

**Security Council**

Distr.: General  
17 November 2016

Original: English

---

**Letter dated 17 November 2016 from the President of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals addressed to the President of the Security Council**

I am pleased to transmit herewith the assessments of the President (see annex I) and of the Prosecutor (see annex II) of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, submitted pursuant to paragraph 16 of Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#).

I would be grateful if the present letter and its annexes could be circulated to the members of the Security Council.

*(Signed)* Theodor **Meron**

---

\* Reissued for technical reasons on 3 May 2017.



**Annex I**

[Original: English and French]

**Assessment and progress report of the President of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, Judge Theodor Meron, for the period from 16 May to 15 November 2016**

1. The present report, the ninth in a series, is submitted pursuant to Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), by which the Council established the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, and, in paragraph 16 of that resolution, requested the President and the Prosecutor of the Mechanism to submit reports every six months to the Council on the progress of the work of the Mechanism.<sup>1</sup> Certain information contained in this report is submitted pursuant to the Council's request in paragraph 20 of its resolution [2256 \(2015\)](#).

**I. Introduction**

2. The Security Council, by its resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), established the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals to carry out a number of essential functions of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, including the trial of fugitives who are among the most senior leaders suspected of being primarily responsible for crimes, after the closure of the two Tribunals. Pursuant to resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), the Mechanism shall operate for an initial period of four years, and subsequently for periods of two years, following reviews of its progress, unless the Council decides otherwise.

3. In accordance with its mandate, and as set forth below, the Mechanism has assumed responsibility for a number of functions of both Tribunals, including with regard to a range of judicial activities, the enforcement of sentences, the resettlement of acquitted and released persons, the protection of victims and witnesses and the management of archives.

4. On 31 July 2016, the mandate of the liquidation team for the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda concluded and the Mechanism assumed full responsibility for the remaining, minor, liquidation tasks. While the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia proceeds in the finalization of its work, drawing on the lessons learned from the liquidation of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, the Mechanism continues to work closely with the principal officers and staff of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia to ensure the smooth transition of its remaining functions and services, consistent with its projected closure timeline.

5. The Mechanism continues to be guided in its activities by the Security Council's vision of it as a small, temporary and efficient structure, the functions and size of which will diminish over time, with a small number of staff commensurate with its limited functions. To that end, the Mechanism continues to draw upon the

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise specified, figures discussed in this report are accurate as of 15 November 2016.

best practices of and lessons learned from both International Tribunals, and from other tribunals, to actively pursue new ways to improve its operations, procedures and working methods, and to maintain flexibility in staff assignments. By doing so, the Mechanism seeks to maximize effectiveness and efficiency across both of its branches, while maintaining relatively low staffing levels.

6. The Mechanism is mindful of the temporary nature of its mandate. Wherever possible, detailed projections of the duration of the residual functions entrusted to the Mechanism are reflected in the present report, in accordance with Security Council resolution [2256 \(2015\)](#). Such projections are based on available data and, as a consequence, at this stage of the Mechanism's work, are both limited in nature and subject to modification depending on evolving circumstances.

## **II. Structure and organization of the Mechanism**

7. In accordance with its statute (see Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), annex 1), the Mechanism has a single set of principals — the President, the Prosecutor and the Registrar — who have responsibility over two branches, one located in Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, and the other in The Hague, the Netherlands. As mandated, the Mechanism commenced operations at its Arusha branch on 1 July 2012, assuming functions derived from the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. The Hague branch commenced operations on 1 July 2013, assuming functions derived from the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

### **A. Organs and principals**

8. Article 4 of the statute of the Mechanism provides that it shall consist of three organs, (a) the Chambers, (b) the Prosecutor, and (c) the Registry, to provide administrative services for the Mechanism. The workloads of the Chambers and of the Registry are set forth below.

9. The President of the Mechanism is Judge Theodor Meron. The Prosecutor is Mr. Serge Brammertz. The Registrar is Mr. John Hocking.

### **B. Judges**

10. Article 8 of the statute of the Mechanism provides that the Mechanism shall have a roster of 25 independent judges. Pursuant to article 8, paragraph 3, of the statute, judges “shall only be present at the seats of the branches of the Mechanism as necessary at the request of the President to exercise the functions requiring their presence. In so far as possible, and as decided by the President, the functions may be exercised remotely...”.

11. During the reporting period, and in accordance with article 10, paragraph 2, of the statute, the Secretary-General appointed Judge Seymour Panton to serve as a judge of the Mechanism following the resignation of Judge Patrick Robinson. Thereafter, in accordance with article 10, paragraph 3, of the statute and paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution [2269 \(2016\)](#), the Secretary-General appointed all judges of the Mechanism for a new, two-year term of office, commencing on 1 July 2016.

12. On 26 and 27 September 2016, the Mechanism's judges conducted their first in-person plenary session, having conducted previous plenaries by remote written procedure. During the plenary, all three principals of the Mechanism briefed the judges on matters related to their areas of responsibility and the judges further discussed issues pertaining to the internal functioning of the Mechanism and ways to strengthen its efficiency and improve its operations. During the reporting period, in furtherance of the Mechanism's effective and transparent management, the President also continued his tradition of providing regular written updates and briefings to his fellow judges on matters related to the work of Chambers and of the Mechanism as a whole.

13. On 5 October 2016, the President informed the President of the Security Council of the arrest, on or about 21 September 2016, of Judge Aydin Sefa Akay, a Turkish national, by law enforcement officials of the Government of Turkey in relation to allegations of conduct connected to the acts of 15 July 2016 directed against the constitutional order of Turkey (S/2016/841). Judge Akay was, at the time of his arrest, carrying out his functions for the Mechanism, having been assigned on 25 July 2016 to a bench of the Appeals Chamber in the still-pending review case *The Prosecutor v. Augustin Ngirabatware*. Pursuant to article 29 of the statute of the Mechanism, the judges of the Mechanism enjoy diplomatic immunity for those periods of time in which they are engaged on the business of the Mechanism. Accordingly, the Office of Legal Affairs, on behalf of the Secretary-General, has formally asserted diplomatic immunity with respect to Judge Akay and requested his immediate release from detention and the cessation of all legal proceedings against him. To date, however, Judge Akay remains in detention. Judge Akay's continued detention prevents the Appeals Chamber bench from reaching a decision on the pending request for review, the postponement of which has materially impacted the conduct of the proceedings, with corresponding implications for the fundamental rights of the applicant. This situation also has broader and serious implications for the Mechanism's ability to carry out its core judicial functions in accordance with the remote-judging model adopted by the Security Council, pursuant to which, for the most part, judges carry out their functions in their State of nationality.

### C. The branches

14. The Government of the United Republic of Tanzania continues to cooperate with the Mechanism, in line with the headquarters agreement for the Arusha branch, which entered into force on 1 April 2014. The agreement between the United Nations and the Netherlands concerning the headquarters of the branch of the Mechanism in The Hague, which entered into force on 1 September 2016, also applies *mutatis mutandis* to the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

15. In close cooperation with the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, construction works for the Mechanism's new premises in Arusha were completed during the reporting period. The project has remained within budget. The construction, which was undertaken by a local company, following a rigorous procurement process, maximized the usage of local materials and building methods and benefited from best practices and lessons learned in other capital projects undertaken by the United Nations. The Mechanism's management of the construction was deemed to be satisfactory by the Office of Internal Oversight

Services (OIOS). During the reporting period, the Mechanism also continued, with the support of the administration of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, to organize its work for the post-construction phase, in particular the provision of goods and services essential for the smooth running of operations in the new facility. It is anticipated that the Mechanism will assume full occupancy of its new premises immediately following the official opening of the Mechanism, scheduled for 25 November 2016. The Mechanism is grateful to the United Republic of Tanzania for its steadfast support for the completion of this project, alongside its generous provisions of land for the site, a permanent road to the site, as well as connections for utilities, in particular water, electricity and Internet connections.

16. The Arusha sub-office in Kigali continues to provide protection and support services to witnesses and to support the activities of the monitors of the cases of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda that have been referred to Rwanda, pursuant to article 6 of the statute of the Mechanism.

17. The Hague branch of the Mechanism is co-located with the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, and the Mechanism has a strong preference, based on efficiency and cost-effectiveness, for remaining at its current premises after the closure of the Tribunal. Ongoing technical discussions and negotiations with the authorities of the host State, the owners of the premises, and possible co-tenants on this matter are progressing.

#### **D. Administration and staffing**

18. The basic requirements for a small, self-standing administration for the Mechanism were developed in cooperation between the Mechanism and the two International Tribunals and were included in the Mechanism's 2014-2015 and 2016-2017 budgets, as approved by the General Assembly. The recruitment of the administrative staff for the Mechanism, in line with those requirements, has taken place in phases as the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda has closed and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia downsizes, including the gradual transference of its administrative functions to the Mechanism. It is anticipated that by the end of 2017 the Mechanism will be a fully independent entity. Through the phased transfer of administrative functions and the extensive use of double-hatting, duplication of resources has been avoided and economies of scale maximized.

19. The Mechanism provided the liquidation team for the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda with all required administrative, security, information technology and logistical support during the liquidation period from 1 January through 31 July 2016. On 1 August 2016, the Mechanism assumed full responsibility for pending administrative and financial matters pertaining to the Tribunal and it will continue to focus on those pending matters until they are resolved.

20. The Human Resources, Budget and Finance, Procurement, Information Technology, Security and General Services Sections of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia have continued to perform their functions for the Tribunal itself and for both branches of the Mechanism. They did so in accordance with the

plan for the transfer of administrative functions to the Mechanism and supported by a limited number of administrative staff of Mechanism, commensurate with its size.

21. The Mechanism has a vacancy rate of only 4 per cent for its continuous posts. As at 10 October 2016, 169 of the 176 approved continuous posts for the biennium had been filled in order to carry out the Mechanism's continuous functions. An additional 160 personnel are serving as general temporary assistance to assist with ad hoc needs, including judicial work, litigation and transition issues. These positions are short-term in nature and the number may fluctuate depending on workload. Since the commencement of the Mechanism's work, recruitment has taken place in alignment with all applicable rules, and no grievance cases have been brought before the organs of administrative justice.

22. The Mechanism's continuous and general temporary assistance positions include nationals of 65 States: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, the Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaysia, Mali, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Zimbabwe.

23. Sixty-one per cent of the professional staff of the Mechanism are female, surpassing the Secretary-General's gender parity goals. In addition, the Mechanism has in place focal points for gender issues; sexual exploitation and abuse; lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender concerns; as well as for diversity and inclusion issues.

24. Further details concerning the staffing of the Mechanism by division are reflected in enclosure 1 to the present report.

25. Out of the overall biennial appropriation for the Mechanism for 2016-2017, of approximately \$127 million, approximately \$44.5 million had been committed as of 8 November 2016, representing a rate of implementation of 35.1 per cent. Further details and a breakdown of the Mechanism's costs, presented in terms of funds committed as at 8 November 2016, are set forth in enclosure 2 to the present report. It should be noted that the Mechanism has continued to rely heavily on double-hatting arrangements during the reporting period. The approved budget levels take into account the support provided by staff members charged against posts of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia under these double-hatting arrangements.

#### **E. Legal and regulatory framework**

26. Having established a structure to govern its activities, the Mechanism continues to develop rules, procedures and policies that harmonize and build upon the best practices of both International Tribunals, as well as its own practice, in order to achieve its mandate in a lean and efficient fashion.

27. During the reporting period, the judges of the Mechanism adopted amendments to the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, in the interest of enhancing the clarity of the Rules and, in one instance, their inclusivity and flexibility. In addition, the Mechanism amended two practice directions: the Practice Direction on Filings Made Before the Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals and the Practice Direction on Procedure for the Proposal, Consideration, and Publication of Amendments to the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Mechanism.

28. Furthermore, the Mechanism's Registrar issued a number of new policies and guidelines, including: (a) the Access Policy for the Records Held by the Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals; (b) the Registry's internal Guidelines on the Development of Mechanism Practice: Directions, Policies, and Policy Instruments; (c) the Remuneration Policy for Persons Assisting Indigent Self-Represented Accused before the Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals; (d) the Remuneration Policy for Persons Representing Indigent Suspects and Accused in Contempt and False Testimony Proceedings before the Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals; and (e) the Guidelines on the Submission of Hourly Invoices and Remunerable Activities for Assistants to Self-Represented Accused.

29. The Mechanism has also continued to develop and improve the procedures and policies that govern its administrative activities.

### **III. Judicial activities**

30. During the reporting period, the Mechanism has been seized of a number of complex matters. The President and the judges have continued to engage in a wide variety of judicial activity, issuing 214 decisions and orders during the period. In accordance with article 8, paragraph 3, of the statute of the Mechanism, judicial activity was primarily carried out remotely. The President assigned matters to judges based on an equitable distribution of the workload. All of the judges on the roster are collectively supported by a small Chambers team of 17 staff distributed across both branches of the Mechanism.

31. Of the 214 decisions and orders, 85 (or approximately 40 per cent) related to requests for access to confidential material or for the variation of protective measures. These requests were made primarily by prosecution authorities in national jurisdictions but also included requests from accused or appellants in pending cases in relation to their defence or appeals or convicted persons seeking information in relation to possible requests for review. All such requests were primarily adjudicated by Single Judges working remotely or by the presiding judge in a pending case and typically involved the issuance of one or more preliminary orders prior to the issuance of the final decision. Although it is not possible to fully foresee when, and how often, requests related to protective measures will arise, as recognized in the report of the Secretary-General preceding the establishment of the Mechanism (S/2009/258, para. 102), it is anticipated that requests for access to confidential material or the variation of protective measures will continue to be filed so long as national authorities continue to investigate and prosecute cases in domestic jurisdictions. In addition, accused or appellants will continue to file such requests while their cases are pending, as indicated below, and convicted persons are likely to do so until the conclusion of their sentence.

32. Judicial work was also carried out remotely by Single Judges in relation to other types of motions, including requests for compensation, disclosure of exculpatory material or investigations into allegations of false testimony or contempt. For example, on 13 June 2016, a Single Judge ordered the Registrar to appoint an *amicus curiae* to investigate allegations of false testimony in relation to evidence given in the *Ntakirutimana* case. On 10 October 2016, the Registrar appointed an *amicus curiae* and the investigation is ongoing. In respect of an investigation into possible contempt in the *Akayesu* case, a Single Judge terminated the proceedings on 17 October 2016 after extensive litigation involving a number of preliminary orders and decisions. Since the Mechanism has a continuing obligation to safeguard the administration of justice, its duty to investigate and prosecute allegations of false testimony or contempt, subject to the provisions of article 1 (4) of the statute, will continue until its closure. During the reporting period, a Single Judge also completed an inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the death of Zdravko Tolimir while in custody at the United Nations Detention Unit in The Hague, and presented his report to the President on 7 September 2016. The President informed the Security Council accordingly.

33. In addition to the above, the judges of the Mechanism continued their work on trials, appeals and requests for review related to the core crimes enumerated in the statute as set forth below.

34. On 9 December 2015, the Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia issued a judgment in the case of Jovica Stanišić and Franko Simatović, quashing their acquittals and ordering a retrial on all counts. A Trial Chamber of the Mechanism at the branch in The Hague is seized of the case. On 18 December 2015, Mr. Stanišić and Mr. Simatović pleaded not guilty at their initial appearance. The Presiding Judge of the Trial Chamber actively oversaw the pre-trial proceedings and trial planning in this case from the seat of the Mechanism in The Hague at no additional cost to the Organization until the completion of his mandate as a permanent judge of the International Tribunal in July 2016. He is now overseeing the pre-trial activity remotely, unless his presence is required at the seat of the Mechanism to conduct hearings or attend to trial preparation matters. The other two judges on the bench have primarily carried out their work in respect of this case remotely since the commencement of the case.

35. Trial preparation hearings were held on 19 February 2016, 23 May 2016 and 28 September 2016. The latter hearing was held before the full bench of the Trial Chamber, making cost-effective use of the presence of the other two judges assigned to the bench in The Hague immediately following the first in-person plenary of judges. Additional hearings are anticipated in December 2016. These hearings will facilitate the determination of the scope of the trial, the manner of the presentation of evidence and modalities for the conduct of the trial, which are key factors in properly projecting the length and duration of the proceedings. The Prosecution filed its pre-trial brief on 5 September 2016, and the pre-trial conference before the full bench of judges is anticipated in the first quarter of 2017. At this stage, this full retrial — unprecedented before the Mechanism and the ad hoc Tribunals — is proceeding on track, and it will be possible to include preliminary projections as to the anticipated overall length of the proceedings in the next report once the modalities and scope of trial have been clarified at the upcoming hearings.



36. On 22 July 2016, Radovan Karadžić and the Prosecution filed notices of appeal against the trial judgment issued on 24 March 2016 by a Trial Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in the *Karadžić* case. The Trial Chamber found Mr. Karadžić guilty of genocide, crimes against humanity and violations of the laws and customs of war, and sentenced him to 40 years of imprisonment. In their notices of appeal, Mr. Karadžić and the Prosecution presented a total of 54 grounds of appeal. Citing the unprecedented breadth and complexity of the case, the large amount of evidence on the record, the length of the trial judgment (being the longest ever issued by the International Tribunal or any other international criminal tribunal), and the complexity of the issues raised on appeal, the parties jointly requested that the Appeals Chamber grant extensions of time for filing their appeal and response briefs. The Appeals Chamber partly granted the joint request of the parties, ordering them to file their appeal briefs by 5 December 2016 and the response briefs within 85 days thereof. Pending receipt of the appeal and response briefs, the estimate of three years for the completion of the case previously reported in the Mechanism's review report of 20 November 2015 (S/2015/896) remains unchanged. At the current stage of the proceedings, all of the judges on the bench in this case are carrying out their work remotely, with the exception of the President, who is presiding.

37. On 31 March 2016, a Trial Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia issued its judgment in the case of Vojislav Šešelj, finding him not guilty on all counts. The Prosecution filed its notice of appeal on 2 May 2016 and its appeal brief on 29 August 2016, arguing that the Trial Chamber had erred in law by failing to deliver a reasoned judgment and that it erred in fact by acquitting Mr. Šešelj. The Prosecution has requested that the Appeals Chamber revise the trial judgment and find Mr. Šešelj guilty or, in the alternative, that it reverse the judgment of acquittal and order a retrial. On 8 July 2016, the President, as Pre-appeal Judge, authorized Mr. Šešelj in the circumstances of this case to file his response brief, if any, within 80 days of the receipt of the Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian translation of the complete trial judgment, including all appended judicial opinions and the Prosecution's appeal brief in all three languages. The translation of the trial judgment, together with the related judicial opinions, and the Prosecution appeal brief were served on Mr. Šešelj on 28 September 2016. The response brief is currently due by 19 December 2016. Pending the full briefing of the appeal, the estimate of three years for the completion of the case previously reported in the Mechanism's review report of 20 November 2015 likewise remains unchanged. At the current stage of the proceedings, all the judges on the bench in this case are carrying out their work remotely, with the exception of the President, who is presiding.

38. On 8 July 2016, Augustin Ngirabatware filed a request for review of his judgment. Briefing has concluded in the matter, and it is pending consideration by the bench upon the timely resolution of the situation of Judge Akay, a member of the bench, as set forth above. Assuming such resolution, if the review is authorized, a hearing will be scheduled at the earliest opportunity to consider the merits of the request. As long as Judge Akay remains detained, it is neither possible to reach a decision on the authorization of review nor to give a projection for the completion of this matter.

39. On 4 October 2016, the Appeals Chamber, with all judges working remotely, except for the Presiding Judge, Judge Burton Hall, who was double-hatted with the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia during most of the case, unanimously rejected Jean Uwinkindi's appeal against the decision of a Trial Chamber of the Mechanism dismissing his request for the revocation of the referral of his case to Rwanda. Earlier, the Appeals Chamber dismissed six requests for admission of additional evidence filed by Mr. Uwinkindi in connection with his appeal.

40. The President of the Mechanism has, pursuant to his authority in the area of enforcement of sentences, issued six decisions in response to requests for early release during the reporting period as well as a number of other decisions and orders. He is currently seized of a number of other confidential enforcement matters. In reaching decisions on certain enforcement matters, the President consults the judges of the sentencing Chamber who are judges of the Mechanism through remote procedure.

41. During the reporting period, the President also issued a number of additional decisions and orders, including two decisions related to requests for legal aid. Moreover, the President issued 43 assignment orders, of which 35 were assigned to Single Judges and eight to the Appeals Chamber.

42. The projections for the duration of various judicial functions remain unchanged from those set forth in the Mechanism's review report of 20 November 2015, with the exception of projections of a possible appeal in the *Hadžić* case, which was terminated before the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia on 22 July 2016, following the death of the accused, Goran Hadžić. These projections reflect estimates based on factors such as past experiences with cases conducted at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the scope of the case concerned, activity at the Mechanism to date and the efficient working methods of the Mechanism's Chambers. These projections presume that no extraordinary events occur during the course of the proceedings that may impact their conduct. All projections remain subject to periodic updating based on any new information. In this respect, the Mechanism recalls that the 12 May 2016 evaluation report by OIOS indicated, with respect to cases before the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, that any changes based on the requirements of a just resolution of a case should not necessarily be construed as reflecting slippage in the conduct of a case and that accurate predictions as to completion could only be made at the close of a trial or at the conclusion of a briefing on appeal. With respect to projections for judicial activities other than trials and appeals from judgment, the Mechanism recalls the observations made in the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General that "it is not possible to foresee when, and how often, requests related to contempt cases, protective orders, review of judgments, referral cases and pardon and commutation of sentences will arise" but that "such issues are more likely to arise within a period of 10 to 15 years after the closure of the Tribunals [...] and that the level of work involved [...] will inevitably decrease over time."(S/2009/258, para. 102)

43. The Mechanism remains committed to building on the best practices of the two International Tribunals and ensuring the expeditious conclusion of all matters.

To that end, during the reporting period, efforts were undertaken to deploy various information technology resources to facilitate the remote work of the judges.

#### **IV. Registry support to judicial activities**

44. During the reporting period, the Registry continued to provide support to the Mechanism's judicial activities in both branches.

45. The Registry also processed and disseminated over 1,097 filings, including 79 Registry legal submissions, amounting in total to more than 10,982 pages. Additionally, it facilitated and serviced the pre-trial phase of the *Stanišić and Simatović* case retrial.

46. The Registry's Language Support Services translated 6,291 pages of documents, provided 16 conference interpreter days and produced 475 pages of transcript in English and French. Additionally, the Kinyarwanda Unit of the Language Support Services provided translations of, inter alia, the monitoring reports with respect to the cases referred to Rwanda. Furthermore, the Registry administered the Mechanism's legal aid system, overseeing an average of 36 defence teams comprising a total of approximately 100 defence team members.

#### **V. Victims and witnesses**

47. Pursuant to article 20 of the statute of the Mechanism and article 5 of the transitional arrangements (see Security Council resolution 1966 (2010), annex 2), the Mechanism is responsible for the support and protection of the thousands of protected witnesses who have testified in cases completed by the two Tribunals, as well as those witnesses who may appear before the Mechanism.

48. The Witness Support and Protection Unit continues to be fully operational at both branches of the Mechanism. Consistent with judicial protection orders, and in close collaboration with domestic authorities and other United Nations entities, the Unit provides security for witnesses by undertaking threat assessments and coordinating responses to security related requirements. The Unit also: ensures that protected witness information remains confidential; continues to contact witnesses when orders to seek consent to the rescission, variation, or augmentation of witness protective measures are received; and facilitates contact between parties and relocated witnesses or witnesses of opposite parties when so required.

49. As part of the Arusha branch's provision of support services to witnesses, witnesses residing in Rwanda continue to receive medical and psychosocial services. These services are particularly focused on the witnesses experiencing psychotrauma or living with HIV/AIDS, many of whom contracted the virus as a result of crimes committed against them during the genocide.

50. The branch in The Hague supported the pilot study, carried out by the Victims and Witnesses Section of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, which was supported by the University of North Texas and partly financed by voluntary contributions, into the long-term impact that testifying before the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia has on witnesses. The final report on the pilot study was successfully launched in June 2016. The Arusha branch is

liaising with the University of North Texas on a similar study of witnesses before the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

51. The witness protection teams at the two branches continue to exchange best practices and use a common information technology platform for their respective witness databases. This platform, accessible since November 2015, maximizes operational efficiency across both branches.

52. The Witness Support and Protection Unit has also complied with 19 judicial orders related to protected witnesses in connection with requests related to their protective measures.

53. It is expected that victim and witness protection will continue to be required in future bienniums in the light of the many judicial protection orders that will remain in force unless rescinded or waived. Determining how long the victim and witness protection function would need to remain operational is a difficult assessment to make. It may be required to provide support until at least the last witness is deceased, or, where applicable, until the cessation of protective measures covering a witness's immediate family members, and in relation to the relocated witnesses, until the last member of the immediate family is deceased.

## **VI. Fugitives and trial and appeal readiness**

54. On 1 July 2012, in accordance with Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#) and the statute of the Mechanism, the responsibility for tracking the remaining fugitives indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda was transferred to the Mechanism. Specifically, the Council urged all States, particularly those where fugitives are suspected to be at large, to further intensify cooperation with and render all necessary assistance to the Mechanism in order to achieve the arrest and surrender of all remaining fugitives as soon as possible.

55. Eight accused indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda remain fugitives. Of the eight fugitives, the Mechanism retains jurisdiction over three: Félicien Kabuga, Augustin Bizimana, and Protais Mpiranya. The cases of the other five fugitives have been referred to Rwanda. The arrest and prosecution of all eight remaining individuals remain a top priority for the Mechanism.

56. Consistent with its commitment to efficiency, the Mechanism continues to ensure that it is prepared to conduct a trial or appeal when a fugitive is apprehended and/or when any ongoing proceedings of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia result in an appeal or retrial. Pursuant to article 15, paragraph 4, of the statute of the Mechanism, rosters of qualified potential staff have been produced to enable the expeditious recruitment of the additional staff required to support these judicial functions.

57. Trial readiness will continue to be required until the remaining accused still at large are apprehended or confirmed to be deceased.

## **VII. Detention facilities**

58. The Mechanism has continued to manage and operate the United Nations

Detention Facility in Arusha since the transfer of this function from the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda on 1 October 2015.

59. It is expected that the services of the Detention Facility will continue to be required until all persons awaiting transfer to an enforcement State are transferred, or, alternatively, are released. Once the remaining convicted persons are transferred, the Facility will retain an area commensurate to the housing of the remaining three fugitives expected to be tried by the Mechanism after they are apprehended and will provide a residual custodial capacity for other individuals potentially appearing before the Mechanism. The Facility will need to continue to be operational, albeit in a reduced capacity, during the trial and appeal of these persons, and, if convicted, until their transfer to an enforcement State.

60. At its branch in The Hague, the Mechanism continued to rely on the provision of detention services by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia at the United Nations Detention Unit.

61. Management of the Detention Unit will be transferred to the Mechanism as the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia closes down. The services of the Unit will continue to be required until all trials and appeals are concluded and all detained persons released or transferred to an enforcement State, along with residual capacities, as described above.

## VIII. Cases referred to national jurisdictions

62. Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 5, of its statute, the Mechanism is responsible for monitoring cases referred by the two International Tribunals to national courts, with the assistance of international and regional organizations and bodies.

63. The cases of three individuals indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and subsequently apprehended, Jean Uwinkindi, Bernard Munyagishari, and Ladislav Ntaganzwa, were referred to Rwanda for trial. The *Uwinkindi* case is on appeal, the trial in the *Munyagishari* case is ongoing and the *Ntaganzwa* case is in the pretrial phase. Two additional individuals indicted by the Tribunal, Laurent Bucyibaruta and Wenceslas Munyeshyaka, have had their cases referred to France for trial. The *Bucyibaruta* case continues to be in the investigative phase, while an appeal is pending before the *Chambre de l'instruction* in relation to the *Munyeshyaka* case after it was dismissed last year by French investigative judges.

64. The Mechanism continued to monitor the cases referred to Rwanda with the pro bono assistance of five monitors from the Kenyan Section of the International Commission of Jurists, pursuant to a memorandum of understanding concluded with the Mechanism on 15 January 2015, and subsequently amended on 16 August 2016 to formally encompass the *Ntaganzwa* case. An interim monitor continued to monitor the two cases referred to France. The public monitoring reports in all five cases are available on the Mechanism's website ([www.unmict.org](http://www.unmict.org)).

65. The Mechanism continues to monitor any change of status in the case of Vladimir Kovačević, which was referred by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia to Serbia in March 2007.

66. The Mechanism's activities in relation to cases referred to national jurisdictions are expected to continue for the duration of such cases. While each case is different, it may be worth noting that Mr. Uwinkindi was transferred to Rwanda for trial on 19 April 2012, that he was sentenced in December 2015 and that appeal proceedings are currently ongoing. If any of the five remaining fugitives whose cases have been referred to Rwanda for trial are arrested, then the estimate for the continuation of the Mechanism's monitoring function will need to be reassessed.

## **IX. Enforcement of sentences**

67. In accordance with article 25 of the statute of the Mechanism, the President has jurisdiction over enforcement issues related to the Mechanism and the two International Tribunals, including the authority to designate the States in which convicted persons are to serve their sentence, to supervise the enforcement of sentences, and to decide on requests for pardon or commutation of sentence.

68. The Mechanism relies on the cooperation of States for the enforcement of sentences. Sentences are served within the territory of States Members of the United Nations that have concluded enforcement-of-sentence agreements or indicated their willingness to accept convicted persons under any other arrangement. The agreements concluded by the United Nations for the two International Tribunals remain in force for the Mechanism, unless superseded by subsequent agreements.

69. Currently, 23 persons convicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda are serving their sentences either in Mali (13) or Benin (10). Currently 10 convicted persons are at the United Nations Detention Facility in Arusha, awaiting transfer to an enforcement State, and the Registrar is negotiating with States concerning the possible enforcement of their sentences.

70. Furthermore, 17 persons convicted by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia are serving their sentences in 9 States: Denmark (1), Estonia (3), Finland (2), France (1), Germany (5), Italy (1), Norway (1), Poland (2) and Sweden (1). Two convicted persons are at the United Nations Detention Unit in The Hague, awaiting transfer to an enforcement State, and the Registrar is negotiating with one State concerning the possible enforcement of their sentences.

71. The Mechanism, in coordination with national authorities, as well as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), continues efforts to address the recommendations of the relevant inspecting bodies charged with examining the conditions of detention in enforcement States. The implementation of the recommendations of an independent prison management expert engaged by the Mechanism is nearing completion in Mali.

72. The Mechanism continued to closely monitor the security situation in Mali and received advice and reports from the Department of Safety and Security of the Secretariat and the designated security official in Mali.

73. With the assistance of UNDP-Senegal, the Mechanism has completed the procurement of items required for the eight cells at a prison in Senegal to be fully operational for the enforcement of sentences. The prison cells were refurbished to

international prison standards and handed over to the authority of the Government of Senegal by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

74. It is anticipated that the transfer to enforcement States of all convicted persons currently held at the United Nations Detention Facility or the United Nations Detention Unit will be completed within the current biennium and that the enforcement of sentences function carried out under the authority of the President will continue until the last prison sentence has been served, subject to the application of rule 128 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Mechanism, which allows for the possibility of another body being designated to supervise the enforcement of sentences after the Mechanism ceases to exist in the event that any convicted person remains imprisoned in an enforcement State at that time. As set forth in the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General, it is not possible to foresee when, and how often, requests for pardon and commutation of sentence will arise, although in 2009 it was suggested that, in general terms, such issues are more likely to arise within a period of 10 to 15 years after the closure of the Tribunals and that the level of work involved will inevitably decrease over time. In that same report, it was noted that, in the views of the Tribunals, applications for commutation of sentence, pardon or early release could be anticipated until at least 2027 for cases of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and until around 2030 for cases of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. The Mechanism no longer considers this 2009 estimate to be accurate, given the number of persons who are serving life sentences, several of whom will not be eligible for consideration of early release until at least 2035.

## **X. Relocation of acquitted and released persons**

75. The Mechanism has continued to deploy all reasonable efforts to ensure sustainable solutions for the resettlement of the released and acquitted persons and to provide those still residing in Arusha with relevant assistance, in line with the strategic plan on the relocation of acquitted and released persons. Thirteen acquitted and released persons are currently awaiting relocation in Arusha.

76. Through its consistent approach of seeking consensual relocation outcomes, the Mechanism has continued to engage bilaterally with States that have indicated willingness to accept, in principle, one or more of these persons. In June 2016, the Mechanism assisted one acquitted person with his family reunification application to a European State, which was ultimately successful. Additionally, active negotiations regarding the relocation of one acquitted and one released person residing in Arusha are under way, with completion expected in the near future.

77. Notwithstanding these positive developments, in view of the totality of experience to date and the numbers of individuals concerned, it remains unlikely that this approach will lead to a comprehensive solution for all individuals concerned within the foreseeable future. Indeed, while each relocation process is unique and occurs at a different pace, it is noted that, between September 2014 and June 2016, no acquitted or released persons in Arusha were resettled. The Mechanism remains grateful to the Security Council and to individual Member States for their ongoing support of relocation efforts in order to resolve this

longstanding challenge, which, with the passage of time, becomes increasingly urgent.

78. Given its mandate to operate as a small and lean institution, the Mechanism is limited in the amount of assistance it may provide to acquitted and released individuals. As of 1 July 2016, the Mechanism adopted a revised and more efficient approach to the upkeep of acquitted and released persons in Arusha, where a branch of the Mechanism is located. This approach provides an appropriate standard of living and additional independence to acquitted and released persons, while also offering significant cost savings. In other enforcement States, the Mechanism is seeking to strengthen the applicable legal framework with respect to persons released following service of sentence.

79. The Mechanism notes that this humanitarian challenge will exist until such time as all acquitted and released individuals are appropriately relocated or have died.

## **XI. Archives and records**

80. In accordance with article 27 of its statute, the Mechanism has responsibility for the management, including preservation and access, of the archives of the Mechanism and the two International Tribunals, which shall be co-located with the respective branches of the Mechanism.

81. The archives of the two International Tribunals include materials concerning: investigations, indictments, and court proceedings; work relating to the detention of accused persons, the protection of witnesses, and the enforcement of sentences; and documents from States, other law enforcement authorities, international and non-governmental organizations, and the general public. The materials exist in both digital and physical format and consist of documents, maps, photographs, audiovisual recordings and objects. The Mechanism Archives and Records Section has been tasked with preserving these materials and facilitating the widest possible access to them, while ensuring the continued protection of confidential information, including information concerning protected witnesses.

82. During the reporting period, the Mechanism Archives and Records Section completed the transfer and accessioning of all physical records of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. The completion of this process, which began in September 2013, marks a significant milestone in the Mechanism's compliance with article 27 of its statute.

83. In total, 1,953 linear metres of physical records have been transferred to the archives in the Arusha branch. In accordance with established retention policies, approximately 40 per cent of the records of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda that have been transferred to the Mechanism's Arusha branch are of temporary value, and the Mechanism Archives and Records Section will be responsible for the ongoing disposition of these records. The first set of these records will be due for destruction in early 2017, while the last will be retained until the end of 2046. The Mechanism will remain responsible for the management, including the preservation, arrangement, description and security of, as well as for access to, the 1,100 linear metres of records of the Tribunal that have been



designated for permanent retention, as well as the records of archival value generated by the Mechanism.

84. In The Hague, the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia has transferred over 41 per cent of its anticipated volume of physical records to the Mechanism, in line with the target to achieve complete transfer of earmarked records by the time of its closure. In the reporting period, the preparation of both physical and digital records has intensified, following an ongoing refresher training programme for managers and staff. The repository assumed by the Mechanism Archives and Records Section in 2015 is currently at 80 per cent capacity of its 1,450 linear metres of storage. Over 190 linear metres of records have been relocated and transferred to the repository during the current reporting period. An additional repository of Tribunal materials of an approximately equal size was transferred to the Mechanism's custody in September 2016. The repository is being renovated and prepared to receive transfers in January 2017. The total amount of records in the repositories of the Archives and Records Section is now over 1,737 linear metres.

85. The Mechanism Archives and Records Section has also completed the transfer of all digital records of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and approximately 80 per cent of the digital records of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Upon completion of the appraisal of these digital records, they will be incorporated into the Mechanism's digital preservation system, which will provide for the long-term integrity, reliability and usability of the digital archives of both Tribunals and of the Mechanism. The relevant testing phases of the digital preservation system have been successfully completed and it is expected that the system will be operational by the first quarter of 2017.

86. The public interface to access and search the judicial records of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the Mechanism has been continuously updated throughout the reporting period: over 30,000 judicial records are currently available to the public through this interface. The Mechanism Archives and Records Section has continued to provide substantive and technical support for the development of a unified system for managing the judicial records of both Tribunals and the Mechanism, which is expected to become operational in both branches in early 2017.

87. In September 2016, the Mechanism presented its work at the quadrennial congress of the International Council on Archives in Seoul, where the Registrar of the Mechanism gave the inaugural keynote address. The Mechanism has confirmed its commitment to host several international archival meetings at the new facility in Arusha in 2017. In addition, the Mechanism has worked with the International Council on Archives on the implementation of its five-year Africa programme and has established a partnership with the Eastern and Southern African Management Institute. In this context the Mechanism provided on-site visits, expert advice and briefings to multiple groups of participants from all over Africa at no cost to the Organization.

88. As the archives are, by definition, records deemed to be of long-term to permanent value, their management will have to be ensured accordingly. As noted in the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General, the management of the

archives is one of the Mechanism's principal residual functions and, even after its other residual functions draw to a close, this particular function shall continue. The Secretary-General's Bulletin on record-keeping and the management of United Nations archives ([ST/SGB/2007/5](#)) defines the archives of the United Nations as "records to be permanently preserved for their administrative, fiscal, legal, historical or informational value", regardless of form or medium.

## **XII. Cooperation of States**

89. Pursuant to article 28 of the statute of the Mechanism, States are required to cooperate in relation to the investigation and prosecution of persons covered under the statute, as well as with orders and requests for assistance in relation to cases before the Mechanism. States are also required to respect the statute owing to its adoption by the Security Council pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The Mechanism, like the two Tribunals, is dependent upon the cooperation of States.

90. The arrest and surrender of the remaining fugitives are a priority of the Mechanism. As described above, the Mechanism requires the full cooperation of States in relation to the ongoing fugitive-tracking operations being conducted by the Prosecutor, and it continues the practice of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda by calling for the assistance of relevant States in this respect. As described above, the Mechanism relies on the cooperation of States for the enforcement of sentences. In addition, the cooperation of Turkey is necessary to resolve the situation concerning Judge Akay, as set forth above (see paras. 13 and 38).

91. The Mechanism continues to promote communication and cooperation with the Governments of Rwanda and the States of the former Yugoslavia. During the reporting period, the Mechanism has continued to discuss areas of mutual interest with Rwandan authorities. Representatives of the Mechanism, including the President, have also engaged with Government officials and met with victims groups from the States of the former Yugoslavia. To further collaboration between the Mechanism and the Government of Rwanda in relation to the legacy of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, in line with paragraph 23 of Security Council resolution [2256 \(2015\)](#), the Mechanism's Kinyarwanda Unit, established in the beginning of 2016, has translated three trial judgments of the Tribunal into Kinyarwanda in the cases of *Ngirabatware*, *Nsengimana*, and *Gacumbitsi*, with work ongoing for the translation of additional judgments.

## **XIII. Assistance to national jurisdictions**

92. The Mechanism routinely receives requests from national authorities or parties to national proceedings for assistance in relation to domestic proceedings concerning individuals allegedly implicated in the genocide in Rwanda or the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia. Furthermore, during the reporting period, the Mechanism received and considered requests to vary the protective measures of witnesses and disclose their testimony and evidence (as discussed in the section on "Judicial activities" above). Comprehensive information and guidance for those who wish to request assistance are available on the Mechanism's website.

93. The data concerning requests for assistance submitted to both branches of the Mechanism continues to be centralized into one repository. The branches also continue to exchange best practices for the development of policies and training programmes with a view to maximizing operational efficiency and ensuring that the Mechanism provides effective assistance to national jurisdictions.

94. While it is not possible to fully foresee when, or how often, requests for assistance from national jurisdictions will arise in the future, it is expected that these activities will continue while national authorities continue to investigate and prosecute cases in domestic jurisdictions related to the genocide in Rwanda and the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia.

#### **XIV. External relations**

95. During the reporting period, various initiatives were undertaken to increase the Mechanism's visibility and to make its work more accessible to audiences worldwide.

96. The External Relations Office, comprising staff at both branches of the Mechanism, has continued to enhance public understanding of the Mechanism's mandate and structure. The Office has promptly responded to media queries on cases under the Mechanism's jurisdiction, delivered presentations to visitors and organized public events for representatives of the diplomatic community, academia and the general public. In addition, the External Relations Office has updated relevant information materials and produced new materials, such as a map of enforced sentences under the Mechanism's supervision and a judicial overview sheet.

97. The Mechanism's website remains an essential public information platform for users around the world, with 165,000 page views during the reporting period. During the reporting period, the External Relations Office also developed the Mechanism's social media platforms, while continuing its presence on YouTube. Information about the Mechanism is now available on Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn and Flickr. In particular, since its launch in June 2016, the Twitter account has reached an audience of over 33,000. The Office has continued managing a separate Facebook account dedicated to the search for fugitives.

98. The Office continues to maintain the website of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the legacy website of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. The latter was enriched with a compendium webpage on the legacy of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. This page is a useful resource for accessing a selection of papers by leading practitioners and experts relating to the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and its contributions to the development of international criminal law. Furthermore, the External Relations Office managed all social media platforms and the mini-websites of the two Tribunals.

99. The Mechanism continues to provide library services. The Arusha library, which is one of the premier international law research resources in East Africa, continues to be open to researchers and members of the public from the Great Lakes region and beyond. The library employs a targeted acquisition policy, acquiring both digital and physical reference materials based on its areas of specialization and on

user requests. The library processed an average of 357 requests per month, including research requests and loans. In The Hague, the Library and Reference Unit served both staff of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the Mechanism. In the reporting period, the Library addressed an average of 164 loans and research requests per month. Consolidation of the library collection and judgments collection and the preparation of book donations is ongoing.

100. The latest edition of the library's routinely updated bibliography was issued in November 2016 and has been expanded to include references to resources related to both Tribunals. It will continue to add value to the legacy of the Tribunals by assisting Mechanism staff and researchers to identify relevant resources and research materials related to the work of the Tribunals and the Mechanism.

## **XV. Audit reports of the Office for Internal Oversight Services**

101. During the reporting period, the Mechanism has continued to benefit from regular audits by the OIOS and to implement its recommendations. Two audits were issued during the reporting period. The overall results were assessed as "satisfactory".

102. The first audit report, issued in June 2016, concerned the management of the Mechanism's archives and records. The audit focused on strategic planning and risk assessment and the regulatory framework. The overall results were "satisfactory", with all recommendations officially closed by OIOS before the report was published.

103. The second audit report, issued in August 2016, concerned the administrative support arrangements between the Mechanism and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. The audit focused on the policies and procedures existing to guide administrative support arrangements between the Mechanism and the Tribunal, including "double-hatting"; whether the policies and procedures are implemented effectively; and whether there is reliability and integrity of operational information. The overall results were "satisfactory" and OIOS gave no recommendations.

104. The Mechanism continued to take steps in relation to the OIOS audit report of the provision of assistance to national jurisdictions by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the Mechanism, issued in November 2015, which contained two recommendations. The first required the development of a consolidated, comprehensive database of requests for assistance. This recommendation has been closed: the database is now fully operational in both branches. The second recommendation pertained to the encryption of electronically transmitted material to national authorities, and it has likewise been closed.

## **XVI. Conclusion**

105. The Mechanism continues to strive to fully realize the mandate established by Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#), crafting innovative approaches across the institution to do so flexibly and effectively. In achieving its goals, the Mechanism benefits from the support of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia,

the Office of Legal Affairs and the Department of Management of the Secretariat, from the Governments of the United Republic of Tanzania, the Netherlands, Rwanda and the States of the former Yugoslavia and from individual States Members of the United Nations. This support is crucial to the continued success of the Mechanism, which maintains its focus on carrying out its mandate in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

## Enclosure 1

**International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals: staffing<sup>a</sup>**

Category	Number of staff by branch and organ					Mechanism overall
	Arusha branch	Hague branch	Chambers <sup>b</sup>	Office of the Prosecutor	Registry <sup>c</sup>	
All staff	159	170	28	64	237	329
Staff on continuous posts	114	55	8	28	133	169
Staff on General Temporary Assistance positions	46	114	20	36	104	160
International (Professional and Field Service)	89	90	21	49	109	179
Local (General Service)	70	80	7	15	128	150

<sup>a</sup> The data in the tables herein represents the number of staff employed as of 10 October 2016. It does not represent the full complement of approved posts and general temporary assistance funding. Such information can be found in the Mechanism budget for the 2016-2017 biennium (A/70/378) and General Assembly resolution 70/243 thereon.

<sup>b</sup> Chambers includes the Office of the President. Chambers staffing data excludes judges. In the Mechanism budget, Chambers staff are included in the Registry.

<sup>c</sup> Registry staff includes: Immediate Office of the Registrar, Mechanism Archives and Records Section, Witness Support and Protection, Conference Support Services, Language Support Services, Public Relations, Administration, and Security (including at the United Nations Detention Facility and United Nations Detention Unit).

	Geographical representation		
	Arusha branch	Hague branch	Mechanism overall (Percentage)
<b>Nationalities</b>	43	45	65
<b>Geographical groups</b>			
<b>All staff</b>			
Africa	116	7	123 (37)
Asia-Pacific	8	10	18 (5)
Eastern Europe	5	36	41 (12)
Latin America and Caribbean	2	3	5 (2)
Western European and Others	28	114	142 (43)
<b>International staff (Professional and Field Service)</b>			
Africa	46	3	49 (27)
Asia-Pacific	8	6	14 (8)
Eastern Europe	5	15	20 (11)
Latin America and Caribbean	2	2	4 (2)
Western European and Others	28	64	92 (51)
<b>Local (General Service)</b>			
Africa	70	4	74 (49)
Asia-Pacific	0	4	4 (3)

	<i>Geographical representation</i>		
	<i>Arusha branch</i>	<i>Hague branch</i>	<i>Mechanism overall (Percentage)</i>
Eastern Europe	0	21	21 (14)
Latin America and Caribbean	0	1	1 (1)
Western European and Others	0	50	50 (33)

**Africa Group:** Benin; Burundi; Cameroon; Côte d'Ivoire; Democratic Republic of the Congo; Ethiopia; Gambia; Ghana; Guinea; Kenya; Liberia; Mali; Niger; Nigeria; Rwanda; Senegal; South Africa; Sudan; Uganda; United Republic of Tanzania; Zimbabwe.

**Asia-Pacific Group:** China; Cyprus; Fiji; Indonesia; Lebanon; Malaysia; Nepal; Pakistan; Philippines, Republic of Korea.

**Eastern European Group:** Albania; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Bulgaria; Croatia; Latvia; Poland; Romania; Russian Federation; Serbia; The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Ukraine.

**Latin America and Caribbean Group:** Bolivia (Plurinational State of); Brazil; Cuba; Dominican Republic; Jamaica.

**Western European and Others Group:** Australia; Austria; Belgium; Canada; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Greece; Ireland; Italy; Netherlands; New Zealand, Spain; Sweden; Turkey; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United States of America.

	<i>Gender representation</i>		
	<i>Arusha branch</i>	<i>Hague branch</i>	<i>Mechanism overall (Percentage)</i>
Professional staff (all levels)			
Male	28	25	53 (39)
Female	17	65	82 (61)
Professional staff (P-4 and above)			
Male	15	8	23 (49)
Female	3	21	24 (51)

	<i>Staff by organ</i>		
	<i>Arusha branch</i>	<i>Hague branch</i>	<i>Mechanism overall</i>
Chambers (including Office of the President)	6	22	28
Office of the Prosecutor	20	44	64
Registry:	134	103	237
Immediate Office of the Registrar	14	10	24
Archives and Records Section	14	12	26
Witness Support and Protection	11	3	14
Conference Support Services	0	9	9
Language Support Services	4	16	20
Public Relations	0	5	5
Administration	31	34	65
Security (including the United Nations Detention Facility and the United Nations Detention Unit)	60	14	74

## Enclosure 2

### International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals: appropriations and expenditures for the biennium 2016-2017

#### Appropriations for the biennium 2016-2017 (net of staff assessment), by branch and organ

	<i>Chambers</i>	<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<i>Liabilities: judges of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and after- service health insurance</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>
<b>Arusha</b>					
Post		5 378 000	24 855 500		30 233 500
Non-post <sup>a</sup>	2 346 600	4 430 200	35 233 300		42 010 100
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2 346 600</b>	<b>9 808 200</b>	<b>60 088 800</b>		<b>72 243 600</b>
<b>The Hague</b>					
Post		1 925 300	8 799 100		10 724 400
Non-post	3 806 500	5 883 700	30 767 000		40 457 200
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3 806 500</b>	<b>7 809 000</b>	<b>39 566 100</b>		<b>51 181 600</b>
<b>Overall</b>					
Post		7 303 300	33 654 600		40 957 900
Non-post	6 153 100	10 313 900	66 000 300	3 520 100	85 987 400
<b>Total</b>	<b>6 153 100</b>	<b>17 617 200</b>	<b>99 654 900</b>	<b>3 520 100</b>	<b>126 945 300</b>

<sup>a</sup> Non-post includes all commitment items other than posts, such as general temporary assistance, travel and rental of premises.

#### Expenditures (net of staff assessment) as at 8 November 2016 (per Umoja), by branch and organ

	<i>Chambers</i>	<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<i>Liabilities: judges of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and after- service health insurance</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>
<b>Arusha</b>					
Post		2 463 750	7 482 445		9 946 195
Non-post	477 403	769 834	9 248 893		10 496 130
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>477 403</b>	<b>3 233 584</b>	<b>16 731 338</b>		<b>20 442 325</b>



	<i>Chambers</i>	<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<i>Liabilities: judges of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and after- service health insurance</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>
<b>The Hague</b>					
Post		1 042 859	4 035 340		5 078 199
Non-post	1 470 258	3 131 743	13 425 054		18 027 056
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1 470 258</b>	<b>4 174 603</b>	<b>17 460 394</b>		<b>23 105 255</b>
<b>Overall</b>					
Post		3 506 609	11 517 785		15 024 394
Non-post	1 947 661	3 901 578	22 673 947	989 187	29 512 373
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 947 661</b>	<b>7 408 187</b>	<b>34 191 732</b>	<b>989 187</b>	<b>44 536 766</b>

**Percentage of biennial budget expended as at 8 November 2016, by branch and organ**

	<i>Chambers</i>	<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<i>Liabilities: judges of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and after- service health insurance</i>	<i>Mechanism</i>
<b>Arusha</b>					
Post		45.8	30.1		32.9
Non-post	20.3	17.4	26.3		25.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>27.8</b>		<b>28.3</b>
<b>The Hague</b>					
Post		54.2	45.9		47.4
Non-post	38.6	53.2	43.6		44.6
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>53.5</b>	<b>44.1</b>		<b>45.1</b>
<b>Overall</b>					
Post		48.0	34.2		36.7
Non-post	31.7	37.8	34.4	28.1	34.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>42.1</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>28.1</b>	<b>35.1</b>

**Annex II**

[Original: English and French]

**Progress report of Serge Brammertz, Prosecutor of the International Residual Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals, for the period from 16 May to 15 November 2016****I. Overview**

1. The Prosecutor submits this ninth progress report pursuant to Security Council resolution 1966 (2010), covering developments between 16 May 2016 and 15 November 2016.

2. During the reporting period, the Mechanism Office of the Prosecutor focused on three priorities: (a) the expeditious completion of trials and appeals; (b) locating and arresting fugitives; and (c) assistance to national jurisdictions. The Office continues to rely on the full cooperation of States to successfully carry out its mandate in these areas.

3. The Office of the Prosecutor continued to engage in intense trial and appeal work during the reporting period. Pretrial proceedings in the *Stanišić and Simatović* case continued following the retrial ordered by the Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia on 15 December 2015. The Office also continued work on appeal proceedings in two cases (*Karadžić and Šešelj*) following the issuance of trial judgments by the International Tribunal on 24 March and 31 March 2016, respectively. In addition to this trial and appeal activity in The Hague, the Office processed a high volume of other litigation at both branches arising out of completed cases.

4. Significant efforts to locate and arrest the eight remaining fugitives indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda continued during the reporting period. The Office of the Prosecutor completed a comprehensive review of its tracking activities and identified challenges to its work. Specific strategies have been designed and put in place for each of the eight fugitives. In addition, the Prosecutor engaged in diplomatic and professional outreach to improve awareness of the Office's tracking efforts and to build support, including strengthening links with organizations such as the Africa Prosecutors Association and the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL).

5. Regarding national prosecutions of war crimes committed in Rwanda, the Office of the Prosecutor, within existing resources, continued to monitor cases referred to Rwandan and French authorities, to provide national justice sectors with access to the Mechanism's evidence collection and to support national accountability for these crimes. A notable development during the reporting period was the decision of 4 October 2016 of the Appeals Chamber of the Mechanism in the *Uwinkindi* case, confirming the decision of the Mechanism's Trial Chamber to reject the accused's request to revoke the referral of his case to Rwanda.

6. Regarding national prosecutions of war crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia, the Office of the Prosecutor notes with concern the intensifying

negative impact of the political environment on domestic war crimes justice. Progress continues to be made in adjudicating war crimes cases, particularly in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and all prosecution services have confirmed their commitment to independent and impartial justice. However, it is clear that politics, both domestic and regional, has been hindering regional judicial cooperation and undermining trust in judicial accountability, and increasingly posing a risk to the independence of the judiciary.

7. In managing its work, the Office of the Prosecutor continued to be guided by the views of the Security Council and its requests, as set forth in, inter alia, paragraphs 18, 19 and 20 of its resolution [2256 \(2015\)](#). The Office, in conjunction with the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, continued to implement the “one office” policy to further streamline operations and reduce costs by effectively integrating staff and resources across the Offices. Since 1 March 2016, staff and resources have been flexibly deployed across both institutions in “double-hatting” arrangements as and when needed based on operational requirements, in accordance with the directions of the Security Council set forth in resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#). The Office also utilized rosters and internal transfer arrangements to efficiently recruit limited numbers of temporary staff as necessary to undertake its ad hoc functions. Finally, consistent with Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#) and article 6 of the Transitional Arrangements, during the reporting period the Office of the Prosecutor continued the coordinated transition of so-called “other functions” from the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

## **II. Trial and appeals**

### **A. Overview**

8. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued its work on one trial (*Stanišić and Simatović*) and two appeals proceedings (*Karadžić and Šešelj*) arising out of cases transferred from the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia pursuant to the statute of the Mechanism and the transitional arrangements. This ad hoc judicial activity is temporary in nature. It is expected that the Office will conduct further appeal proceedings, if any, in the *Mladić* case following the anticipated rendering of the trial judgment by the Tribunal in November 2017.

### **B. Update on the progress of trials**

9. On 15 December 2015, the Appeals Chamber partially granted the appeal of the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in the *Stanišić and Simatović* case, revoked the Trial Chamber’s judgment and ordered the case to be retried on all counts. Pursuant to the statute of the Mechanism and the transitional arrangements, the retrial is being conducted by the Mechanism.

10. On 3 June 2016, the pretrial judge issued the pretrial workplan for this case, which foresees that the pretrial conference will be held in the second half of February 2017, with the trial to commence sometime afterwards. The Office of the Prosecutor has been undertaking the necessary activities in accordance with the

pretrial workplan and submitted the required filing by the established deadlines. In particular, notwithstanding the significant amount of work required in a short time period, the Prosecution submitted its consolidated pretrial brief and exhibit and witness lists on 5 September 2016.

### **C. Update on the progress of appeals**

#### **1. Karadžić**

11. On 24 March 2016, the Trial Chamber of the Yugoslavia Tribunal unanimously convicted Radovan Karadžić of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes, and sentenced him to a term of imprisonment of 40 years.

12. On 22 July 2016, the Office of the Prosecutor filed its notice of appeal against the trial judgment. The Office identified four grounds of appeal, including against the acquittal for genocide in 1992 and the imposed sentence. The defence also filed its notice of appeal, which set out 50 grounds of appeal.

13. The next step in the proceeding will be the filing of appeal briefs by both parties, which are due on 5 December 2016.

#### **2. Šešelj**

14. On 31 March 2016, the Trial Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, by majority, acquitted Vojislav Šešelj on all counts of the indictment.

15. The Office of the Prosecutor filed its notice of appeal on 2 May 2016, and filed its appeal brief on 18 July 2016. The Office puts forward two grounds of appeal. Ground 1 avers that the Trial Chamber erred in law by failing to deliver a reasoned judgment, as the Trial Chamber failed to provide sufficient reasons for key conclusions, failed to address Prosecution arguments and clearly relevant evidence, failed to adjudicate essential issues in the case and did not explain the substantive law it applied. Ground 2 argues that the Trial Chamber erred in fact by acquitting the accused, as no reasonable trial chamber could have found, on the basis of the entirety of the evidence, the accused not guilty of all of the charges.

16. Šešelj received the translation of the appeal brief of the Prosecution on 28 September 2016. Šešelj has until 19 December 2016 to file a response.

### **D. Cooperation with the Office of the Prosecutor**

17. The Office of the Prosecutor continues to rely on the full cooperation of States to successfully complete its mandate. The Office's access to documents, archives and witnesses is critical to the ongoing trial and appeal proceedings of the Mechanism.

#### **1. Cooperation with Rwanda and the States of the former Yugoslavia**

18. During the reporting period, cooperation by Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Rwanda and Serbia with the Office of the Prosecutor remained satisfactory. The Office will require assistance in relation to trial, appeal, review and contempt proceedings, including the provision of evidence and access to witnesses, and it

fully expects that its requests for assistance will be promptly and adequately processed. During his mission to Belgrade, the Prosecutor raised with Serbian authorities the Office's expectation that all responses to requests for assistance will be as comprehensive as possible and prepared in a spirit of providing maximum cooperation.

## **2. Cooperation with other States and organizations**

19. Cooperation and support from States outside the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, as well as from international organizations, remains integral to the successful completion of Mechanism activities. There is a continuing need for assistance in accessing documents, information and witnesses, as well as in matters related to locating and arresting fugitives and witness protection. The Office of the Prosecutor once again acknowledges the support it has received during the reporting period from States Members of the United Nations and international organizations, including the United Nations and its agencies, the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and INTERPOL.

20. The international community continues to play an important role in providing incentives for States to cooperate with the Mechanism and undertake national prosecutions of war crimes. The European Union's policy of conditionality, linking membership progress to full cooperation with the Mechanism, remains a key tool for ensuring continued cooperation with the Mechanism and consolidating the rule of law in the former Yugoslavia. Increasingly, assistance is also needed to support the national prosecution of war crimes cases in Rwanda and the States of the former Yugoslavia.

## **III. Fugitives**

21. As of the end of the reporting period, eight fugitives indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda remain at large. The Office of the Prosecutor continued its efforts to locate and arrest the three fugitives whose cases will be tried by the Mechanism: Félicien Kabuga, Protais Mpiranya and Augustin Bizimana. The Office also continued to search for information on the whereabouts of the five fugitives who are currently expected to be brought to trial in Rwanda following their arrest: Fulgence Kayishema, Charles Sikubwabo, Aloys Ndimbati, Ryandikayo and Pheneas Munyarugarama.

22. During the reporting period the Office of the Prosecutor completed its previously-announced overall review of its tracking efforts to date. As a result of that review, a number of challenges were identified, and steps are now being taken to resolve these issues. As one example, the Office identified the need to strengthen its fugitive-related analytical capacities, which has now been addressed through the recruitment, from INTERPOL, of a criminal analyst with relevant expertise. The Office further developed concrete strategies for each of the eight remaining fugitives, which are now being implemented. The Office of the Prosecutor expects that these and other measures will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its work to locate and arrest the remaining fugitives.

23. The Office also strengthened its public communications and outreach. The Prosecutor undertook extensive efforts to raise awareness of the Office's mandate to locate and arrest the remaining eight fugitives, in particular with its professional counterparts in Africa, including the Africa Prosecutors Association and INTERPOL. As part of these efforts, the Prosecutor will attend the upcoming annual meeting of the Africa Prosecutors Association and brief national chief prosecutors on the Office's work and on the assistance that is needed from national justice authorities.

24. State cooperation will be essential to successfully track and arrest the remaining fugitives. The Office of the Prosecutor appreciates the assistance already provided by the Member States, including the United States War Crimes Rewards Program. The Office welcomes offers of assistance from additional States. The Office is discussing with relevant African and European States support for the Office's fugitive tracking efforts and cooperation in conducting arrests.

#### **IV. Assistance to national war crimes prosecutions**

25. National prosecutions are now essential to the achievement of greater justice for the victims of war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide committed in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. Consistent with the completion strategies of both Tribunals, Security Council resolution 1966 (2010), the statute of the Mechanism and Council resolution 2256 (2015), the Office of the Prosecutor is mandated to assist and support effective national prosecutions of these crimes. In the affected countries, the effective prosecution of the crimes committed is fundamental in order to build and sustain the rule of law, establish the truth of what occurred and promote reconciliation. Third-party States are also undertaking prosecutions against suspects who are present in their territory for crimes committed in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia.

26. The Office continued its efforts, within existing resources, to monitor, support and advise national judicial authorities prosecuting war crimes cases arising out of the conflicts in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. The Office maintains an ongoing dialogue with counterparts, and undertakes a range of initiatives to assist and build capacity in national criminal justice sectors.

##### **A. War crimes committed in Rwanda**

27. Five cases referred by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda under rule 11bis of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence are currently being processed in the national courts of France and Rwanda. The cases against Wenceslas Munyeshyaka and Laurent Bucyibaruta were referred to France in 2007. Jean Uwinkindi, Bernard Munyagishari and Ladislav Ntaganzwa were transferred to Rwanda in 2012, 2013 and 2016, respectively. All proceedings remain ongoing.

28. During the reporting period, there was important litigation concerning the implementation of international fair trial standards in war crimes cases prosecuted in Rwanda. In the *Uwinkindi* case, the Appeals Chamber of the Mechanism issued its decision on 4 October 2016, confirming the Trial Chamber's decision to reject the accused's application to revoke the referral of the case to Rwanda. The Trial and

Appeals Chambers of the Mechanism considered fair trial issues raised by the accused, such as the provision of legal aid and the quality of defence counsel in Rwanda, and reaffirmed that conditions exist for a fair trial in Rwandan courts. Separately, Rwandan requests for the extradition of war crimes suspects were litigated during the reporting period in third-party States such as the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The Netherlands extradited two suspects. In the United Kingdom, the extradition request was refused in the first-instance decision, and that decision is now under appeal. The Office of the Prosecutor hopes the Mechanism's decisions will be given due consideration in extradition and related proceedings.

29. It should be emphasized that all those suspected of committing crimes during the Rwandan genocide must be brought to justice, whether in Rwanda or another State. Consistent with the principle of complementarity and national ownership of post-conflict accountability, prosecutions by the Rwandan justice sector are in principle the most advantageous accountability mechanism, as long as international due process and fair trial standards are implemented. In this regard, the Office of the Prosecutor encourages the international community to continue its efforts to support and strengthen the Rwandan criminal justice sector by providing financial assistance and capacity-building, as needed.

#### **1. Cases referred to France**

30. Wenceslas Munyeshyaka, an ordained Catholic priest, was indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in July 2005 on four counts of genocide, rape as a crime against humanity, extermination as a crime against humanity and murder as a crime against humanity. The indictment was referred by the Rwanda Tribunal to France for trial on 20 November 2007. As previously reported, the investigation by French authorities in the *Munyeshyaka* case has not resulted in charges being brought against the suspect. On the recommendation of the Paris Public Prosecutor, on 2 October 2015, the *Juge d'instruction* confirmed the *non-lieu* dismissal of the case before trial, which the civil parties have appealed. A date for the appeal hearing has not yet been set.

31. Laurent Bucyibaruta, the prefect of Gikongoro Prefecture, was indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in June 2005 on six counts of direct and public incitement to commit genocide, genocide, complicity in genocide, extermination as a crime against humanity, murder as a crime against humanity and rape as a crime against humanity. The indictment was referred by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda to France for trial on 20 November 2007. The investigation by French authorities is under way. It is understood that investigations are nearing completion, and that a decision by the *Juge d'instruction* whether to proceed to trial can be expected sometime in 2017.

32. The Prosecutor visited Paris on 18 May 2016 to discuss the status of these cases with relevant French authorities, including representatives of the public prosecution, the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Although confirmed indictments in both cases were referred by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda to France in 2007, today, more than nine years later, neither case has gone to trial or been closed. French authorities recognized that this cannot be considered satisfactory, and identified insufficient resources in the specialized

war crimes unit of the *Tribunal de Grande Instance* as a key challenge. The Office of the Prosecutor welcomes the recent decision by French authorities to strengthen the capacities of the specialized war crimes unit, including funding for one additional magistrate and six additional investigators.

## **2. Cases referred to Rwanda**

33. Jean Uwinkindi, a pastor in the Pentecostal Church, was indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in September 2001 on three counts of genocide, conspiracy to commit genocide and extermination as a crime against humanity. He was transferred to Rwanda for trial on 19 April 2012, and the trial commenced on 14 May 2012. On 30 December 2015, the High Court issued its trial judgment, convicting Uwinkindi and sentencing him to life imprisonment. Appeals proceedings are now underway.

34. Bernard Munyagishari, a local leader in the *Mouvement Révolutionnaire National pour le Développement* party, was indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in September 2005 on five counts of conspiracy to commit genocide, genocide, complicity in genocide, murder as a crime against humanity and rape as a crime against humanity. He was transferred to Rwanda for trial on 24 July 2013. Trial proceedings are now under way.

35. Ladislav Ntaganzwa, burgomaster of Nyakizu commune, was indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in June 1996, with an amended indictment charging him with five counts of genocide, direct and public incitement to commit genocide, extermination as a crime against humanity, murder as a crime against humanity and rape as a crime against humanity. He was transferred to Rwanda for trial on 20 March 2016. His case remains in the pretrial phase, with the filing of the indictment expected in the near future.

## **B. War crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia**

### **1. Regional judicial cooperation**

36. Judicial cooperation between the States of the former Yugoslavia is essential to ensure that those responsible for war crimes are held accountable. Many suspects may not be present in the territory where they are alleged to have committed the crimes and cannot be extradited to the territorial State for prosecution. The Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia previously reported, in its twenty-fourth completion strategy report (S/2016/454), that the political environment, particularly at the regional level, was increasingly difficult and hindering the justice process. Unfortunately, during the reporting period political trends in the region regarding war crimes justice continued moving in a negative direction. Ethnic tensions were aggravated, and regional diplomatic relations significantly worsened, particularly between Croatia and Serbia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia. In parallel, there continued to be prominent examples in the public sphere of the glorification of war criminals, denial of crimes and attempts at historical revisionism.

37. Two examples from the reporting period demonstrate the negative impact the difficult political environment is having on regional judicial cooperation. As previously reported, the policies of the Croatian Government continue to block



regional cooperation between prosecutors on war crimes cases, including with respect to category II cases transferred by the Office of the Prosecutor to national counterparts. Similarly, at a time of increased diplomatic confrontations between the Governments of Croatia and Serbia, the Serbian War Crimes Prosecutor's Office had to decline to attend the tenth annual Regional Conference of War Crimes Prosecutors. The Serbian delegation's non-participation in this important working meeting, for the first time in 10 years, sent a troubling signal. These and other negative developments not only undermine regional cooperation, but unavoidably create the appearance that the independence and impartiality of the judiciary in war crimes cases is at risk from political influence.

38. Authorities in the States of the former Yugoslavia should take urgent steps to mitigate and reverse this situation. The Office of the Prosecutor calls upon all political and Government officials in the region to act responsibly and to refrain from politicizing war crimes proceedings. Respect for judicial independence requires that officials not only express a commitment to accountability, but put that commitment into regular practice. Equally, it is incumbent upon national authorities to swiftly undertake steps to rebuild and reinforce trust in judicial accountability for war crimes, particularly trust in the criminal justice sectors of neighbouring countries. The Office of the Prosecutor stands ready to support initiatives by the respective countries to improve mutual trust in domestic accountability mechanisms and to move regional judicial cooperation closer towards European standards.

## **2. Bosnia and Herzegovina**

39. The Office of the Prosecutor is pleased to note that in Bosnia and Herzegovina, positive trends in national prosecutions continued during the reporting period. Notable developments over the last year include the filing of indictments in complex cases such as the *Mahmuljin*, *Merkez et al.* and *Tintor* cases, and important prosecutions of conflict-related sexual violence crimes. While a large backlog of cases remains and previously-reported issues have not been fully addressed, it should be recognized that the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina has taken important steps towards meeting the public's expectations for expeditious and effective justice for war crimes. These results demonstrate again that national prosecutions, appropriately supported by international partners, can meaningfully advance accountability, including in the most complex cases. The Office will continue working with the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina to achieve further progress in accountability for war crimes, including on the remaining so-called "rules of the road" cases initially reviewed by the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, which have been jointly identified as an important priority for action.

40. During the reporting period, the Chief Prosecutor of the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina was suspended from duty while disciplinary and criminal proceedings against him are ongoing. The Acting Chief Prosecutor, who previously served as the Head of the Special Department for War Crimes, has demonstrated her strong commitment to continuing reforms and improvements in her Office, including implementing recommendations from the recent expert report of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe on its work. The Office of the Prosecutor looks forward to its continuing close cooperation with the Acting Chief

Prosecutor and her staff. In this regard, it has been agreed to intensify discussions on training and capacity needs, and, in the context of the national war crimes strategy, to hold more trilateral meetings between the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina, victims associations and the Office of the Prosecutor of the Mechanism.

41. While progress is being made in judicial accountability, the political environment and the mindset in Bosnia and Herzegovina related to war crimes justice remain of significant concern. The Office of the Prosecutor strongly condemns the recent decision of the National Assembly of the Republika Srpska to decorate Biljana Plavšić, Momčilo Krajišnik and Radovan Karadžić. Plavšić and Krajišnik are convicted war criminals, while Karadžić was recently found guilty at trial by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia for genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes, and sentenced to 40 years imprisonment. These decorations followed other recent acts by officials of the Republika Srpska, such as naming a student dormitory after Karadžić on the eve of the judgment against him, and promoting the denial and revisionism of judicially established atrocities, including the infamous violent events that took place in Markale in 1994 and 1995 and in Tuzla in 1995. These acts represent the continued denial of the facts established by international and domestic courts. Even more, they are aimed at promoting a false version of the region's recent history.

42. The Office of the Prosecutor must also express its concerns with the negative reactions by some officials in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia to the recent arrests of 10 individuals suspected of war crimes in the Orašje municipality. From the information available, all indications are that these arrests mark a positive development that should be welcomed. This case appears to be complex, as it involves both superiors and their subordinates who are suspected of responsibility for crimes against humanity and war crimes. Recognizing the real risk that the suspects could flee to another territory from which they could not be extradited, the arrest operation would also appear to be fully justified. In this context, it is regrettable that some officials immediately made unsubstantiated allegations of selective justice and characterized the arrests as an attack against the Croatian people. The judiciary must act independently of political influence, and judicial measures such as arrests must remain confidential from political institutions. The Office of the Prosecutor will continue to monitor this case and related developments, and report, as appropriate.

### **3. Croatia**

43. During the reporting period limited progress was made by Croatian authorities in addressing outstanding issues previously reported on. In a separate development, the convicting trial judgment in the *Glavaš* case, a category II case previously referred by the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia to the State Attorney's Office of Croatia, was revoked by the Croatian Supreme Court and remanded for retrial.

44. As previously reported, the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina has sought the cooperation of Croatian authorities in processing a number of category II case files. Two cases were previously transferred to the State Attorney's Office of Croatia. In one case, a decision was taken to open the investigation in June 2016.

With regard to that case, during the reporting period the Office of the Prosecutor of the Mechanism provided Croatian counterparts with 778 documents, comprising 9,146 pages and 9 audio/visual files, in response to requests for assistance. The other case remains in the pre-investigative phase. The State Attorney's Office cancelled a planned meeting to discuss and resolve challenges in that case. The Office of the Prosecutor encourages the State Attorney's Office to ensure that these category II case files are processed and prosecuted as soon as possible, and reiterates its offer to provide support as may be requested.

45. Separately, the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in mid-2015 and early-2016, respectively, submitted mutual legal assistance requests to the Croatian Ministry of Justice in relation to two other category II case files. These important requests remain pending as of the end of the reporting period due to the policy of the Government of Croatia not to provide judicial cooperation in certain war crimes cases. The failure of the Croatian Ministry of Justice to appropriately process these requests has obstructed further judicial proceedings in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Office of the Prosecutor urges Croatian authorities to promptly review and revise this policy, and to ensure that they are providing full cooperation to the national judiciaries in the region prosecuting war crimes.

46. In June 2016, the Supreme Court of Croatia quashed the trial judgment convicting Branimir Glavaš for war crimes (torture and murder) against civilians and ordered a retrial on the charges. This category II case file was transferred to the Croatian authorities in 2006, and the trial judgment convicting the accused was issued in 2009. The Supreme Court, following remand of the case by the Constitutional Court in 2015, found that the Trial Court should have applied the law of international armed conflict to the crimes, rather than the law applicable in non-international armed conflict. Neither the decision of the Supreme Court nor that of the Constitutional Court called into question the evidence previously found to establish the accused's guilt. The Office of the Prosecutor hopes that the retrial will be expeditiously completed.

47. The Office of the Prosecutor will continue to monitor these matters and hopes to be able to report progress in the future.

#### **4. Serbia**

48. War crimes justice in Serbia is at a crossroads. During the reporting period, there was limited progress in war crimes prosecutions by the Serbian War Crimes Prosecutor's Office, with only a small number of indictments filed against low-level perpetrators. The acquittal in the *Gradiška* case further raised concerns about quality control of the Office's work. The limited results in 2016 can be attributed, in part, to the absence of formally appointed leadership in the Office. More positively, the Office of the Prosecutor of the Mechanism notes that judicial cooperation, particularly with authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, continued during the reporting period, and that the previously-reported Srebrenica indictment was finally confirmed.

49. On 20 February 2016, the Serbian Government adopted its national strategy for the prosecution of war crimes for the period 2016-2020. The strategy expresses the Government's commitment to accountability for war crimes, regardless of the

nationality, ethnicity, religion or status of the perpetrator or victim. The strategy further establishes important goals that should significantly improve the efficiency of war crimes justice in Serbia, including supporting the judiciary and improving societal acceptance of prosecuting war crimes. In addition, on 18 July 2016, Serbia opened negotiations on chapter 23 (judiciary and fundamental rights) of the European Union acquis, and is now expected to implement its chapter 23 action plan, which foresees, inter alia, achieving similar goals as set forth in the strategy.

50. Nevertheless, at the same time, long-standing issues remain unresolved, and there has been limited evidence that the strategy and action plan are being implemented. As discussed in the twenty-ninth completion strategy report of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (S/2016/976), Serbia has failed to cooperate by failing to arrest three indictees for whom arrest warrants were issued in January 2015. Furthermore, the post of Chief War Crimes Prosecutor was unfilled as of the end of the reporting period. Additional staff and resources for the Serbian War Crimes Prosecutor's Office, as foreseen in the strategy, have not yet been provided, nor have training and capacity-building programmes been initiated. The Ministry of Interior has not yet produced its report on the Special Investigative Service for War Crimes, as foreseen in the strategy, and the head of that entity was unexpectedly replaced during the reporting period. It will be extremely difficult to achieve progress in the expeditious and effective processing of war crimes cases in Serbia if the steps identified in the strategy and action plan to support that goal are not implemented.

51. Similarly, the *Djukić* case, raised in the last four reports of the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, remained unresolved as of the end of the reporting period. The enforcement in Serbia of the war crimes conviction issued by the court of Bosnia and Herzegovina in this case, by applying existing legislation, would be an important step towards European standards in judicial cooperation. The next scheduled court hearing is expected shortly after the end of the reporting period. The Office of the Prosecutor will report on any developments.

52. More broadly, the political climate and the mindset in Serbia remain unfavourable to war crimes justice. Denial of crimes and glorification of war criminals continued. During the reporting period, officials attempted to rehabilitate Slobodan Milošević, and an initiative was launched to build a monument to him. The former Chief War Crimes Prosecutor was publicly labelled as unpatriotic and accused of selectively prosecuting Serbs by a member of the board of the Belgrade Bar Association. There are also developing trends, which build upon the denial of crimes, to promote a false version of history.

53. The Office of the Prosecutor raised its concerns with Serbian authorities during open and constructive discussions in Belgrade. Serbian authorities acknowledged the Office's assessment, and expressed regret that there had not been more positive developments during the reporting period. It was agreed that relationships between the Office and relevant ministries should be strengthened, and Serbian authorities underlined their determination to demonstrate immediate action. In this regard, the Office of the Prosecutor welcomes the Prime Minister's recent public statement that the Government would take a decision on the appointment of the Chief War Crimes Prosecutor shortly after the end of the reporting period. The

Office of the Prosecutor will continue to monitor developments, and will report on any further progress in its briefing to the Security Council.

**C. Access to information and evidence**

54. With the closure of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the approaching completion of the mandate of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, further accountability for crimes committed in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia now depends on national justice sectors. The Office of the Prosecutor seeks to support national judicial authorities prosecuting these crimes, particularly through the provision of access to evidence and information.

55. The Office possesses extensive evidence and invaluable expertise that can greatly benefit national justice efforts. The evidence collection related to the crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia comprises more than nine million pages of documents and thousands of hours of audio and video records, most of which were not introduced into evidence in any proceeding of the Tribunal and are thus only available from the Office of the Prosecutor. The Rwanda-related evidence collection comprises more than one million pages of documents. The Office's staff have unique insight into the crimes and the cases that can assist national prosecutors to prepare and prove their indictments.

56. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued to receive a high volume of requests for assistance from national judiciaries and international organizations. There were two notable developments. First, the Office of the Prosecutor increased its cooperation with the Kosovo Specialist Prosecutor's Office following the latter's formal establishment a few months ago. Second, the Office continued to strengthen its cooperation with Montenegrin authorities prosecuting war crimes. The staff of the Office of the Prosecutor participated in a training for Montenegrin prosecutors, and the Office hosted its Montenegrin counterparts on two working visits during the reporting period.

57. In relation to Rwanda, the Office of the Prosecutor received seven requests for assistance from two Member States and one international organization. All requests have been processed. In total, the Office handed over 6,930 pages of documentation. In addition, the Office filed submissions in relation to one request for variation of witness protective measures, which concerned a proceeding in France.

58. In relation to the former Yugoslavia, the Office of the Prosecutor received 160 requests for assistance from eight Member States and three international organizations. Ninety-four requests for assistance were submitted by authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, two were from Serbia and 50 were from Croatia. In total, the Office handed over 3,480 documents comprising 46,499 pages and 60 audio/visual files. In addition, the Office filed submissions in relation to 16 requests for variation of witness protective measures, one of which concerned a proceeding in Serbia and 15 of which concerned proceedings in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

59. For the last eight years, the European Union and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia have organized a joint training project for national prosecutors and young professionals from the States of the former Yugoslavia. The project has been a central component of the strategy of the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal to strengthen the capacity of national criminal justice

systems in the States of the former Yugoslavia to handle war crimes cases. The young professionals component of the project terminated at the end of 2015, while the visiting professionals component of the project will terminate at the end of 2016.

60. The Office of the Prosecutor is pleased to report that following the unanimous request from national prosecution services in the region, the European Union has now agreed to extend both components of the project for another two-year period. The project will also be transitioned from the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia to the Office of the Prosecutor. The Office of the Prosecutor is grateful to the European Union for its consistent support to this important project, and for recognizing the ongoing need to build the capacity of the national justice sector by providing education and training for young lawyers from the region.

#### **D. Capacity-building**

61. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued its efforts, within existing resources, to build capacity in national judiciaries prosecuting war crimes. The Office's capacity-building efforts focus on three areas: the Great Lakes region and East Africa; the former Yugoslavia; and globally. Strengthening national capacities supports the principle of complementarity and national ownership of post-conflict accountability.

62. With respect to the Great Lakes region and East Africa, in Nairobi, in August 2016, staff from the Office led a six-day advanced training course focused on practical legal skills in international criminal law. The training, which had a thematic focus on the prosecution of sexual violence crimes in conflict, was attended by 30 prosecutors and other practitioners from Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania. The training was followed by an experience-sharing conference, which brought together a wide-range of stakeholders, encouraged deeper and more coordinated dialogue, exchange of expertise and action among actors working to address conflict-related sexual violence both at the international and the national level. Materials for the training and conference were drawn from the lessons learned and legacy publications on prosecuting sexual violence produced by the Offices of the Prosecutor of both the Rwanda and Yugoslavia Tribunals.

63. With respect to the former Yugoslavia, the Office of the Prosecutor anticipates significant increases in requests for capacity-building, particularly in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia as these countries advance through in the European Union accession process. Under their respective action plans for chapter 23, Montenegrin and Serbian authorities have committed themselves to improving the capacities of their domestic criminal justice sectors in the prosecution of war crimes, and have identified, as a particular priority, drawing from the expertise and legacy of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Similarly, it is expected that ongoing capacity-building efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina will continue and increase as it progresses through candidate status in the European Union. The Office of the Prosecutor has contacted authorities in these countries to share relevant materials and offer support in designing and implementing meaningful capacity-building and training programmes.

64. In this regard, the Office of the Prosecutor has developed a proposal to translate its publication, *Prosecuting Conflict-Related Sexual Violence at the ICTY*, into the Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian languages. The Office is also developing a complementary training programme to help teach practitioners in the States of the former Yugoslavia and elsewhere about the key insights and messages from the book.

65. In addition to its work in the Great Lakes region, East Africa and the States of the former Yugoslavia, the Office of the Prosecutor has increasingly been called upon to engage with national criminal justice sectors around the world that are developing their capacity to prosecute war crimes. The Office aims to ensure that the lessons learned from its work and the best practices that have been developed for international prosecutions are widely shared with national counterparts working across a range of criminal justice issues. One mechanism for promoting this objective is the Prosecuting Conflict-Related Sexual Violence Network, set up through the International Association of Prosecutors, which the Office supports with expertise, information on precedents and other materials. Within the limits of its operational capacity, the Office will continue to engage with training providers and donors working in other areas to ensure that appropriate practical training in investigative and prosecutorial techniques is made available.

#### **E. Missing persons and victim compensation**

66. In the Prosecutor's meetings with victims associations, the lack of information concerning missing family members continues to be consistently identified as one of the most important outstanding issues. The search for and exhumation of mass graves and the subsequent identification of the remains need to be accelerated as it is both essential for surviving family members and fundamental to reconciliation in the former Yugoslavia. Victims from all sides of the conflict must be identified.

67. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia have undertaken commitments to assume additional responsibilities in the investigation and identification of missing persons from the conflicts. The Office of the Prosecutor encourages these authorities to ensure that their commitments are translated into concrete activities and results, particularly by providing full funding and political support.

68. The Office of the Prosecutor further encourages its national counterparts to actively work within the existing legal frameworks to incorporate compensation claims into criminal trial proceedings, where possible. Procedures should be streamlined to assist war crimes victims in obtaining redress and to discourage the imposition of unnecessary burdens upon the victims, including requiring them to bring separate civil compensation proceedings. The Office also strongly encourages the adoption of operational guidelines for prosecutors to improve the consistency of their approaches across prosecution offices. This, in turn, will ensure better outcomes for victims, and increase their confidence in the rule of law.

## V. Other residual functions

69. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor continued to perform its responsibilities in respect of other residual functions, namely protection of victims and witnesses, contempt of court and false testimony, enforcement of sentences, review of judgments and management of records and archives.

70. As previously reported, the volume of litigation arising out of completed cases in the Mechanism continues to be higher than previously expected. During the reporting period, the Office of the Prosecutor responded to a large number of requests for variation of protective measures and motions for access to case files. The Office was further ordered to conduct three investigations in contempt and completed cases, two at the Arusha branch and one at the branch in The Hague. These unexpected developments, a reminder of the difficulty in predicting the Office's workload, put a strain on its limited resources, particularly at the Arusha branch. The Office was nonetheless able to make sufficient resources available, particularly through its "one office" policy. Similarly, the previously reported trend of attempts by convicted persons to obtain review and ultimately revocation of their convictions entered by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia also continued, generating a significant workload for the Office.

71. The Office of the Prosecutor also continued to make submissions, when invited, in relation to the enforcement of sentences of persons convicted by the two Tribunals, particularly on requests by convicted persons for early release.

72. Consistent with Security Council resolution [1966 \(2010\)](#) and article 6 of the transitional arrangements, during the reporting period the Office of the Prosecutor continued the coordinated transition of so-called "other functions" from the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

## VI. Management

### A. Overview

73. The Office of the Prosecutor is committed to managing its staff and resources in line with the Security Council's instructions that the Mechanism be a "small, temporary and efficient structure". The Office continues to be guided by the Security Council's views and requests as set forth in, inter alia, paragraphs 18, 19 and 20 of Council resolution [2256 \(2015\)](#).

74. An important component of the Office's efforts in this respect is the "one office" approach to integrate the staff and resources of the Offices of the Prosecutor of the Mechanism and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia for the period of their co-existence. Under this policy, all staff of the Offices of the Prosecutor of both bodies is available to "double-hat" so they can be flexibly assigned to work either for the Mechanism or the International Tribunal, depending on operational requirements and their case-related knowledge. Resources of both Offices are also being flexibly deployed where needed. The Prosecutor has further integrated the management teams for both Offices in order to best support him in carrying out the responsibilities of both institutions.



75. The “one office” approach has already generated efficiencies and overall cost savings. For example, following the judgment of the Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in December 2015, ordering a retrial in the *Stanišić and Simatović* case, the Office was able to reassign existing staff of the Mechanism and the International Tribunal with case-specific knowledge to carry out the pretrial work in this case. By reassigning existing staff, without conducting recruitment exercises, the Office of the Prosecutor was able to prevent possible delays in commencing the necessary work. Moreover, as this reassignment was absorbed within existing resources for a significant period of time, the Office was able to delay establishing additional posts and incurring related costs.

76. Consistent with the Security Council’s instruction, during the reporting period the Office utilized rosters and internal transfer arrangements to efficiently recruit limited numbers of temporary staff, as necessary, to undertake its reduced ad hoc functions. These mechanisms have enabled the Office to temporarily increase its resources as required for ad hoc activities.

77. The Office of the Prosecutor notes the projections for the duration of Mechanism functions prepared by the Mechanism President and provided in his report. In relation to trial and appeal activities, the Office is committed to continuing to meet all deadlines imposed, and will further endeavour to explore all reasonable options within its control to expedite the completion of this work.

## **B. Audit reports**

78. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), in its report on assistance to national jurisdictions dated 10 November 2015 (report No. 2015/137, available on the OIOS website), recommended that the Office of the Prosecutor, in conjunction with the Information Technology Services Section and the Mechanism Archives and Records Section, should develop a consolidated, comprehensive database for managing requests for assistance received from national jurisdictions. The Mechanism accepted this recommendation. A solution has been developed, and it is expected to be implemented by the end of 2016, which would close this recommendation.

## **VII. Conclusion**

79. During the reporting period, efforts to locate and arrest the remaining eight fugitives indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda continued. The Office of the Prosecutor completed an overall review of its tracking efforts to date, and has put concrete strategies in place for each of the eight fugitives. State cooperation will be essential to successfully locate and arrest them.

80. The Office of the Prosecutor continued to litigate one trial and two appeals before the Mechanism, both of which were transferred from the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in accordance with the statute of the Mechanism and the transitional arrangements. The Office of the Prosecutor quickly commenced its work on these cases in a cost-efficient manner, utilizing the roster and “double-hatting” arrangements prescribed by the Security Council. Using the “one office”

approach, the Office will continue to allocate and manage its resources flexibly in order to comply with all imposed deadlines.

81. Significant challenges remain with respect to the national prosecution of war crimes in the States of the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. Regarding the national prosecution of war crimes committed in Rwanda, cases referred to France are still ongoing, and there has been progress in the cases referred to Rwanda. Regarding national prosecutions of war crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia, the Prosecutor's Office of Bosnia and Herzegovina continued to achieve positive results, while outstanding issues remain unresolved in Croatia and Serbia. Of significant concern, the negative impact of the political environment on domestic war crimes justice is intensifying. Politics, both domestic and regional, has been hindering regional judicial cooperation and undermining trust in judicial accountability, and is increasingly posing a risk to the independence of the judiciary. The Office of the Prosecutor will continue to engage with counterparts and support improvement of the processing of national war crimes. The Office will also continue to encourage improved regional cooperation on war crimes matters and will closely monitor developments.

82. In all of its endeavours, the Office of the Prosecutor relies upon and gratefully acknowledges the support of the international community, and especially that of the Security Council of the United Nations.

---