		39 64	469p 808p			61 9 121	459 76 1404	9				37	431	78				1	5	*			
	Others Chambers		111 399	517p 2379p	Chambers without Redaction Orders 149/1176p		57 75 542	747 398 3680	669	Chambers without Redaction Orders 253/2371p			50	207	93				*	*	*			

Indicators	<i>Al Hassan</i> <i>From 14 July 2020 to 30 September 2020</i> <i>for the purpose of this report – trial on going</i>	
	Data	Comments
Number of accused persons	1	
Number of charges	13	
Time allocated for opening statements	5h58min	Prosecution :3h09 Defence Legal Representatives of victims :

¹⁰ Corresponds to number of victims applications transmitted in the record of the case.

Time allocated for closing submissions		n/a	Trial is ongoing		
Number of hearing days scheduled		31	As of 14 July 2020 until 30 September 2020 for the purpose of this report – Trial is ongoing		
Number of hearing days used		18	As of 14 July 2020 until 30 September 2020 and is ongoing		
Number of witnesses 11	Heard in Physical presence	7	As of 14 July 2020 to 30 September 2020		
	Heard via video-link	4			
	Testimony introduced in writing	0			
	Hybrid (testimony introduced in writing but witness present in court)	15			
Average time per witness		3h05			
Percentage of witnesses benefitting from protective measures		63.3%			
Number of witnesses brought to headquarters		7			
Participating victims	Number of applications¹¹	891			
	Number of victims authorised to participate	882			
Number of victims allowed to present views and concerns					
Number of motions/ Number of pages contained in	Prosecution	48	387		
	Defence	38	259		

¹¹ Corresponds to number of victims applications transmitted in the record of the case.

motions/ Number of pages contained in the annexes	Victims	9	58		
	Others	14	95		
	Chambers	24	293		

Indicators		<i>Al Hassan</i> 14 July 2020 – 30 September 2020			
		Data		Comments	
Decisions and orders	Oral	17			
	In writing	33			
	By email (where applicable)	51			
Amount of disclosed material by the parties (number of items / number of pages)	Prosecution	535d items	2864 pages		
	Defence	291 items	1694 pages		
	Other (including Registry)	23 items	25 pages		
Amount of evidence submitted (number of items / number of pages)		115			
Number of pages of final submissions by the parties		n/a			
Number of languages supported in the courtroom		3 English, French, Arabic		Ongoing trial	
Length of the evidentiary phase	Prosecution	n/a		Ongoing trial	
	Victims, if applicable	n/a		Ongoing trial	
	Defence	n/a		Ongoing trial	
Absolute duration of the phase		n/a		Ongoing trial	

PHASE 3 – TRIAL (continued)

Between the first day of the opening statements and the last day of the closing submissions

Indicators		Ongwen 6 December 2016 – 14 March 2020		Ntaganda		Gbagbo & Blé Goudé		Al Mahdi		Bemba et al.	
		Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments
Decisions and orders	Oral	53		257				12		80	
	In writing	124		252		105		18		266	
	By email (where applicable)	176		71		20		37		*	
Amount of disclosed material by the parties (number of items / number of pages)	Prosecution	5820	20831p	3350	23621	2542	12583	111	2,844	6,601	33,350
	Defence	652	6998p	633	6351	966 (LG) 294 (CBG)	5655 (LG) 1839 (CBG)	2	8	907	8,532
	Other (including Registry)	98	78p	186	740	240	594	*	*	*	*
Amount of evidence submitted (number of items / number of pages)		6570 items		4169 items		4042 items		714 items		2,075 / 13,123	
Number of pages of final submissions by the parties		Defence: 198p OTP: 202p Victim: 123p OPCV: 115p		1161 pages	464 – Defence 423 – OTP 105 – Rep. Child soldiers 169 – Rep other attacks These digits do not take the annexes into consideration	Submissions pursuant the Defence teams submissions for a “no case to answer” were held orally		49	Prosecution: 21 pages Defence: 28 pages <i>The Defence only submitted observations on sentencing</i>	571	Prosecution: 150 pages Mr Bemba: 77 pages Mr Kilolo: 9 pages Mr Babala: 90 pages Mr Arido: 85 pages
Number of languages supported in the courtroom		6 English, Acholi, French, Ateso, Lango, Swahili	French transcripts are still prepared but no one speaks this language in the courtroom	4 English, French, Kinyarwanda, Swahili		3 French, English, Dioula		3 English, French, Arabic		2 English, French	
Length of the evidentiary phase	Prosecution	1 year, 2 months, 27 days	The presentation of evidence by the Prosecution started on 16 January 2017 and ended on 12 April 2018	18 months, 15 days	The presentation of evidence by the Prosecution started on 15 September 2015 and ended on 29 March 2017.	1 year, 11 months, 17 days.	<i>As of 30 September 2017</i> The presentation of evidence by the Prosecution started on 2 February 2016 and ended on 19 January 2018.	N/A	The trial was held in a short span of time.	1 month, 29 days	
	Victims, if applicable	24 days	From 1 May to 24 May 2018	3 days	From 10 to 12 April 2017	N/A		N/A		N/A	
	Defence	1 year, 1 month, 28 days	The presentation of evidence by the Defence started on 01 October 2018 until 29 November 2019	8 months	The presentation of evidence by the Defence started on 29 May 2017 and ended on 29 January 2018		N/A			N/A	
Absolute duration of the phase		3 years, 3 months, 7 days	First day of opening statements: 6 December 2016 *** Last day of closing statements : 12 March 2020	2 years 11 months 15 days	First day of opening statements: 2 September 2015 Last day of closing statements: 30 August 2018	3 years 1 month 3 days	Trial opened on 28 January 2016 Acquittal by TCI on 15 January 2019 Confirmed by AC on 1 February 2019	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

D. PHASE 4 – TRIAL DELIBERATIONS

Between the last day of the closing submissions and the issuance of the judgement on conviction

Indicators	Ongwen		Ntaganda		Gbagbo & Blé Goudé		Al Mahdi		Bemba et al.	
	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments	Data	Comments
Number of pages of judgement	n/a		539		8	The majority's analysis of the evidence is contained in Judge Henderson's reasons (Annex B)	49	Judgement and sentence combined in one decision; Judgement itself is about 30 pages.	458	
Number of pages of annexes (if applicable)	n/a		41	Anx A: 15 Anx B: 5 Anx C: 21	1058	Anx A: 90 Anx B: 968	0		0	
Number of pages of appended opinions (if applicable)	n/a		n/a		307	Anx C: 307	0		0	
Absolute duration of the phase	n/a	Ongoing deliberation from 12 March 2020	10 months 9 days	Last day closing statement: 30 August 2018 Judgement: 8 July 2019	9 months and 16 days	1-3October 2018 – Oral Submission Prosecution on a “no case to answer motion filed by the defence teams 12-21 November 2018 – Oral submissions Defence 15 January 2019 – Oral Decision TCI 16 July 2019 Written reasons of the Decision on acquittal.	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

E. PHASE 5 – SENTENCING

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

Indicators		Ongwen			Ntaganda			Gbagbo & 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				n/a	10	62	0	n/a				n/a Judgement on conviction and sentencing issued at the same time	14	154	44
	Defence					14	120	598						71	474	202
	Victims					0	0	0						N/A	N/A	N/A
	Others (including Registry)					0	0	0						*	*	*
Decisions and Orders		n/a			12			n/a			22					
Amount of evidence submitted for the purpose of sentencing (number of items / pages)	Prosecution				n/a	23	964		n/a	N/A			See "Trial" phase	28		
	Defence					20	75			2 items				157		
	Victims					0				N/A				N/A		
Number of witnesses heard					n/a	3		All three were Defence witnesses, two were heard via video link	n/a	0		n/a	1			
Number of hearing days used	Sentencing hearing				n/a	3			n/a	1		Oral hearing to deliver the judgement on conviction and sentence	4		3 days for sentencing hearings (12 – 14 December 2016); 1 day for the delivery of the sentencing decision (22 March 2017)	
	Others					0				0				0		
Number of pages of sentencing decision						125		117 + 8 in annex		49		See "Judgement" phase	100			
Absolute duration of the phase		Not Applicable –	Deliberations ongoing from 12 March 2020		4 months		From 8 July 2019 to 7 November 2019		Not Applicable –	Both accused were acquitted on 15 January 2019, Confirmed, under condition by the Appeals Chamber on 1 February 2019	N/A	Trial Chamber VIII rendered the judgement and the sentence simultaneously	I year 11 months		Date of judgement on conviction: 19 October 2016. Appeals Chamber confirmed the conviction on 8 March 2018 but reversed the sentences of Mr Bemba, Mr Mangenda and Mr Kilo and remanded the matter to the Trial Chamber for a new determination. The TCVII rendered its Decision on 17 September 2018	

F. 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			Al Mahdi			Ntaganda					
	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 <i>The reparations order was amended by the Appeals Chamber on 3 March 2015 and completed by Trial Chamber II on 15 December 2017.</i> *** Date of judgement of the Appeals Chamber on the determination of Mr Lubanga's amount of liability 18 July 2019			Date of judgement on conviction: 7 March 2014 *** Date of first reparations order: 24 March 2017 *** Date of judgement on the appeals against the order for reparations of Trial Chamber II 08 March 2018.			Date of judgement on conviction: 27 September 2016 *** Date of first reparations order: 17 August 2017 The reparations order has been appealed on 18 September 2017. Judgement issued 8 March 2018			Date of judgement on conviction: 17.07.2019 *** Date of first reparations order: 25.07.2019 (“Order for preliminary information on reparations”)				
Number of victims seeking reparations, as applicable	1009	This is the total number of applications received to date in the case, including those assessed by the Appeals Chamber II before the Appeals Chamber judgement and those of potential beneficiaries identified after the judgement and submitted to TFV via VPRS..		341	Total number of applications for reparations received in the case.		660	Number of victims who submitted applications to receive reparations; an additional 400 applications expected until March 2021.		2139					
Number of victims who will receive reparations, in case of individual awards	854	The collective award will address a specific number of eligible victims; eligibility determination is ongoing.		297	Total number of victims found to be eligible for reparations.		124	Board of Directors issued until September 2020 this number of positive administrative decisions for individual reparations. (ongoing)			No decision on reparations beneficiaries to date.				
Number of motions/ Number of pages contained in the motions/ Number of	Victims OPCV	23	234	9	23	2,655	2,424	138	1,490	1,333	1	9	20	418p	To date, no implementation plan has been submitted in the Case, therefore, the end date for this section should be the end date of the reporting period (30
	Defence	23	583	492	*	*	*	4	49	*	57	927p	0		
	TFV (where appropriate)	24	323	221	13	259	245	6	73	*	3	74p	0		

Indicators	Lubanga				Katanga				Al Mahdi				Ntaganda				
	Data			Comments	Data			Comments	Data			Comments	Data			Comments	
	pages contained in the annexes	Others (including experts)															
		485	7,279	7,161		2	5	*		237	2,131	1,957		15	107p		September 2020).
Decisions and orders	Oral	*				*				*				0			To date, no implementation plan has been submitted in the Case, therefore, the end date for this section should be the end date of the reporting period (30 September 2020).
	In writing	57				17				28				54/1004p			
	By email (where applicable)	*				*				*				0			
Number of hearing days used		2			Trial Chamber II decision fixing the amount of reparations for which Mr Lubanga is liable on 15 December 2017	2			Delivery of the reparation order on 24 March 2017	2			Delivery of the reparation order on 17 August 2017	n/a			Hearings were held for other purposes than the reparations
					Appeals Chamber delivery of judgment on two appeals filed pursuant to Article 82(4) against the decision setting the size of the reparations award on 18 July 2019				Appeals Chamber delivery of judgment on three appeals pursuant to article 82(4) against the order for reparations on 08 March 2018.				Appeals Chamber delivery of judgment on appeal against the reparations order on 08 March 2018.				
Time lapse between issuance of reparations decision/order and approval of implementation plan		Symbolic reparations 19 months, 19 days			Date of the amended reparations order: 3 March 2015 ***	Individual reparations 6 months, 19 days			Date of approval of implementation of individual reparations 12 October 2017 ***	1 year, 6 months, 16 days			Date of approval of implementation plan 04 March 2019	Ongoing			Date of First Decision on Reparation process : 26 June 2020 No Decision on implementation/approval of reparation plan yet
		Collective reparations 25 months, 4 days			Date of approval of implementation plan (symbolic reparations): 21 October 2016	Collective reparations 1 year, 6 months, days			Date of the issuance of the order to the TFV to file information on the modalities of collective reparations 20 September 2018 ***								
Number of pages of the reparations order		94				131 (over 1000 pages for the annex)				61				n/a			
Absolute duration of the phase					Phase is ongoing				Phase is ongoing				Phase is ongoing	n/a			Ongoing

G. 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		n/a	2 Against conviction)			1 (Prosecution)				N0 appeal in this case	5 (against conviction)	Mr Arido; Mr Babala; Mr Mangenda; Mr Bemba; Mr Kilolo		
			4 (against sentence)								Mr Arido; Mr Babala; Mr Bemba; Prosecution			
Number of grounds per party	Defence	n/a	15	See doc. 01/04-02/06-2396 and 2395		n/a					23 / conviction 20 / sentence	Mr Arido; 5 (conviction; 2 (sentence) Mr Babala		
	Prosecution		2			2					N/A / conviction 2 / sentence			
Number of motions / number of pages contained in the motions / number of pages contained in the annexes	Prosecution	n/a	1	5	0		1	9	0			13	178	31
	Defence		3	28	54 0						189	4,833	3,645	
	Victims		1	12	0						N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Others (including Registry)										5	15	4	
Decisions and orders	n/a		7			2					52			
Numbers of hearing days used	Appeals hearing		n/a	3 hearings days used for the purpose of sentencing		0					2			
	Others		3			0					0			
Number of pages of appeals judgement	n/a		n/a			n/a			n/a		699			
Absolute duration of the phase	n/a		n/a	First notice of Appeals filed by the Defence on 17 July 2019		n/a	Phase ongoing				1 year 4 months 8 days	The first notice of appeal against the trial judgement was filed by Mr Arido on 31 October 2016. *** The Appeals Chamber rendered its Judgment on 8 March 2018		

H. INTERLOCUTORY APPEALS

Year		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number of Interlocutory Appeals handled		10	19	12	7	14	17	6	7	2	8	12
Average Duration (Days)	Between the submission of the appeal brief and the issuance of the judgement	92	49	58	87	168	147	107	92	149 days (only two OAs as follows: OA13) 3 days OA2) 295 days)	56 days	
	Between the completion of all submissions and the issuance of the judgement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	108	129	88	88	153 days (only two OAs as follows: OA13) 3 days OA2) 304 days)	85 days	
Comments						Since 2014, stored data allows measuring of averages also from the completion of the appeal briefing			The notice of appeal of one of these appeals was dismissed <i>in limine</i>	ICC-02/05-01/09-326 (OA2) appeal filed on 12.03.2018, but Judgment issued on 06.05.2019	Some OAs are still ongoing. Average has been calculated as per 30.09.2019	

I. Overall disclosure figures

	Office of the Prosecutor				
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
<i>Number of documents disclosed</i>	19,075	6,252	10,637	19,938	21601
<i>Number of pages disclosed</i>	109,457	28,091	39,603	81,134	93121

J. Duration of the phases for the previous cases

Cases

The Prosecutor v.

	<i>Thomas Lubanga Dyilo</i>	<i>Germain Katanga and Mathieu Ngudjolo</i>	<i>Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo</i>	<i>Bosco Ntaganda</i>	<i>L. Gbagbo et C. Blé Goudé</i>
Number of Accused	1	2	1	1	2
Number of Charges	3	10	5	18	4
<u>Duration of Phases</u>					
Phase 1 – Confirmation	10 months, 10 days	11 months, 4 days	11 months, 12 days	14 months, 15 days	L. Gbagbo 30 months, 8 days C. Blé Goudé , 8 months, 15 days
Phase 2 – Trial preparation	23 months, 29 days	13 months, 30 days	17 months, 8 days	14 months, 25 days	L. Gbagbo 19 months, 17 days C. Blé Goudé , 13 months, 18 days
Phase 3 – Trial	31 months, 1 day	2 years 5 months 21 days	3 years, 11 months, 22 days	2 years, 11 months, 15 days	3 years, 1 month 3 days

Phase 4 – Judgement	6 months, 18 days	Katanga, 1 year, 9 months, 21 days Ngudjolo 7 months, 4 days	1 year, 4 months, 10 days	10 months 16 days	9 months 16 days
Phase 5 – Sentencing	3 months, 27 days	Katanga, 2 months, 17 days Ngudjolo N/A	3 months, 1 day	4 months	n/a
Phase 6 – Reparations	Ongoing	Katanga Ongoing Ngudjolo N/A	N/A	Ongoing	n/a
Phase 7 – Appeals	2 years, 1 month, 28 days	Katanga N/A Ngudjolo 2 years, 2 months, 8 days	2 years, 2 months, 3 days	Ongoing	n/a

Cases

The Prosecutor v.

	<i>Bemba et al.</i>	<i>Al Mahdi</i>	<i>Dominic Ongwen</i>	<i>Al Hassan</i>	Yekatom and Ngaissona
Number of Accused	5	1	1	1	2
Number of Charges	42	1	70	13	42
<u>Duration of Phases</u>					
Phase 1 – Confirmation	11 months, 16 days	5 months, 25 days	14 months, 1 day	17 months, 26 days	Y: 1 year, 18 days N: 10 months, 16 days
Phase 2 – Trial preparation	10 months, 19 days	4 months, 30 days	8 months, 11 days	9 months, 14 days	1 year, 1 month, 9 days ¹²
Phase 3 – Trial	8 months, 4 days	3 days	3 years, 3 months, 7 days	Ongoing	
Phase 4 – Judgement	4 months 19 days	n/a	Ongoing	N/A	N/A
Phase 5 – Sentencing	1 year, 11 months	n/a	Ongoing	N/A	N/A
Phase 6 – Reparations	n/a	Ongoing	Ongoing	N/A	N/A
Phase 7 – Appeals	1 year 4 months, 8 days	n/a	Ongoing	N/A	N/A

¹² If trial starts on 9 February 2021 as decided.

Abd Al Rahman

Number of Accused	1
Number of Charges	42 counts in AWA

Duration of Phases

Phase 1 – Confirmation	Ongoing
Phase 2 – Trial preparation	N/A
Phase 3 – Trial	N/A
Phase 4 – Judgement	N/A
Phase 5 – Sentencing	N/A
Phase 6 – Reparations	N/A
Phase 7 – Appeals	N/A

K. Indicators of Publicity

Overall percentage of courtroom time spent in public hearings vs. private and/or closed sessions										
	2016		2017		2018		2019		2020	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Ongwen	99%	1%	84%	16%	93%	7%	91%	9%	89.4%	10.6%
Ntaganda	41%	59%	63%	37%	83%	17%	79%	21%	100%	0%
Al Mahdi	86%	14%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	n/a	n/a
Gbagbo & Blé Goudé	82%	18%	93%	7%	98%	2%	69%	31%	98.8%	1.2%
Bemba et al.	89%	11%	79%	21%	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Al Hassan	-	-	-	-	-	-			75.4%	24.6%
Yekatom & Ngaissona	-	-	-	-	-	-			89.4%	10.6%
Abd-Al-Rahman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	0%

Percentage of judicial decisions that are public vs. non-public classification										
	2016		2017		2018		2019		2020	
	Public	Classified	Public	Classified	Public	Classified	Public	Classified	Public	Classified
Ongwen	83%	17%	84%	16%	87.5%	11.5%	93%	7%	97%	3%
Ntaganda	65%	35%	73%	27%	74%	26%	81%	9%	72%	18%
Al Mahdi	100%	0%	69%	31%	53.5%	46.5	50%	50%	25%	75%
Gbagbo & Blé Goudé	75%	25%	75%	25%	82%	18%	87.5%	12.5%	21,5	78,5%
Bemba et al.	100%	0%	92%	8%	85%	15%	45%	55%	20%	80%
Al Hassan	-	-	-	-	-	-			42%	58%
Kushayb	-	-	-	-	-	-			92%	8%
Yekatom & Ngaissona	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51,5	48,5

L. Transcripts, translation and interpretation

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

Transcripts

	2016		2017		2018		2019		2020	
	ENG	FRA	ENG	FRA	ENG	FRA	ENG	FRA	ENG	FRA
Transcript Provision										
Overall Volume	284 (21,115)	278 (20,937)	246 (18,143)	247 (18,360)	154 (11,012)	138 (9,482)	110 (5,669)	106 (5,312)	57 (3478)	59 (3521)
Timelines of delivery of edited transcripts	N/A	N/A	99.5%	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*
Reclassification	93 (7,499)	87 (7,583)	18 (1,256)	33 (2,340)	29 (2,286)	32 (2,493)	98 (7,199)	80 (5,815)	204 (15035)	29 (1690)
Correction	5 (364)	6 (541)	62 (4,767)	40 (324)	108 (8,937)	94 (7,589)	128 (10,560)	98 (7,772)	30 (2071)	13 (1048)
Public redacted	210 (15,481)	195 (14,473)	336 (26,244)	354 (28,406)	139 (9,071)	145 (9,426)	315 (23,287)	268 (20,125)	42 (3163)	30 (2267)

- Note: the distribution of edited transcripts has been delayed from time to time, in consultation with the Chambers at time of simultaneous hearings due to lack of resources. These transcripts were however distributed before the agreed date.

Translation / interpretation

Court interpretation

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2019	2020
Requests received	2,721	2,204	1,311	1,223	1,050	651
Services provided on time	2,721	2,204	1,094	928	1,050	651
Cancelled request	298	351	217	255	278	74
Implementation	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Staff interpreter days	2,931	1,602	937	805	1,029	392
Outsourced interpreter days	799	622	157	157	176	287

Field and operational interpretation

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2019	2020
Requests received	119	123	103	121	129	62
Services provided on time	102	111	90	110	118	46
Implementation	86%	90%	87%	91%	91%	74%
Overall amount of field interpreter days	528	805	821	875	1,168	364

Translation of judicial documents

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2019	2020
Pages of translation produced	7,214	6,106	8,770	6,523	8,791	8,398
Services provided on time	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Pages of translation outsourced	787	231	1,232	1,755	2,154	1,463

Translation of non-judicial documents

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2019	2020
Pages of translation produced	5,366	2,502	3,881	3,729	4,321	2,689
Services provided on time	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Pages of translation outsourced	911	155	395	108	141	95

M. Volume of witness-related services delivered

The Victims and Witnesses Section (VWS) is responsible for the appearance of witnesses (in person or via video link) in every case before the Court. In addition, the VWS is responsible for the protection of victims and witnesses (and their dependents) where a risk to them exists owing to their engagement with 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.

Recent Value	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number of witnesses assisted at the Court, including psychosocial and other support	97	134	39	41	19
Number of individuals receiving protection measures (approximate)	510	440	320	550	650
Expert input for Registry filings with Chambers (approximate)	28	5	11	6	19
Expert protection and psychological advice and reports sent to the Chambers via e-mail (approximate)	100	180	70	78	25
Number of specific cases subject to interaction *	15	15	20	20	24

* Number of cases in which VWS has interaction with witnesses and victims (either for Trial, Support or Protection purposes)

N. Victim Participation

1. Indicators per phase of a case – number of victims participating by phase of proceedings as of 30 September 2020 ¹³

Case	Phase	Number of Participants in Phase
Lubanga Case – ICC -01/04-01/06	Reparations	855 to date (ongoing ¹⁴)
Katanga Case – ICC-01/04-01/06	Reparations	297
Ntaganda Case – ICC-01/04-02/06	Reparations /Appeal	2,139 (ongoing)
Gbagbo and Blé Goudé Case – ICC-02/11-01/15	Appeal	726
Ongwen Case – ICC-02/04-01/15	Trial	4,095
Al-Madhi Case – ICC-01/12-01/15	Reparations	218 to date (ongoing)
Al Hassan Case - ICC-01/12-01/18	Trial preparation	882 to date (ongoing)
Yekatom-Ngaissona Case – ICC-01/14-01/18	Pre-Trial	1085 to date (ongoing)
Ahmad Muhammad Harun ("Ahmad Harun") and Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman ("Ali Kushayb") Case - ICC-02/05-01/07	Pre-Trial	6
The Prosecutor v. Omar Hassan Ahmad Al Bashir - ICC-02/05-01/09	Pre-Trial	11
Banda Case - ICC-02/05-03/09	Pre-Trial	89
Kony Case - ICC-02/04-01/05	Pre-Trial	41
The Prosecutor v. Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman ("Ali Kushayb") - ICC-02/05-01/20	Pre-Trial	No data as yet (ongoing)

¹³ Numbers only indicate victims whose participation has been indicated through a judicial decision to that effect; if one were to include victim applicants in ongoing proceedings, relevant overall figures would be higher.

¹⁴ The term 'ongoing' here and below indicates that the victim application process is actively proceeding and numbers will therefore be very dynamic in the relevant cases.

2. Victim legal representation – number of victims represented by the OPCV and/or external victim’s representatives per case at trial

Case	Number of Victims Represented by External Legal Representatives	Number of Victims Represented by the OPCV
Lubanga Case – ICC -01/04-01/06	359	496
Katanga Case – ICC-01/04-01/06	283	14
Ntaganda Case – ICC-01/04-02/06	0	2,139
Gbagbo and Blé Goudé Case – ICC-02/11-01/15	0	726
Ongwen Case – ICC-02/04-01/15	2,594	1,501
Al-Madhi Case – ICC-01/12-01/15	12	0
Al Hassan Case - ICC-01/12-01/18	882	0
Yekatom and Ngaïssona Case – ICC-01/14-01/18	997	88 ¹⁵
Ahmad Muhammad Harun ("Ahmad Harun")	6	0
Banda Case - ICC-02/05-03/09	89	0
The Prosecutor v. Omar Hassan Ahmad Al Bashir - ICC-02/05-01/09	9	2
Kony Case - ICC-02/04-01/05	0	41
The Prosecutor v. Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman ("Ali Kushayb") - ICC-02/05-01/20	N/A	N/A

¹⁵ The overall number of participating victims is 1085 victims, distributed over two common legal representatives: the first group (child soldier victims) is entirely represented by counsel from the OPCV, whereas the second group (comprising 997 victims) is represented by a legal representative team comprising both external legal representatives and counsel from the OPCV.

3. 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). 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				
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Ongwen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 International Trips • 6 Local Trips • 9 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trips • 5 Local Trips • 6 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 International Trips • 7 Local Trips • 7 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 International Trips • 5 Local Trips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 International Trip • 8 Local Trips
Gbagbo & Blé Goudé	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 International Trips • 4 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trips • 2 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 International Trips • 7 Local Trips • 7 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 International Trips • 3 Local Trips • 5 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trip
Ntaganda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 International Trips • 9 Local Trips • 11 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 International Trips • 8 Local Trips • 11 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 International Trips • 1 Local Trips • 1 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 International Trips • 1 Local Trips • 1 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 International Trips • 5 Local Trips
Katanga (reparations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Local Trips • 1 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trips • 2 Local Trips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 International Trips • 1 Local Trips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Local Trips
Lubanga (reparations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 International Trips • 2 Local Trips • 4 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 International Trips • 4 Local Trips • 4 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trips • 2 Local Trips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trips • 2 Local Trips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trips
Yekatom&N gaissona (pre-trial)	*	•	•	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 International Trip • 3 Local Trips Bangui • 1 Local Trip

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

Cases	Number of field trips of Court-appointed external legal representatives of victims				
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Lubanga	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 International Trips • 4 Local Trips • 5 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 International Trips • 6 Local Trips • 4 Missions
Ongwen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Trip • 1 Mission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trips • 7 Local Trips • 7 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 International Trip • 8 Local Trip • 5 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 Local Trips • 6 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Local Trips • 1 Mission

Bemba (reparations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 International Trips • 5 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 International Trips • 4 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 International Trips • 6 Missions 	No missions under Legal Aid	No missions under Legal Aid
Katanga (reparations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 International Trips • 3 Local Trips • 5 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 International Trips • 3 Local Trips • 8 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 International Trips • 4 Local Trips • 8 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 International Trips • 3 Local Trips • 3 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trips • 1 Local Trip • 1 Mission
Al Mahdi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 International Trips • 4 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 International Trips • 3 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 International Trips • 4 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 International Trips • 7 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trips • 1 Mission
Al Hassan	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trips • 1 Mission 	No missions performed
Yekatom-Ngaissona	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 International Trips • 2 Local Trips • 3 Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Local Trips • 3 Missions

5. Number of appointments and missions undertaken by Duty/ad hoc Counsel/ and Rule 74 Counsel

Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Appointments	25	45	44	59	48	67	92	65	36
Trips to the Field	24	22	28	34	24	23	27	16	8
CIV	5	5	9	13	11	24	12	10	0
DRC	11	9	6	5	9	3	1	0	0
CAR	4	8	2	9	15	5	30	26	12
MLI	0	0	6	2	9	16	35	8	11
UGA	0	0	0	2	4	19	14	13	0
Appointment to counsel in the field	1	23	16	25	24	44	65	49	28
% of trips required for appointments	96%	47%	60%	54%	50%	65%	29%	25%	22%
Comments	The lower the percentage the less field trips have become necessary due to appointment of counsel in the field for relevant assignments								

O. Reparations and assistance

1. Number of decisions taken by the Board of Directors on victims' eligibility

The TFV Board of Directors took between January and 30 September 2020, a total of 956 (positive and negative) eligibility decisions on beneficiaries for collective reparations in the case of *Lubanga* and individual reparations in the case of *Al Mahdi*.

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

In the Katanga case, the Trust Fund, upon concluding the implementation of individual reparations awards for 297 victims, continued in 2019 and 2020 the implementation of collective reparations awards with respect to the same group of victims. The Trust Fund has, so far, been implementing the individual and collective reparations in this case itself and not through implementing partners.

3. Number of victims benefitting from assistance mandate-related TFV projects.

The cumulative total of direct beneficiaries of assistance programmes of TFV activities in December 2017 was 101,723. In the DRC, the first programme cycle closed in 2017 with a total number of 58,439 direct beneficiaries supported, whereas Uganda was in the second phase of programme activities with 43,284 beneficiaries as of December 2017.

In 2018 assistance programmes continued in Uganda. The total number of direct beneficiaries reached in 2018 was 6006.

From April 2019 the TFV started a new programme cycle in Uganda. From April to December 2019, the number of direct beneficiaries was 5,257. Since many beneficiaries received more than one type of assistance, the table below provides data on the types of assistance provided.

Type of Assistance	Uganda assistance programme from April to December 2019	Comments
Number of direct beneficiaries of the assistance programme	5,257	After completing an international competitive bidding process the TFV began a new phase of assistance programming in Uganda in April 2019.
Number of beneficiaries who received physical rehabilitation	970	
Number of beneficiaries fitted with artificial limbs	221	
Number of victims of sexual and gender-based violence who received assistance	570	
Number of beneficiaries who received psychological rehabilitation	4170	
Number of beneficiaries who received material support	1093	

In Uganda, assistance programmes continued into 2020. Total number of direct beneficiaries between 1 January 2020 until 30 September 2020 is 3,173.

In DRC and in CAR, assistance programmes started in the third quarter of 2020, in July and October 2020 respectively; implementation data will be available mid-January 2021.

;Relevant comparator	Relevant value	Comments
Number of locally based TFV implementing partners as of 1 November 2020	15	5 (originally 6) implementing partners in Uganda started in April 2019, 9 implementing partners in DRC since July 2020, one implementing partner in CAR since September 2020; in addition 3 implementing partners in CIV and 1 in DRC since November 2020; by 1 January 2021, the TFV is expected to have in addition 5 implementing partners in CAR, 4 implementing partners in Mali and 1 additional implementing partner in DRC (at total of 29).
Amount of financial resources available at the TFV in 2020	€17.9 million	As at September 2020
Amount of TFV reparations resources in 2020	€3.1 million	As at September 2020
Amount of TFV complement to payment of reparations awards	€5.88 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lubanga reparations (€8.4 million approx. equivalent to US\$10 million liability amount): total complement as of Sep. 2020 €3.85 million (from the Netherlands €350,000; €2.5 million from the TFV reparations reserve); • Katanga reparations (€842,000 approx. equivalent to US\$1 million liability amount): fully complemented - €200,000 from the Netherlands; €642,000 from the TFV reparations reserve; • Al Mahdi reparations (€2.7 million liability amount): complement as of Sep. 2020 includes €516,000 from Norway, €28,000 from the UK, €40,000 from Italy and €800,000 from the TFV reparations reserve.
Amount of TFV non-obligated TFV resources	€3.7 million	The TFV plans to use these funds for future programmes under both assistance and reparations mandate.

P. ICC Field Presence

		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	
DRC	Field Office	[Green bar]														
	Satellite Office (Bunia)	[Green bar]														
Uganda	Field Office	[Green bar]														
	Satellite Office	[White bar]														
Côte-d'Ivoire	Field Office	[White bar]					[Green bar]									
	Satellite Office	[White bar]														
CAR	Field Office	[Green bar]														
	Satellite Office	[White bar]														
Kenya	Field Office	[White bar]				[Green bar]								[White bar]		
	Satellite Office	[White bar]														
Sudan (From Chad)	Field Office (Abeche)	[Green bar]						[White bar]								
	Satellite Office (N'Djamena)	[Green bar]						[White bar]								
Libya	Field Office	[White bar]														
	Satellite Office	[White bar]														
Mali	Field Office	[White bar]										[Green bar]				
	Satellite Office	[White bar]														
Georgia	Field Office	[White bar]											[Green bar]			
	Satellite Office	[White bar]														

Q. In-country outreach and public information

1. Events organized by the Court's Outreach Unit, and the level of participation

Situation Country		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
DRC	Events	81	66	70	75	11
	Population reached directly	3,412	3,968	3,393	4,807	482
Uganda	Events	101	114	428	322	103
	Population reached directly	3,968	33,130	189,408	79,356	16,948
CAR	Events	148	17	37	232	40
	Population reached directly	1,260	608	1,437	12,277	3,717
Côte-d'Ivoire	Events	4	12	20	47	1
	Population reached directly	262	678	2,584	12,571	530
Kenya	Events	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Population reached directly	169	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mali	Events	N/A	N/A	6	4	2
	Population reached directly	N/A	N/A	120	57	12
Libya	Events	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Population reached directly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	Events	10	12	55	80	11
	Population reached directly	165	148	725	787	120
Burundi	Events	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
	Population reached directly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Bangladesh/Myanmar	Events	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	0
	Population reached directly	N/A	N/A	N/A	160	0
Sudan	Events	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
	Population reached directly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	40
Afghanistan	Events	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
	Population reached directly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4

2. Hours of radio and TV broadcasts of audio-visual productions on the ICC

Situation Country	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
DRC	106	94	128	219	89
Uganda	152	17	41	0	1
CAR	195	76	106	451	432
Côte-d'Ivoire	0	211	10	0	0
Kenya	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mali	N/A	N/A	0	0	0
Libya	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0
Burundi	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Bangladesh/Myanmar	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0
Sudan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Afghanistan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

3. Estimated population reached through radio and television

(number of projections of video programmes)

Situation Country	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
DRC	43	107	34	47	0
Uganda	25	38	340	144	28
CAR	33	83	49	210	46
Côte-d'Ivoire	0	10	9	35	0
Kenya	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mali	N/A	N/A	15	0	0
Libya	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	0	9	0	1	0
Burundi	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Bangladesh/Myanmar	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Sudan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Afghanistan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

4. Interviews given in the field to local media

Situation Country	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
DRC	289	107	143	89	26
Uganda	101	38	169	182	80
CAR	144	83	185	49	25
Côte-d'Ivoire	0	10	36	27	10
Kenya	40	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mali	N/A	N/A	0	15	0
Libya	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	8	9	15	7	2
Burundi	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	0
Bangladesh/Myanmar	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Sudan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Afghanistan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

Annex II – Cooperation and complementarity goals

1. Cooperation (reporting period 16/09/2019 to 15/09/2020)

1.1. Cooperation in support of preliminary examinations, investigations, prosecutions and judicial proceedings (including with the Defence)

<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	
<i>Total number of Requests for Assistance (“RFAs”) sent during the reporting period for specific requests</i>	
Total number of RFAs sent during the reporting period	402 RFAs (including 70 notifications of missions)
Total number of Requests for Information (“RFIs”) concerning the preliminary examinations for the reporting period	10 RFIs
% of replies for the RFAs during the reporting period	32,33 % (a total of 130 RFAs executed out of the 402, as of 15/09/2020) ¹⁶
Average time needed to execute an RFA	40,5 days
<i>Registry</i>	
<i>Total number of Requests for Cooperation (“RFCs”) sent during the reporting period for specific requests</i>	
Defence teams’ requests transmitted by the Registry	37 – of which 9 received positive replies (24,3 % execution rate)
Legal Representatives for Victims teams’ requests transmitted by the Registry	4 – of which 4 received positive replies (100 % execution rate)
TFV’s requests transmitted by the Registry	3 – of which 3 received positive replies (100 % execution rate)
Witness protection requests	40 – of which 30 received positive replies (75 % execution rate)
Support to judicial proceedings’ requests	9 – of which 8 received positive replies (88,8 % execution rate)
Average time needed for reply	40 days
% of positive replies to RFCs during the reporting period	58 %

1.2. Arrest and surrender

<i>Registry</i>	
Total number of RFCs sent during the reporting period for arrest and surrender	5 (including support in surrender)
Average time needed for reply	4 months
% of positive replies to RFCs during the reporting period	80 %

¹⁶ It is normal that all RFAs sent during a specific time period are not executed during the same time period, given the time needed to receive, process, consult, and execute the requests. In addition, the closer to the end of the period it is sent, the least likely an RFA will be executed within the same time period. *The choice was made here to only include the RFAs that were sent AND recorded as executed during the period of reference, i.e. this excludes all those RFAs executed during the period of reference but sent before it and all those sent during the period of reference but executed after it.*

1.3. Identification, seizing and freezing of assets

<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	
Total number of RFAs sent during the reporting period for financial investigations for identification of assets	12
% of execution rate	16 %
Average time needed to execute an RFA	4 months
<i>Registry</i>	
Total number of RFCs sent during the reporting period for financial investigations for legal aid	5
Total number of RFCs sent during the reporting period for asset recovery for fines and reparations	1
Average time needed for reply	4 months
% of positive replies to RFCs during the reporting period	16 %

2. Complementarity (reporting period 16/09/2019 to 15/09/2020)

2.1. Incoming RFAs

<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	
Total number of RFAs received by the OTP during the reporting period	34
% of RFAs provided with a substantive response within 3 months of receipt.	97 % (33 out of 34)
Average time needed to provide incoming RFAs with a substantive response.	42 days

Annex III – Organisational performance goals

A. Accessibility of ICC – related information	51
B. Budget Implementation	52
C. Human Resources	52
1. Average time of recruitment process	52
2. Percentage rate of staff appraisals conducted and performance ratings per Organ/Office	52
3. Geographical representation and gender balance of staff	53
D. Procurement	56
E. Physical and asset security (in the field and at Headquarters).....	57
1. Mission-specific indicators.....	57
2. Substantive security and safety incidents (2016-2019).....	57
F. IT Security (in the field and at Headquarters)	58
1. Threat level	58
2. Has the Court implemented an adequate and/or proportional information security program?	58
3. When a risk manifests itself, has the Court’s security framework proven adequate in the circumstances?	58
4. New KPIs for 2020.....	59

A. Accessibility of ICC – related information

<u>Indicator</u>	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number of visitors to the website	1,071,000	995,000	1,700,000	1,887,000	1,552,000
Number of internet pages viewed	5,145,720	4,723,260	4,785,367	5,249,740	4,158,149
Live streaming	5,874,473	19,931,798	9,487,520	29,624,284	35,378,326
Number of visitors to court hearings	11,520	7,395	7,925	17,468	2,756
Number of Press Releases / Advisory Materials distributed	140	132	137	128	65
Number of media interviews with ICC officials and with situations Country Office staff	1,542	1,152	1,414	764	344
Number of ICC information kits distributed	3,364	3,216	3,211	3,014	261
Number of audio and video summaries produced for international media	631	213	561	735	540
<u>Social Media</u>					
<u>Twitter</u>					
<i>English Account</i>					
Followers	236,000	250,671	312,968	375,610	422,932
Impressions/day	40,737	40,753	39,665	36,693	37,778
Likes/day	106	108	143	147	148
<i>French Account</i>					
Followers	N/A	1,898	10,684	20,111	29,030
Impressions/day	N/A	1,997	5,103	5,517	5,278
Likes/day	N/A	4.9	22.8	25	28
<u>YouTube</u>					
Followers	11,200	14,400	19,800	32,416	47,400
Views	2,700,000	2,820,000	3,920,000	4,738,107	6,176,858
<u>Facebook</u>					
<i>English Page</i>					
Followers	N/A	81,570	117,285	152,256	171,453
Impressions	N/A	5,610,258	18,240,066	13,348,824	5,728,742
Engagements	N/A	267,668	1,405,183	854,834	330,444
<i>French Page</i>					
Followers	N/A	1,423	10,397	26,980	46,612
Impressions	N/A	344,772	1,861,175	3,455,719	4,171,541
Engagements	N/A	14,882	136,295	296,037	350,000

B. Budget Implementation

Implementation rate in %					
Court Organs	2016	2017	2018	2019	09/2020
MP I	102.2	97.6	95.6	95.7	73.6
MP II	94.7	98.8	95.1	99.2	72.8
MP III	98.5	100.9	98.4	98.4	75.4
Total	97.6	99.9	97.0	98.5	74.4

C. Human Resources

1. Average time of recruitment process in days

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Duration General Service (GS) selection process (days)	73	84	142	169	129
Duration Professional Level (P) selection process (days)	86	73	222	277	201
Comments	The data for 2016 and 2017 is based on the difference between the finalisation of the shortlist and the date of the Prosecutor/Registrar's approval of the interview panel report.		The data for 2018, 2019 and 2020 is based on the difference between the closing date of the VA and the date of the Prosecutor/Registrar's approval of the interview panel report.		

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

	Performance Appraisal System Objective Setting Compliance Rate (1 March to 28 February of the following year)					
	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021
Judiciary	36%	67%	26%	62%	76%	98%
OTP	91%	100%	98%	99%	95%	96%
Registry	84%	95%	97%	93%	95%	97%
Office of Internal Audit	75%	100%	100%	75%	100%	100%
Secretariat of the Assembly of State parties	14%	38%	80%	33%	80%	11%
IOM	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%
Secretariat, Trust Fund for Victims	38%	0%	50%	14%	20%	88%
Total	82%	94%	92%	92%	93%	96%

	Completed Performance Appraisals (1 March to 28 February of the following year)					
	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021
Judiciary	36%	47%	26%	53%	94%	TBD
Office of the Prosecutor	72%	100%	98%	97%	94%	TBD
Registry	64%	93%	97%	96%	96%	TBD
Office of Internal Audit	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	TBD
Secretariat of the Assembly of State parties	14%	38%	80%	58%	29%	TBD
IOM	-	-	100%	100%	100%	TBD
Secretariat, Trust Fund for Victims	38%	0%	50%	11%	100%	TBD
Total	65%	92%	93%	95%	95%	TBD

3. Geographical representation and gender balance of staff

Gender balance of all established posts, excluding elected officials

	Gender Balance as at:							
	30/09/2017		30/09/2018		31/12/2019		30/09/2020	
	F %	M %	F %	M %	F %	M %	F %	M %
ALL ICC								
Judiciary	60.00%	40.00%	63.27%	36.73%	63.83%	36.17%	63.04%	36.96%
OTP	62.67%	47.33%	52.20%	47.80%	52.38%	47.62%	52.38%	47.62%
Registry	41.47%	58.53%	42.23%	57.77%	42.45%	57.55%	42.75%	57.25%
Secretariat of the ASP	40.00%	60.00%	40.00%	60.00%	40.00%	60.00%	44.44%	55.56%
Secretariat of the TFV	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	57.14%	42.86%	66.67%	33.33%
IOM	75.00%	25.00%	100.00%	0.00%	75.00%	25.00%	66.67%	33.33%
Office of Internal Audit	75.00%	25.00%	66.67%	33.33%	75.00%	25.00%	75.00%	25.00%
Total	46.62%	53.38%	46.98%	53.02%	47.21%	52.79%	47.09%	52.91%

Professional Posts	F %	M %	F %	M %	F %	M %	F %	M %
Judiciary	50.00%	50.00%	52.78%	47.22%	52.78%	47.22%	54.29%	45.71%
OTP	48.68%	51.32%	48.43%	51.57%	49.33%	50.67%	49.07%	50.93%
Registry	49.08%	50.92%	50.43%	49.57%	50.00%	50.00%	48.25%	51.75%
Secretariat of the ASP	40.00%	60.00%	40.00%	60.00%	40.00%	60.00%	40.00%	60.00%
Secretariat of the TFV	33.33%	66.67%	25.00%	75.00%	50.00%	50.00%	57.14%	42.86%
IOM	66.67%	33.33%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	50.00%	50.00%
Office of Internal Audit	66.67%	33.33%	66.67%	33.33%	66.67%	33.33%	66.67%	33.33%
Total	49.00%	51.00%	49.70%	50.30%	50.00%	50.00%	49.19%	50.81%

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

Grade	Gender Balance as at:							
	30/09/2017		30/09/2018		31/12/2019		30/09/2020	
	F %	M %	F %	M %	F %	M %	F %	M %
D-1	11.11%	88.89%	11.11%	88.89%	11.11%	88.89%	11.11%	88.89%
P-5	31.82%	68.18%	30.95%	69.05%	29.50%	70.50%	28.20%	71.80%
P-4	36.90%	63.10%	36.14%	63.86%	36.60%	63.40%	38.30%	61.70%
P-3	45.45%	54.55%	45.14%	54.86%	46.20%	53.80%	44.70%	55.30%
P-2	60.76%	39.24%	62.58%	37.42%	61.80%	38.20%	61.50%	38.50%
P-1	72.22%	27.78%	78.79%	21.21%	80.00%	20.00%	78.80%	21.20%
G-7	42.11%	57.89%	41.18%	58.82%	41.18%	58.82%	40.00%	60.00%
G-6	36.49%	63.51%	36.99%	63.01%	38.36%	61.64%	38.89%	61.11%
G-5	49.33%	50.67%	49.67%	50.33%	51.27%	48.73%	52.26%	47.74%
G-4	63.64%	36.36%	65.79%	34.21%	62.20%	37.80%	62.67%	37.33%
G-3	15.38%	84.62%	10.77%	89.23%	8.20%	91.80%	8.47%	91.53%
G-2								
G-1	40.00%	60.00%	40.00%	60.00%	40.00%	60.00%	40.00%	60.00%
Total	46.61%	53.39%	46.98%	53.02%	47.21%	52.79%	47.10%	52.90%

Geographical distribution

Geographic representation – number of States Parties which are:	31/12/2017	31/12/2018	31/12/2019	30/09/2020
OVER-REPRESENTED	27	29	27	24
IN BALANCE	21	21	18	20
UNDER-REPRESENTED	21	19	22	23
NON-REPRESENTED	55	54	55	56
STATES NOT PARTY TO RS	24	24	25	25
Total	148	147	147	148
TOTAL NUMBER OF STATES PARTIES REPRESENTED	69	69	67	67
Percentage of States Parties represented	47%	47%	46%	45%

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

Country	Difference to Target Representation as at:			
	31/12/2017	31/12/2018	31/12/2019	30/09/2020
Japan	-34	-34	-34	-34
Brazil	-16	-15	-13	-13
Germany	-13	-11	-11	-11
Mexico	-3	-3	-3	-3
Sweden	-2	-2	-2	-2
Italy	0	0	0	0
Poland	-1	0	0	0
Switzerland	-4	-4	-4	-3
Argentina	0	0	0	0
Chile	-2	-2	-2	-2
Denmark	-2	-2	-2	-2
Greece	-1	0	0	0
Venezuela	-2	-2	-3	-3
Philippines	0	0	3	3
Nigeria	0	0	0	0
Bulgaria	-2	-2	-2	-2
Costa Rica	-1	-1	-1	-1
Cyprus	-1	-1	-1	-1
Burkina Faso	-1	-1	-1	-1
Zambia	-1	-1	-1	-1
Malawi	-1	-1	-1	-1
Jordan	-1	0	-1	-1
New Zealand	1	2	2	1
Benin	0	0	0	0
Iceland	-1	-1	-1	-1
Afghanistan	-1	-1	-1	-1
Guatemala	-1	-1	-1	-1
Republic of Korea	-9	-9	-10	-10

D. Procurement

The Registry Procurement Unit is part of the General Services Section (GSS) that 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.

	2017	2018	2019	09/2020
Number of Procurement Staff	7	7	7**	7**
Purchase Orders (POs)				
# of POs	1,741	1,566	1,1,305	865
Value of POs	23,347,343	25,874,753	,25,021,601	15,258,932***
Requisitions				
# of Requisitions	1,383	1,935	1,383	1,400***
Procurement Review Committee (PRC)				
# of PRC	65	80	44	37
Value of PRC	34,265,766	49,297,659*	17,487,582	26,895,399*

(*) The Trust Fund for Victims programmes for reparations are increasing and generating additional workload for the Registry Procurement Unit that is reflected mainly in the PRC meetings.

(**) The role of PRC Secretary has been transferred from Registry Legal Office to the Procurement Unit. This is currently under recruitment process completion with an approved GTA post.

(***) This is Year-To-Date by end September 2020. Furthermore Covid-19 Crisis Management and US Sanctions risk mitigation measures are changing many existing obligations and generating complex new sourcing requirements with significant additional workloads for the Registry Procurement Unit that are not reflected in the above.

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

1. Mission-specific indicators

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

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Overall amount of missions	608	278	565	465	464	348
Missions with previous full briefing	578-608	264-278	536-565	442-465	459	330
Implementation	95-100%	95-100%	95-100%	95-100%	98.9%	94.8%

Data prior to 2020 was limited to the percentage of Registry travellers receiving only security briefings upon arrival to the Situation Country of destination. As of January 2020 this data is now updated to also include in adherence to all security (including the security briefing upon arrival), medical and diplomatic procedures/protocols.

2. Substantive security and safety incidents (2016-2020)

Incident	2016		2017		2018		2019		2020	
	HQ	Field	HQ	Field	HQ	Field	HQ	Field	HQ	Field
Death of staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Arrest of staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1
Assault	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	1	0
Burglary	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	0
Fire alarm	0	0	9	1	17	0	10	0	8	0
Lost property	9	4	87	10	78	9	76	17	11	4
Physical security breach	0	0	2	0	2	0	6	0	0	0
Property damage	4	3	16	4	25	4	31	4	8	3
Robbery	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Suspicious incident	1	1	4	0	3	5	2	2	0	1
Theft	0	0	3	3	6	0	5	5	0	3
Traffic accident	1	4	3	17	8	4	9	7	1	1

E. IT Security (in the field and at Headquarters)

1. Threat level

The table below indicates the number of substantive incidents that have occurred during the period 2016-2020. These workload 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.

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Denial of Service	4	4	1	0	1
Malware infection	3	0	0	0	0
Storage media theft/loss	2	1	1	1	1
Unauthorized data access	2	0	0	1	1
Unauthorized disclosure	2	1	1	0	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.

	Incidents per month in				
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Scans and probes	1,000,000	38,000,000	35,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Spam / phishing / malicious email	10,000	1,300,000	1,200,000	1,400,000	42,000
Malware infection	600	600	500	600	70
Document handling errors	10	10	10	9	4

2. Has the Court implemented an adequate and/or proportional information security program?

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number of relevant software updates detected	337	486	492	445	431
Number of relevant software updates carried out	337	486	492	445	431
Implementation	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number of substantive incidents	13	6	3	2	4
Number of incidents leading to harm	13	6	3	2	4
Immediate counter measures taken	13	6	3	2	4
Lessons learnt process carried out	13	6	3	2	4
Implementation / Comments	100%	100%	100%	100%	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.

4. New KPIs for 2020

Since the end of 2019, IMSS has been tracking an alternative key performance indicator that directly relates to the achievement of a security objective. The following KPI tracks progress towards the Court's objective of responding promptly to serious information security incidents.

	2019	2020
The response time by the Court to the most critical information security incidents when they occur.	46 (mins)	29 (mins)