

Annex A
Public version

Annex A Public

Application of victim a/0026/10 [Annex 2]¹

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a certificate of loss of documents (“attestation de carence”) issued by the city of [REDACTED] and a photograph of the applicant.²

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, militiamen abducted her and she was transferred to [REDACTED] and then to [REDACTED], where the war was taking place. She states that there were many who were killed and injured. She was widowed and has been rejected by her community. She does not know where her family lives and she has a child who is fatherless. She describes Mr Thomas Lubanga and her husband, [REDACTED], as being responsible for the crimes. She alleges she has suffered material, physical and psychological harm as a result of these events.³ By way of elaboration, the applicant sets out that she was first abducted when walking home in [REDACTED]; she was taken, in order, to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], and finally [REDACTED], from whence she was able to escape. Another girl, called [REDACTED], was abducted at the same time. The militiamen took her forcibly to a camp, where she was forced to become the “wife” of one of the men. The militiamen belonged to the UPC, coming from the [REDACTED]. She identified “Thomas” as the chief of the UPC. After [REDACTED] days she was transferred to [REDACTED], where she worked mainly in the kitchen and she “spent the night” with her militia “husband”. A [REDACTED] pregnancy was terminated by [REDACTED], but she gave birth to a child following a [REDACTED] pregnancy. She was separated from her “husband”, and she was transferred to [REDACTED], where she was used to transport ammunition into the forest and she prepared food. Later she was taken to [REDACTED], and although she cannot say how long she was kept at [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] she estimates that overall she was kept by the militia for about [REDACTED] months. She did not participate in combat. She was also forced to carry ammunition in [REDACTED], from whence she

¹ See also Report on supplementary information related to applications a/0026/10, a/0031/10 and a/0738/10, 11 November 2010, ICC-01/04-01/06-2616-Conf-Exp-Anx1.

² Firth Report to Trial Chamber I on Victims’ Applications under Regulation 86.5 of the Regulations of the Court, 14 June 2010, ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx2, pages 18-19.

³ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx2, pages 9-11.

escaped. She did not go to a demobilisation centre and together with [REDACTED] she now lives with her parents. She bears [REDACTED] that are the result of the beatings she received, and she experienced pain following the occasions when she was raped. She sometimes has headaches and chest pains, she has not returned to school.⁴

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in all phases of the proceedings.⁵

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. As regards the specific observations vis-à-vis this applicant, the defence contends that her application is general and lacks precision as regards the description of the alleged crimes (Section D-1). It is suggested it is impossible to establish a link between the applicant and the charges or the accused. It is stressed that the applicant does not refer to the UPC or the FPLC and it is impossible to establish on the basis of the information provided whether the applicant was enlisted or whether she actively participated in hostilities.⁶

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution argued in its initial submissions that the applicant had failed to indicate whether she underwent military training or actively participated in hostilities, and as a result it suggested that further information or clarification was necessary.⁷ However, following the applicant's supplementary report, the prosecution accepts that the victims should be permitted to participate.⁸

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.⁹

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.¹⁰

⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-2616-Conf-Exp-Anx1, pages 2-5.

⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx2, page 9.

⁶ Observations de la Défense sur les 15 demandes de participation à la procédure communiquées le 29 juin 2010, 18 October 2010, ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 29.

⁷ Prosecution's Observations on Fifteen Redacted Applications for Victim Participation in the Case, 22 October 2010, ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 27.

⁸ Prosecution's Observations on supplementary information related to applications a/0026/10, a/0031/10 and a/0738/10, 23 November 2010, ICC-01/04-01/06-2633, paragraphs 8-9.

⁹ Réplique aux observations de la Défense sur les 15 demandes de participation des victimes, 5 November 2010, ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.¹¹

Based on the application and the supplementary information submitted by the alleged victim, she was abducted and held by the UPC for a period of [REDACTED] months, within the timeframe of the charges and in the context of a suggested broad campaign conducted by the UPC of child abduction and forced recruitment. Given the alleged systematic recruitment, enlistment or use of child soldiers at this time by that group, on a *prima facie* basis, the Chamber considers that it is fair to infer that she was held, *inter alia*, for one of these purposes. Indeed, the applicant has indicated that she was used to transport ammunition when in [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].¹² Accordingly, the Chamber rejects the argument that there is insufficient information to establish a link between her abduction and the charges against the accused.

The Chamber thus considers that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence for the Chamber to conclude, *prima facie*, that she was abducted in the context of the systematic conscription of children under the age of 15 into the military forces of the UPC.¹³

Application of victim a/0027/10 [Annex 3]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a certificate of loss of documents ("attestation de carence") issued by the city of [REDACTED] and a photograph of the applicant.¹⁴

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, militiamen of Thomas Lubanga abducted her in [REDACTED]. She

¹⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

¹¹ Decision on victims' participation, 18 January 2008, ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, as confirmed, amended and reversed by the Appeals Chamber's Judgment on the appeals of The Prosecutor and The Defence against Trial Chamber I's Decision on Victims' Participation of 18 January 2008, 11 July 2008, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

¹² ICC-01/04-01/06-2616-Conf-Exp-Anx1, pages 2-3.

¹³ Confidential Ex parte Annex A 1 to the Order issuing Annexes to the "Decision on the applications by victims to participate in the proceedings" of 15 December 2008, 19 December 2008, ICC-01/04-01/06-1563-Conf-Exp-AnxA1, page 230.

¹⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx3, pages 19-20.

was then transferred to [REDACTED] and later to [REDACTED], where she was trained under difficult conditions. She became pregnant by a militiaman with whom she had children. He later died. The applicant alleges she suffered material loss and she experiences very painful memories.¹⁵

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in the trial and appeal proceedings.¹⁶

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. As regards the specific observations of the defence vis-à-vis this applicant, the defence argues that the lack of precision in relation to the dates of the events (and the relevant redactions) make it impossible for the defence to establish whether the alleged crimes occurred in the timeframe of the charges against the accused.¹⁷

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.¹⁸

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.¹⁹

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.²⁰

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.²¹

The uncertainty as to the date of the relevant events is the consequence of the redactions and does not reflect a lack of information provided by the applicant.

¹⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx3, pages 9-11 and page 18.

¹⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx3, page 9.

¹⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 28.

¹⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 13.

¹⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

²⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

²¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

The applicant has provided sufficient evidence to establish, *prima facie*, that she is a victim under Rule 85(a) of the Rules: she suffered personal harm as a result of the crimes confirmed against the accused, namely her alleged conscription, enlistment or use, by way of participating actively in the hostilities, between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.²²

Application of victim a/0028/10 [Annex 4]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a certificate of loss of documents (“attestation de carence”) issued by the city of [REDACTED] and a photograph of the applicant.²³

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, UPC militiamen forcibly abducted her, along with her sister, while working on a field in [REDACTED]. They were transferred to the [REDACTED] camp and then to [REDACTED], where they were both threatened; they were subjected to sexual violence; and they were forced to carry out domestic tasks. They also received military training and they were used to carry pillaged goods following hostilities. One of the UPC commanders took the applicant as his “wife” in order to “defend” her from others. The applicant alleges she suffered material harm and loss, and she has experienced psychological difficulties.²⁴

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in the trial and during the appeal proceedings.²⁵

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. As regards the specific observations vis-à-vis this applicant, the defence notes that she refers to the UPC and the APC and she relates both of them to Thomas Lubanga. Furthermore, the defence suggests it cannot determine whether the applicant received military training or actively participated in hostilities. Finally, it is observed that although it is mentioned

²² ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

²³ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx4, page 20.

²⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx4, pages 9-11 and 18-19.

²⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx4, page 9.

in the application form, the applicant has not included the “declaration d’indigence”.²⁶

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be granted status to participate.²⁷

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.²⁸

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.²⁹

The Chamber’s analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber’s Decision on victims’ participation.³⁰

The accused is charged with crimes which were allegedly committed between September 2002 and 13 August 2003, when the UPC/FPLC systematically recruited children.³¹ Given that this occurred in Ituri, where the applicant is from, notwithstanding the fact that the responsibility of others cannot be discounted (*viz.* the reference to the APC), on the material provided to the Bench there is *prima facie* evidence (as opposed to proof beyond a reasonable doubt or on a balance of probabilities) that the applicant is a victim of the crimes confirmed against the accused in the period of time between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.³²

The applicant has thus provided sufficient evidence to establish, *prima facie*, that she is a victim under Rules 85(a) of the Rules: she suffered personal harm as a result of the crimes confirmed against the accused, namely her alleged conscription, enlistment or use to participate actively in the hostilities, between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.³³

²⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 29.

²⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 14.

²⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

²⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

³⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

³¹ Decision on the confirmation of the charges, 14 May 2007, ICC-01/04-01/06-803-tEN, paragraph 250.

³² Decision on the participation of victims in the trial and on 86 applications by victims to participate in the proceedings, 30 June 2010, ICC-01/05-01/08-807, paragraph 94.

³³ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

Application of victim a/0029/10 [Annex 5]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a certificate of loss of documents (“attestation de carence”) issued by the city of [REDACTED] and a photograph of the applicant.³⁴

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, militiamen abducted her in [REDACTED]. She spent [REDACTED] in their camp and she was then transferred to [REDACTED], followed by [REDACTED] and finally [REDACTED], where she received military training from Commander Kisémbó. She participated in hostilities in [REDACTED]. She suggests Thomas Lubanga, Commander [REDACTED] and her husband, someone by the name of [REDACTED], were responsible for these events. The applicant alleges she suffered material loss and psychological problems as a result.³⁵

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in the trial and the appeal proceedings.³⁶

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. The defence has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.³⁷

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.³⁸

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.³⁹

³⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx5, page 18.

³⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx5, pages 9-11.

³⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx5, page 9.

³⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf.

³⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 15.

³⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.⁴⁰

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.⁴¹

The applicant has provided sufficient evidence to establish, *prima facie*, that she is a victim under Rules 85(a) of the Rules: the applicant suffered personal harm as a result of the crimes confirmed against the accused, namely her alleged conscription, enlistment or use to participate actively in the hostilities, between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.⁴²

Application of victim a/0030/10 [Annex 6]**The means of identification**

The Chamber has been provided with a student identity card of the applicant.⁴³

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, a commander of Thomas Lubanga abducted her when she was returning home from school. She was sent to [REDACTED], where she was forced to carry out different tasks and where she was subjected to sexual violence. She was then taken to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], where she received military training. She participated in a battle in [REDACTED], and her [REDACTED] was injured. Her property was pillaged. As a result of these events, she claims to have suffered material loss, and physical and psychological harm.⁴⁴

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in the trial and the appeal proceedings.⁴⁵

The observations of the defence

⁴⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

⁴¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

⁴² ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

⁴³ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx6, pages 21-22.

⁴⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx6, pages 9-11 and 18-19.

⁴⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx6, page 9.

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. As regards the specific observations of the defence vis-à-vis the applicant, the defence contends that the applicant refers to crimes not included in the charges (domestic work and sexual violence). It is also submitted that due to the redactions in the application the defence cannot establish whether the applicant's military training occurred before 13 August 2003.⁴⁶ It is suggested that the identity document does not include a date of birth, and it is thus impossible to verify the age of the applicant. Finally, contrary to what is stated in the application form, the "declaration d'indigence" is not included.⁴⁷

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.⁴⁸

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.⁴⁹

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.⁵⁰

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.⁵¹

The uncertainty as to the date of the relevant events is the consequence of the redactions and does not reflect a lack of information provided by the applicant. As regards the defence observation that the student identity card does not include a date of birth, the format of the card does not provide for this information to be included. However, the applicant has given her date of birth in the application, which indicates she was below the age of 15 at the time of the relevant events.

The Chamber therefore concludes that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence to establish, *prima facie*, that she is a victim under Rules 85(a) of the

⁴⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 28.

⁴⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 29.

⁴⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 16.

⁴⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

⁵⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

⁵¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

Rules: she suffered personal harm as a result of the crimes confirmed against the accused, namely her alleged conscription, enlistment or use to participate actively in the hostilities, between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.⁵²

Application of victim a/0031/10 [Annex 7]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a certificate of loss of documents (“attestation de carence”) issued by the city of [REDACTED] and a photograph of the applicant.⁵³

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, militiamen of Thomas Lubanga abducted her by force along with [REDACTED] other girls, when she was returning home from school. She was taken to [REDACTED], and then to [REDACTED], where she was forced into domestic work and where she received military training. She was later taken to [REDACTED] and was ordered to carry goods that had been pillaged during combat. The applicant was forced to “marry” a militiaman. She suffered material loss and psychological harm.⁵⁴ In later representations, the applicant sets out that she was raped on multiple occasions in the camp, which stopped when Commander [REDACTED] “married” her. This meant that he alone raped and beat her, following orders he issued that no one else was to touch her. She gave birth to a [REDACTED] as a result of this forced relationship who [REDACTED] her mother. At the camp she also undertook domestic work for the commander. Eventually, she managed to escape, although she did not attend at a demobilisation centre. The applicant claims that she suffers from [REDACTED] problems following participation in military exercises, despite the fact that she was very weak. She experiences chest pains that are the result of being forced to transport heavy loads of ammunition. She is very anxious and has heart palpitations.⁵⁵

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in the trial and the appeal proceedings.⁵⁶

The observations of the defence

⁵² ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

⁵³ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx7, page 19.

⁵⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx7, pages 9-11 and 18.

⁵⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2616-Conf-Exp-Anx2, pages 2-4.

⁵⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx7, page 9.

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. The defence has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.⁵⁷

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submitted in its original observations that although the application met most of the legal requirements, the date of the applicant's abduction required clarification, because the personal harm she alleges may have been caused after the ambit of the charges. The prosecution therefore suggested that further information was necessary.⁵⁸ However, following the supplementary report provided by the applicant, the prosecution submits the applicant should be permitted to participate.⁵⁹

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.⁶⁰

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.⁶¹

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.⁶²

In the application form it is suggested that the applicant was conscripted well before August 2003, and the harm she suffered (*e.g.* psychological damage) occurred during the relevant period.

Consequently, the Chamber considers that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence to establish, *prima facie*, that she is a victim under Rules 85(a) of the Rules: the applicant suffered personal harm as a result of the crimes confirmed against the accused, namely her alleged conscription, enlistment or use to participate actively in the hostilities, between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.⁶³

⁵⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf.

⁵⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 29.

⁵⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2633, paragraphs 10-11.

⁶⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

⁶¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

⁶² ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

⁶³ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

Application of victim a/0033/10 [Annex 8]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a certificate of loss of documents (“attestation de carence”) issued by the city of [REDACTED] and a photograph of the applicant.⁶⁴

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in March 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, UPC militiamen ambushed and abducted her whilst she was in the market in [REDACTED]. They took her to [REDACTED], and then on to [REDACTED]. She was forced to “marry” one of the men. For a [REDACTED] she was forced to carry out domestic work and to carry heavy items on her back. She was forced to “do what other women do with their husbands”, seemingly referring to sexual violence. Her “husband” was killed in combat. She undertook military training, and she was sent to [REDACTED] for [REDACTED]-month’s training. She participated in hostilities on [REDACTED] occasions in [REDACTED]. The applicant suffered from material loss.⁶⁵

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in the trial and the appeal proceedings.⁶⁶

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. The defence has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.⁶⁷

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.⁶⁸

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.⁶⁹

⁶⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx8, page 18.

⁶⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx8, pages 9-11 and 19.

⁶⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx8, page 9.

⁶⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf.

⁶⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 17.

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.⁷⁰

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.⁷¹

The applicant has provided sufficient evidence to establish, *prima facie*, that she is a victim under Rules 85(a) of the Rules: she suffered personal harm as a result of the crimes confirmed against the accused, namely her alleged conscription, enlistment or use to participate actively in the hostilities, between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.⁷²

Application of victim a/0035/10 [Annex 9]**The means of identification**

The Chamber has been provided with a school identity card for the applicant.⁷³

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, she was abducted by two militiamen in [REDACTED] and taken to the [REDACTED] camp. She was raped and one of the men used her as his "wife". She was taken to [REDACTED], later to [REDACTED] and then on to [REDACTED]. She carried out domestic work and she was subjected to sexual violence. She was taught to use weapons and participated in [REDACTED] attacks. She carried heavy loads and became ill with [REDACTED]. She finally escaped in 2004 and returned to [REDACTED]. However, her family rejected her because she returned with a child. As a result of these events, she suffers from psychological harm, as well as experiencing material loss.⁷⁴

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in all phases of the proceedings.⁷⁵

⁶⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

⁷⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

⁷¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

⁷² ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

⁷³ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx9, pages 18-19.

⁷⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx9, pages 9-11 and 20-21.

⁷⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx9, page 9.

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. The defence argues that due to the redactions in the application, the defence cannot establish whether the military training took place during the timeframe of the charges.⁷⁶ The defence also contends that the applicant states that she was principally used for sexual purposes and to carry goods, crimes not included in the charges.⁷⁷

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.⁷⁸

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.⁷⁹

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.⁸⁰

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.⁸¹

The application reveals the alleged victim was allegedly abducted and held by two UPC militiamen during the timeframe of these charges. The applicant states that she learned to use weapons; she carried heavy loads; and she participated in [REDACTED] attacks.⁸² In all the circumstances, the applicant has provided sufficient evidence for the Chamber to conclude, *prima facie*, that she was abducted in the broad context of the systematic conscription of children under the age of 15 into the military forces of the UPC.⁸³

The Chamber thus concludes that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence to establish, *prima facie*, that she is a victim under Rules 85(a) of the Rules: she suffered personal harm as a result of the crimes confirmed against

⁷⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 28.

⁷⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 29.

⁷⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 18.

⁷⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

⁸⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

⁸¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

⁸² ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx9, pages 9-11 and 20-21.

⁸³ ICC-01/04-01/06-1563-Conf-Exp-AnxA1, page 230.

the accused, namely her alleged conscription, enlistment or use to participate actively in the hostilities, between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.⁸⁴

Application of victim a/0037/10 [Annex 10]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a school identity card of the applicant.⁸⁵

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, she was abducted, when she was returning home from school in [REDACTED]. She was taken to [REDACTED] and later to [REDACTED], where she received military training. She was forced to carry heavy loads towards [REDACTED], where she participated in hostilities. She finally managed to escape back to [REDACTED] with an officer. She was apparently married to a militiaman. She identifies Thomas Lubanga, Commander [REDACTED] and her husband as those responsible for the events. As a result, the applicant has suffered psychological harm and material loss.⁸⁶

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in the trial and the appeal proceedings.⁸⁷

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. The defence has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.⁸⁸

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.⁸⁹

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.⁹⁰

⁸⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

⁸⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx10, pages 19-20.

⁸⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx10, pages 9-11 and 18.

⁸⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx10, page 9.

⁸⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf.

⁸⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 19.

⁹⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.⁹¹

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.⁹²

The applicant has provided sufficient evidence to establish, *prima facie*, that she is a victim under Rules 85(a) of the Rules: she suffered personal harm as a result of the crimes confirmed against the accused, namely her alleged conscription, enlistment or use to participate actively in the hostilities, between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.⁹³

Application of victim a/0333/10 [Annex 11]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a school identity card for the applicant.⁹⁴

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, militiamen of Thomas Lubanga abducted the applicant and her brother in [REDACTED]. The men tortured her brother and took her to [REDACTED]. She received military training, participated in combat in [REDACTED] and was subjected to sexual violence. She became malnourished. Finally, she managed to escape and she learned that her brother had died following the torture to which he was subjected. As a result of these events, the applicant claims she suffered from psychological harm and material loss.⁹⁵

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in the trial and the appeal proceedings.⁹⁶

⁹¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

⁹² ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

⁹³ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

⁹⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx11, pages 19-21.

⁹⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx11, pages 9-11 and 18.

⁹⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx11, page 9.

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. As regards the specific observations of the defence vis-à-vis this applicant, the defence argues that the lack of precision in relation to the dates of the events (and the relevant redactions) make it impossible for the defence to establish whether the alleged crimes occurred in the timeframe of the charges against the accused.⁹⁷

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.⁹⁸

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.⁹⁹

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.¹⁰⁰

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.¹⁰¹

The uncertainty as to the date of the relevant events is the consequence of the redactions and does not reflect a lack of information provided by the applicant.

The Chamber thus concludes that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence to establish, *prima facie*, that she is a victim under Rules 85(a) of the Rules: the applicant suffered personal harm as a result of the crimes confirmed against the accused, namely her alleged conscription, enlistment or use to participate actively in the hostilities, between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.¹⁰²

⁹⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 28.

⁹⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 20.

⁹⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

¹⁰⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

¹⁰¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

¹⁰² ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

Application of victim a/0334/10 [Annex 12]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a certificate of loss of documents (“attestation de carence”) issued by the city of [REDACTED] and a photograph of the applicant.¹⁰³

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, she was taken by APC military to [REDACTED]. She received military training in [REDACTED] and was married forcibly to a militiaman and raped by another man. She was then transferred to [REDACTED], where she received military training and was forced to carry heavy loads. Another commander with whom she had two children later took her to [REDACTED]. She states that the men that recruited her were also involved with the UPC, and that Thomas Lubanga was in charge of the group. As a result of these events the applicant experienced fatigue, and she became ill and suffered material loss.¹⁰⁴

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in the trial and the appeal proceedings.¹⁰⁵

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. The defence argues that it cannot establish whether the military training took place during the timeframe of the charges.¹⁰⁶ The defence also relies on the applicant’s reference to having been abducted by the APC, seemingly confusing this group with the UPC and suggesting that Thomas Lubanga was in charge of both groups. The defence finally observes that contrary to what is written in the application form, no student identity card has been provided. The defence submits that since the applicant states in the “attestation de carence” that she lost her identity card, there is a contradiction in her application that casts serious doubts as to its truthfulness.¹⁰⁷

The observations of the prosecution

¹⁰³ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx12, page 20.

¹⁰⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx12, pages 9-11 and 18-19.

¹⁰⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx12, page 9.

¹⁰⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 28.

¹⁰⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 29.

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.¹⁰⁸

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.¹⁰⁹

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.¹¹⁰

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.¹¹¹

The Chamber has addressed the potential confusion between the APC and the UPC. However, the applicant indicated that the person with overall responsibility for the harm she suffered was Thomas Lubanga.

Given the accused is charged with crimes allegedly committed between September 2002 and 13 August 2003, which was when the UPC/FPLC carried out recruitment of children in a systematic way,¹¹² and since this occurred in Ituri, where these events concerning the applicant occurred, notwithstanding the fact that the responsibility of others cannot be discounted (such as the APC), the Chamber concludes that, on the material provided to the Bench, there is *prima facie* evidence (as opposed to proof beyond a reasonable doubt or on a balance of probabilities) that the applicant is a victim of the crimes confirmed against the accused.

The Chamber thus concludes that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence to establish, *prima facie*, that she is a victim under Rules 85(a) of the Rules: she suffered personal harm as a result of the crimes confirmed against the accused, namely her alleged conscription, enlistment or use to participate actively in the hostilities, between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.¹¹³

¹⁰⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 21.

¹⁰⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

¹¹⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

¹¹¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

¹¹² ICC-01/04-01/06-803-tEN, paragraph 250.

¹¹³ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

Application of victim a/0336/10 [Annex 13]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a certificate of loss of documents (“attestation de carence”) issued by the city of [REDACTED] and a photograph of the applicant.¹¹⁴

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, 15 UPC militiamen abducted her when she was [REDACTED] years old. She was taken to a camp in [REDACTED], where she was raped and later “married” to one of the militiamen. She was then taken to [REDACTED] to receive military training; she was forced to carry heavy loads; and she was subjected to beatings. She [REDACTED], and was taken to [REDACTED]. She finally managed to escape to [REDACTED] in 2004. As a result of these events, she suffers from various illnesses and she has experienced material loss.¹¹⁵

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in trial and appeal proceedings.¹¹⁶

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. The defence argues that due to the redactions in the application they cannot establish whether the military training took place during the timeframe of the charges.¹¹⁷ The defence submits that although the applicant mentions in Section D-1 of her application that the events took place in “[REDACTED]-hostilities”, she does not refer to having actively participated in hostilities elsewhere in her application.¹¹⁸

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.¹¹⁹

Observations of the legal representative

¹¹⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx13, page 20.

¹¹⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx13, pages 9-11 and 18-19.

¹¹⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx13, page 9.

¹¹⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 28.

¹¹⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 29.

¹¹⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 22.

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.¹²⁰

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.¹²¹

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.¹²²

The uncertainty as to the date of the relevant events is the consequence of the redactions and does not reflect a lack of information provided by the applicant.

The application sets out that the victim was allegedly abducted and held by the "15 UPC militiamen" for a period within the timeframe of the charges, in the context of a broad campaign conducted by the UPC of child abduction and forced recruitment. Given the alleged systematic recruitment, enlistment or use of child soldiers at this time by that group, on a *prima facie* basis, it is fair to infer that the applicant was held, *inter alia*, for one of these purposes. Accordingly, the lack of any mention in the application to active participation in hostilities does not invalidate this application, particularly since the applicant indicated that she received military training in [REDACTED] and was forced to carry heavy loads.¹²³

The Chamber thus considers that the applicant has presented sufficient evidence for the Chamber to conclude, *prima facie*, that she was abducted in the broad context of the systematic conscription of children under the age of 15 into the military forces of the UPC.¹²⁴

Application of victim a/0738/10 [Annex 14]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a student identity card of the applicant.¹²⁵

¹²⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

¹²¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

¹²² ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

¹²³ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx13, pages 9-11 and 18-19.

¹²⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-1563-Conf-Exp, page 230.

¹²⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx14, page 22.

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that she was in the market in [REDACTED] buying groceries when four UPC militiamen took her by force to camp [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. She then became a “wife”. As a consequence of her family situation, the applicant states she decided to stay as a wife of a militiaman. She summarises that in 2002 she was the wife of a militiaman called Mr [REDACTED], with whom she had a child. In 2003 she was the wife of a militiaman in [REDACTED]. She received military training in [REDACTED], where she learned to shoot and was also ordered to pillage. She was also beaten and punished. She finally managed to escape and return to [REDACTED], where she started a demobilisation program in 2004. The applicant identifies Mr Thomas Lubanga and Commander Kisémbó as the persons responsible for the events. She claims to suffer from the separation from her family, torture and threats received. She also has chest pains and headaches, high blood pressure and [REDACTED]. She also claims to have suffered delay in her schooling.¹²⁶

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in trial and appeal proceedings.¹²⁷

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. The defence argues that it cannot establish whether the military training took place during the timeframe of the charges, particularly since the applicant refers to having first being abducted as a “wife” without identifying if she was enlisted in an armed group or actively participated in the hostilities.¹²⁸

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.¹²⁹

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.¹³⁰

¹²⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx14, pages 9-11, 19-20; ICC-01/04-01/06-2616-Conf-Exp-Anx3, pages 2-3.

¹²⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx14, page 9.

¹²⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 28.

¹²⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 23 ; ICC-01/04-01/06-2633, paragraph 7.

¹³⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.¹³¹

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.¹³²

The uncertainty as to the date of the relevant events is the consequence of the redactions and does not reflect a lack of information provided by the applicant.

The application reveals that the applicant was allegedly abducted and held by four UPC militiamen within the timeframe of the charges, in the context of a broad campaign conducted by the UPC of child abduction and forced recruitment. Given the alleged systematic recruitment, enlistment or use of child soldiers at this time by that group, on a *prima facie* basis, it is fair to infer that she was held, *inter alia*, for one of these purposes, particularly the applicant indicates that she received military training in [REDACTED].¹³³ Accordingly, there is sufficient information to establish the link between the applicant's abduction and the charges.

The Chamber thus considers that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence for the Chamber to conclude, *prima facie*, that she was abducted in the broad context of the systematic conscription of children under the age of 15 into the military forces of the UPC.¹³⁴

Application of victim a/0739/10 [Annex 15]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a certificate of loss of documents ("attestation de carence") issued by the city of [REDACTED] and a photograph of the applicant.¹³⁵

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, four UPC militiamen abducted her in [REDACTED], where she did

¹³¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

¹³² ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

¹³³ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx14, pages 9-11 and 19-20; ICC-01/04-01/06-2616-Conf-Exp-Anx3, page 2.

¹³⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-1563-Conf-Exp, page 230.

¹³⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx15, page 20.

domestic work, and she was raped. She was then taken to [REDACTED], where she received military training. She was later transferred to [REDACTED], from where she managed to escape to [REDACTED]. As a result of these events she suffers psychologically.¹³⁶

The phase of the proceedings

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in the trial and the appeal proceedings.¹³⁷

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. The defence argues that it cannot establish whether the military training took place during the timeframe of the charges, because the applicant only mentions that she was abducted in [REDACTED] 2003 and became a “wife” of a militiaman and was forced to do domestic work.¹³⁸ The defence also contends that the application is incoherent as regards the applicant’s identity card, since in Section A-13 she states that she has been unable to obtain an identity card since her [REDACTED], whereas in the “attestation de carence” she mentions that her identity card got lost during the war.¹³⁹

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.¹⁴⁰

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.¹⁴¹

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.¹⁴²

The Chamber’s analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial

¹³⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx15, pages 9-11 and 18-19.

¹³⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx15, page 9.

¹³⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 28.

¹³⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 29.

¹⁴⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 24.

¹⁴¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

¹⁴² ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.¹⁴³ The inconsistencies as to the identity card are insufficiently serious to invalidate this application.

The application reveals that she was allegedly captured by "four UPC militiamen" within the timeframe of the charges, in the context of a broad campaign conducted by the UPC of child abduction and forced recruitment. Given the alleged systematic recruitment, enlistment or use of child soldiers at this time by that group, on a *prima facie* basis, it is fair to infer that she was held, *inter alia*, for one of these purposes, particularly given the applicant refers to having received military training for [REDACTED]. Accordingly, the information sufficiently establishes the link between the applicant's abduction and the charges, within their timeframe.

The Chamber thus concludes that the applicant has presented sufficient evidence for the Chamber to conclude, *prima facie*, that she was abducted in the broad context of the systematic conscription of children under the age of 15 into the military forces of the UPC.¹⁴⁴

Application of victim a/0740/10 [Annex 16]

The means of identification

The Chamber has been provided with a student identity card of the applicant.¹⁴⁵

The claim to victim status

The applicant claims that in [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] 2003, when she was [REDACTED] years old, three UPC militiamen abducted her, while she was on her way to the market of [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. She was taken as a "wife", forced to do domestic work and subjected to sexual violence. She was then transferred to [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] and later to [REDACTED], where she received military training. She was also forced to participate in combat. She finally managed to escape. As a result of these events the applicant suffers psychologically and she has endured material loss.¹⁴⁶

The phase of the proceedings

¹⁴³ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

¹⁴⁴ ICC-01/04-01/06-1563-Conf-Exp, page 230.

¹⁴⁵ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx16, page 20.

¹⁴⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx16, pages 9-11 and 18-19.

The applicant submits she has an interest in participating in the trial and the appeal proceedings.¹⁴⁷

The observations of the defence

The submissions that apply generally to the applicants have been addressed in the cover decision. The defence argues that it cannot establish whether the military training took place during the timeframe of the charges, due to the redactions and the imprecise information included in the application form.¹⁴⁸

The observations of the prosecution

The prosecution submits that this applicant should be permitted to participate.¹⁴⁹

Observations of the legal representative

The legal representative has made no observations vis-à-vis this particular applicant.¹⁵⁰

Legal representation

The applicant has been represented thus far by Mr Keta.¹⁵¹

The Chamber's analysis and decision

The documents and other material provided have assisted the Chamber in determining the identity of the applicant in accordance with the Trial Chamber's Decision on victims' participation.¹⁵²

The uncertainty as to the date of the relevant events is the consequence of the redactions and does not reflect a lack of information provided by the applicant.

The applicant has provided sufficient evidence to establish, *prima facie*, that she is a victim under Rules 85(a) of the Rules: she suffered personal harm as a result of the crimes confirmed against the accused, namely her alleged conscription, enlistment or use to participate actively in the hostilities, between September 2002 and 13 August 2003.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁷ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp-Anx16, page 9.

¹⁴⁸ ICC-01/04-01/06-2587-Conf, paragraph 28.

¹⁴⁹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2590-Conf, paragraph 25.

¹⁵⁰ ICC-01/04-01/06-2603.

¹⁵¹ ICC-01/04-01/06-2474-Conf-Exp, paragraph 10.

¹⁵² ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.

¹⁵³ ICC-01/04-01/06-1119, ICC-01/04-01/06-1432.